

Annual Monitoring Report 2021/2022



Contents

Annual Monitoring Report 2021/2022	1
1. Introduction	5
Update on other Development Plan Documents (DPD) and Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs)	5
Update on Neighbourhood Plans.....	7
2. Quantity of Development – How Much.....	8
Policy 1 Quantity of Development	8
Net completions.....	10
Spatial Distribution of Development – Where.....	11
Policy 2 Employment Land.....	12
Policy 3 Aykley Heads.....	14
Policy 4 Housing Allocations	15
Policy 5 Durham City Sustainable Urban Extensions	16
Policy 6 Development on Unallocated Sites	18
3. Building a Strong and Competitive Economy.....	22
Policy 7 Visitor Attractions.....	22
Policy 8 Visitor Accommodation	22
Ensuring the Vitality of Town Centres	23
Policy 9 Retail Hierarchy and Town Centre Development.....	23
Supporting a Prosperous Rural Economy	26
Policy 10 Development in the Countryside.....	26
Policy 11 Rural Housing and Employment Exception Sites.....	28
Policy 12 Permanent Rural Workers Dwellings.....	29
Policy 13 Equestrian Development	30
Policy 14 Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land and Soil Resources	30
4. Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes	31
Policy 15 Addressing Housing Need.....	31
Policy 16 Durham University Development, Purpose Built Student Accommodation and Houses in Multiple Occupation	34
Policy 17 Sites for Travellers	40
Policy 18 Children’s Homes.....	42
Policy 19 Type and Mix of Housing	42
5. Protecting Green Belt Land.....	45
Policy 20 Green Belt.....	46
6. Delivering Sustainable Transport.....	48

Policy 21 Delivering Sustainable Transport.....	48
Policy 22 Durham City Sustainable Transport.....	48
Table 15 Durham University Travel to Work	49
Policy 23 Allocating and Safeguarding Transport Routes and Facilities	59
Policy 24 Provision of Transport Infrastructure.....	60
7. Supporting High Quality Infrastructure	61
Policy 25 Developer Contributions	61
Policy 26 Green Infrastructure.....	62
Policy 27 Utilities, Telecommunications and Other Broadcast Infrastructure	63
Policy 28 Safeguarded Areas.....	63
Requiring Good Design	64
Policy 29 Sustainable Design.....	64
Promoting Healthy Communities.....	74
Policy 30 Hot Food Takeaways.....	75
Policy 31 Amenity and Pollution	77
Policy 32 Despoiled, Degraded, Derelict, Contaminated and Unstable Land.....	77
8. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change.....	79
Policy 33 Renewable Energy	79
Policy 34 Wind Turbine Development	79
Policy 35 Water Management	80
Policy 36 Water Infrastructure.....	81
Policy 37 Durham Coast and Heritage Coast	81
9. Conserving and enhancing the natural and historic environment	83
Policy 39 Landscape	83
Policy 40 Trees, Woodland and Hedges.....	84
Policy 41 Biodiversity and Geodiversity.....	84
Policy 42 Internationally Designated Sites.....	85
Policy 43 Protected Species and Nationally and Locally Protected Sites.....	86
Policy 44 Historic Environment	87
Policy 45 Durham Castle and Cathedral World Heritage Site	89
Policy 46 Stockton and Darlington Railway.....	89
10. Minerals and Waste	90
Policy 47 Sustainable Minerals and Waste Resource Management.....	90
Policy 48 Safeguarding Minerals Sites, Minerals Related Infrastructure and Waste Management Sites.....	91
Policy 49 Primary Aggregates Provision.....	92

Policy 50 Locational Approach to the Future Supply of Primary Aggregates	94
Policy 51 Meeting Future Aggregate Requirements	94
Policy 52 Brick Making Raw Materials	95
Policy 53 Surface Mined Coal and Fireclay	96
Policy 54 Natural Building and Roofing Stone	96
Policy 55 Reopening of Relic Building Stone Quarries for Heritage Projects.....	96
Policy 56 Safeguarding Mineral Resources	97
Policy 57 The Conservation and Use of High Grade Dolomite.....	98
Policy 58 Preferred Areas for Future Carboniferous Limestone Extraction	98
Policy 59 Strategic Area of Search to the South of Todhills Brickworks	99
Policy 60 Waste Management Provision	99
Policy 61 Location of New Waste Management Facilities	105

1. Introduction

- 1.1. An Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) monitors the effectiveness of planning policies and proposals within a Development Plan.
- 1.2. A Local Planning Authority is required to produce a monitoring report of its Local Plan as per The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The AMR should contain information on the implementation of the Local Development Scheme (LDS), and the extent to which planning policies set out in the Local Plan are performing and being delivered.
- 1.3. Last year's AMR (2020/21) was the first to report against the indicators within the adopted County Durham Plan (CDP). This year's AMR (2021/22) is the second AMR of the CDP and first AMR to report on a full year of indicators within the Plan. It has been produced by the Spatial Policy team. It reports on activity from 1st April 2021 to 31st March 2022.
- 1.4. The structure of the report reflects that of the Plan and is reported by the following themes:
 - Quantity of Development (How Much)
 - Spatial Distribution (Where)
 - Building a strong and competitive economy
 - Ensuring the vitality of town centres
 - Supporting a prosperous rural economy
 - Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes
 - Protecting Green Belt land
 - Delivering sustainable transport
 - Supporting high quality infrastructure
 - Requiring good design
 - Promoting healthy communities
 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
 - Conserving and enhancing the natural and historic environment
 - Minerals and waste
- 1.5. The AMR includes analysis of the policy indicators and an assessment as to whether the corresponding policies have met any targets that have been set. This year's AMR builds on the initial findings of last year, in some sections providing more detail and analysis. The County Durham Plan (CDP) has been adopted just over 17 months (21st October 2020 – 31st March 2022) and this means that it is too early to provide any indications as to whether any intervention or early review is required.

Update on other Development Plan Documents (DPD) and Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs)

- 1.6. As well as having an adopted plan, the Council consulted on a Minerals and Waste Policies and Allocations Development Plan Document (M&WDPD) in September/October 2021. This DPD will supplement the Minerals and Waste policies with the CDP and on adoption will

have its own monitoring framework that will be reported within the AMR. A further stage of consultation on a Publication Draft started on 28th November 2022. Once this consultation is completed the DPD, subject to Full Council approval, will be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for an Examination in Public by an independent inspector. Following adoption, it will form part of the statutory development plan for County Durham and will replace the remaining saved policies of the County Durham Minerals Local Plan (December 2000) and the County Durham Waste Local Plan (April 2005).

- 1.7. As well as the M&WDPD, a number of SPDs are in production. Consultation took place in June 2022 on the Development Viability, Affordable Housing and Financial Contributions SPD. A further round of consultation is due to take place in January/February 2023 with the view to adopting this document in April 2023. In addition to this, four other SPDs are to be consulted on for the first time in January/February 2023. These are a Housing Needs SPD, a Design Code SPD, a Trees Woodland and Hedges SPD and a Solar Power SPD. A further SPD on Ecology is to be prepared later in 2023.
- 1.8. A new Local Development Scheme was agreed in November 2022 and confirms this timetable for the M&WDPD and the SPDs in Table 1 below.

Table 1 Local Development Scheme

Local Development Scheme	Reg 19 Consultation	Submission	EIP	Adoption
M&WDPD	Nov 2022- Jan 2023	May 2023	Sept 2023	Jun 2024

Table 1 Local Development Scheme continued

Local Development Scheme continued	First Consultation	Second Consultation	Adoption
Development Viability, Affordable Housing and Financial Contributions SPD	N/A	Jan/Feb 2023	Apr 2023
Housing Needs SPD	Jan/Feb 2023	Jun/Jul 2023	Sept 2023
County Durham Design Code SPD	Jan/Feb 2023	Jun/Jul 2023	Sept 2023
Trees, Woodland and Hedges SPD	Jan/Feb 2023	Jun/Jul 2023	Sept 2023
Solar Power SPD	Jan/Feb 2023	Jun/Jul 2023	Sept 2023
Ecology SPD	Sept/Oct 2023	Feb/Mar 2024	May 2024

Update on Neighbourhood Plans

1.9. Neighbourhood activity and the production of Neighbourhood Plans is led by parish and town councils, or in the case of an unparished area, a neighbourhood forum. The Council provides advice and support to these groups so they can navigate their way through the process.

Within County Durham 9 Neighbourhood Plans have been adopted, these are:

- Durham City
- Cassop-cum-Quarrington
- Cotherstone
- Great Aycliffe
- Lanchester
- Oakenshaw
- Sedgefield
- Whorlton
- Witton Gilbert

The following Neighbourhood Plans are currently being prepared

- Startforth
- Brancepeth
- Coxhoe
- Middridge

2. Quantity of Development – How Much

2.1. The County Durham Plan reflects the need to create successful places by improving the economic performance of County Durham and providing the housing and other development that we need. The Plan is paramount to creating the right conditions for a sustainable County Durham. This includes creating a better environment for business and residents by providing the infrastructure that is needed to enable an increased proportion of the working age population to be in employment, people to live in good quality housing and to have access to a range of facilities, with all the benefits to resident’s health, wellbeing and prosperity that follow as a result. The Plan therefore seeks to enable growth and economic prosperity by ensuring that there is sufficient land, of the right type and in the places where people and business wish to locate within the environmental constraints which exist.

Policy 1 Quantity of Development

2.2. Policy 1 provides the figure for the amount of employment land to be allocated and the minimum housing number for the plan period. The following provides detail of progress in terms of the development of employment land and also housing development over the period April 1st 2021 to March 31st 2022.

QD1 Employment Land approved and completed

Amount of employment land approved:	29.92ha
Amount of employment completed:	5.51ha
Target:	In accordance with the employment land trajectory
Performance against target:	See indicator SD1

2.3. Policy 1 allocates 300ha of employment land. It is Policy 2 that sets out a portfolio of employment sites which are allocated (undeveloped plots/areas) and protected (existing sites with industrial/premises on) for B1, B2 and B8 uses. From September 1st 2020 B1 uses now fall within the new E use class. For the purposes of the policy moving forward, the former B1 uses are monitored by the following use class:

- **E(g)(i)** Offices to carry out any operational or administrative functions;
- **E(g)(ii)** Research and development of products or processes;
- **E(g)(iii)** Industrial processes.

2.4. In the monitoring period 29.92ha of land has been approved for employment space and 5.51ha has been developed. Further analysis is provided under indicator SD1.

QD2 Gross Housing Completions

Gross Housing Completions:	1,681 gross completions (1,671 net)
Target	1,308 net homes completed
Performance against target:	Target met

*figures may be subject to small changes over time, as data is collected from a large number of sources and due to this some figures may be delayed.

QD3 Number of houses approved

Number of housing units approved:	2,528
Target:	No target
Performance against target:	N/A

- 2.5. Policy 1 also sets out the quantity of development required in the county throughout the plan period (2016-2035), and the housing need for County Durham is 1,308 homes per annum, which when applied over the plan period equates to 24,852 dwellings needed.
- 2.6. There have been 2,528 units approved in 2021/22 which is a slight decrease on last year's figure of 2,370 housing units approved. This could be due to the CDP being adopted in October 2020 meaning that there has been less windfall sites approved, and development is being directed to the most sustainable locations through policy 4 and policy 6.
- 2.7. There have been 1,681 completions in total in 2021/22. The target for this indicator is to ensure that net completions are in line with the housing need of 1,308 homes per annum. To ensure this target is being met, several indicators are considered (QD2 and QD4-QD8) to determine the net completion figure taking into account other sources of losses and gains of housing units.

QD4 Number of housing demolitions

Number of housing demolitions	8
Target:	No target
Performance against target	N/A

- 2.8. There have been 8 housing demolitions this financial year, therefore these housing units have been lost to demolition and need to be taken from the gross completions figure.

QD5 Number of empty homes brought back into use

Number of empty homes brought back into use	113*
Target:	No target
Performance against target	N/A

*Long Term Empty (LTE) (not including second homes) brought back into use between 31st March 2021 and 31st March 2022).

- 2.9. Empty homes data shows that over the last full year period of available data there were 113 Long Term Empty (LTE) homes brought back into use.
- 2.10. Since the gross figures for empty homes are offset to some degree by those that move from being short term vacancies to becoming long term vacancies during the same period, it has not been factored into the net completion figure for 2021/22, however we will continue to monitor empty homes annually going forward.

QD6 Number of homes lost to conversion to other uses (excluding student accommodation: C4 small HMOs and Sui Generis large HMOs)

Number of homes lost to conversion to other uses (excluding student accommodation: C4 small HMOs and Sui Generis large HMOs)	2
Target:	No target
Performance against target	N/A

2.11. This year, 2 houses have been converted to other uses (retail units), these therefore need to be taken from the gross completions figure.

QD7 Number of homes gained from conversion from other uses (excluding student accommodation: C4 small HMOs and Sui Generis large HMOs)

Number of homes gained from conversion to other uses (excluding student accommodation: C4 small HMOs and Sui Generis large HMOs)	1
Target:	No target
Performance against target	N/A

2.12. Similarly, the number of homes gained from conversion from other uses should be added to the completions. This year 1 housing unit has been gained through conversion from a public house to a residential dwelling.

QD8 Number of C3 homes lost to C4 small HMOs and Sui Generis large HMOs

Number of C3 homes lost to C4 small HMOs and Sui Generis large HMOs	1
Target:	No target
Performance against target	N/A

2.13. This indicator monitors homes lost to conversion, in this case being to Houses in Multiple Occupancy (HMOs). This year, 1 house has been converted to a HMO.

QD9 Number of C4 small HMOs and Sui Generis Larger HMOs brought back into C3 use

Number of C4 small HMOs and Sui Generis Larger HMOs brought back into C3 use	0
Target:	No target
Performance against target	N/A

2.14. Like indicator QD7, this indicator monitors the number of homes brought back into use, in this case from HMOs. This year no homes have been converted back to C3 use from to HMOs.

Net completions

2.15. Taking all of the above into account from the gross completion figure of 1,681, the net completion figure this year is 1,671. This is much higher than the target in Policy 1 of 1,308 net completions and is significantly higher than last year's figure, and the highest since the start of the Plan period.

2.16. The Covid 19 pandemic impacted on completions in quarter 1 of last year, which in part explains the significant increase from last year, as it was expected that developers would be

compensating for that this year. We have also seen several sites started and completed within this year. The table and graph below show past performance for gross and net housing completions.

Figure 1




Table 2 - Gross and net housing completions

Housing completions	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/2	2020/21	2021/22
Gross housing completions	1,417	1,356	1,513	1,633	1,343	1,681
Net housing completions	1,410	1,339	1,463	1,628	1,328	1,671

* figures may be subject to small changes over time, as data is collected from a large number of sources and due to this some figures may be delayed.

QD10 Number of PBSA bedrooms completed

Number of PBSA bedrooms completed	95
Target:	No target
Performance against target	N/A

2.17. This year 95 new bedrooms have been completed in Purpose Built Student Accommodation (PBSA). While this isn't factored into the completions above, it is factored into the Housing Delivery Test (HDT) which is set out in further detail at indicator SD5.

Spatial Distribution of Development – Where

- 2.18. The County Durham Plan not only identifies the amount of new development needed but also where it should be located. Development within the Plan should reflect the principles of sustainable development but also be realistic and deliverable.

Policy 2 Employment Land

- 2.19. It is important to ensure that there is a portfolio of available employment sites across the county which are attractive to new employers, allow the expansion of existing businesses and respond to the changing needs of businesses. It is essential that these are located in areas of the county that offer good opportunities to attract investment. Policy 2 sets out the approach for allocating and protecting employment sites across the county.

SD1 Amount of employment land approved and completed by Use Class on allocated sites

Amount of employment land approved:	29.92ha
Amount of employment completed:	5.51ha
Target:	In accordance with the employment land trajectory (29.35ha developed)
Performance against target:	Please refer to item 2.20 for more information

- 2.20. This indicator consists of two parts to cover employment space permitted and employment space completed.
- 2.21. Indicator SD1 is a similar indicator to that which the Council reported on through pre-CDP published AMRs. Therefore, as well as comparing against last year's figure, the table below shows figures for 2019/20 and 2018/19.

Table 3 Data from previous AMRs

Monitoring year	Employment land approved	Employment land completed
2018/19	16ha	10.5ha
2019/20	62.37ha	17.29ha
2020/21	18.68ha	36.69ha
2021/22	29.92ha	5.51ha

- 2.22. Policy 2 sets out a portfolio of employment sites which are allocated (undeveloped plots/areas) and protected (existing sites with industrial/premises on) for B1, B2 and B8 uses. From September 1st 2020 B1 uses now fall within the new E use class. For the purposes of the policy moving forward, the former B1 uses are monitored by the following use class.
- **E(g)(i)** Offices to carry out any operational or administrative functions,
 - **E(g)(ii)** Research and development of products or processes
 - **E(g)(iii)** Industrial processes
- 2.23. In the monitoring period 29.92ha of land has been approved for employment space and 5.51ha has been completed.

Table 4 Amount of employment land approved on allocated/protected sites

Monitoring year	E(g)(i) office	E(g)(ii) R&D	E(g)(iii) Industrial processes	B2 (General Industry)	B8 (Storage and Distribution)	Total
20/21	15.153ha	0ha	0.43ha	3.03ha	0.067ha	18.68ha
21/22	1.49ha	15.6ha	1.84ha	6.1ha	4.89ha	29.92ha

- 2.24. Table 4 shows that of the 29.92ha of land approved, over half of this can be attributed to the approval at NETPark for Phase 3a, which proposes the development of 15.6ha for Research and Development floorspace. Other approvals of note include an application at Belmont Industrial Estate of 5.2ha proposing B2 and B8 floorspace. The remaining approvals are all small-scale schemes.
- 2.25. This year's AMR allows us to compare this year's figures with the figures reported last year. It is first notable that more land has been approved in the monitoring period than last year. Apart from office development, the amount of land approved for each use has increased. Future AMRs will continue to monitor these trends.

Table 5 Amount of employment land completed on allocated/protected sites

Monitoring year	E(g)(i) office	E(g)(ii) R&D	E(g)(iii) Industrial processes	B2 (General Industry)	B8 (Storage and Distribution)	Total
20/21	0.56ha	0ha	1.88ha	6.1ha	28.15ha	36.69ha
21/22	0ha	0ha	0.26ha	1.65ha	3.6ha	5.51ha

- 2.26. Table 5 shows that 5.51ha of employment land has been developed for employment uses. This is a fall on previous years and reflects that there have not been the large-scale units completed as there had been the previous year (the last AMR reported on the completion of significant development at Integra61 and Jade). This year's figure reflects the completion of a number of smaller proposals across various locations in the County, including Aycliffe, Belmont, St Helen Auckland, Willington, Consett and South Hetton. The majority of completions were either general industry or storage and distribution floorspace.
- 2.27. The impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic may still be felt on employment land completions, however it is anticipated that the figure will be significantly higher next year as a number of larger sites, such as Plot C at Aykley Heads are currently under construction and the rise in the number of approvals over the monitoring period. However, given the low figure for completions, the target which is set by the employment land trajectory (29.35ha) has not been met in this monitoring period.

SD2 The amount of allocated, specific and protected employment space lost to other use

Amount of employment land lost (permitted):	0.83ha
Amount of employment land lost (completed):	0.046ha
Target:	None lost to other uses
Performance against target:	Please refer to item 2.28 for more information

2.28. For the purposes of this indicator, it has been split into two to cover employment land lost (permitted), and employment land lost (completed). Over the monitoring period 0.83ha of land has been approved for uses other than what the land is allocated or protected for. In each case these have been generally small scale losses, the largest of which was an approval for a small convenience store on Castleside Industrial Estate. In addition there have been small scale losses to uses such as a tattoo studio, a beauty salon, an indoor children’s play area, a canine day care and a car sales use.

Table 6 Amount of allocated, specific and protected employment space lost to other use

Monitoring year	Amount of employment land lost (permitted):	Amount of employment land lost (completed):
20/21	2.07ha	Not monitored
21/22	0.83ha	0.046ha

2.29. Comparing the figures with the figures reported last year shows a slight fall in the amount of land permitted to non-employment uses. Future AMRs will continue to monitor these trends.

2.30. This year’s AMR also reports on the permitted losses identified in last year’s AMR which have now been completed. Of the losses permitted in the period 20/21, just one has been completed, this being the change of use of a unit at Dragonville, from B8 to Class E (Bulky Goods Retail), now trading as Frank’s Factory Flooring. Due to this reported loss, the indicator target has not strictly been met. It should be noted that the applications approved have been able to demonstrate that they meet criteria a or b within Policy 2 which allows for uses outside of what the sites are protected or allocated for.

Policy 3 Aykley Heads

2.31. Aykley Heads has been identified as a strategic employment site within the County Durham Plan. This recognises the potential opportunity to develop a high quality office development, building on recent investment and the locational advantages of the site.

SD3 Gross employment floorspace completed at Aykley Heads

Floorspace completed:	0sqm
Target:	38,468sqm of floorspace completed
Performance against target:	N/A

2.32. The Aykley Heads policy sets out the criteria for assessing planning applications which will deliver a business park with the potential to create 4000 jobs over the Plan period.

2.33. Last year’s AMR reported on the approval of an application on the full Aykley Heads site, as identified in the CDP. The application proposed a total of 38,468sqm of floorspace, the majority of this was in outline, although the application included a detailed submission on Plot C which was for an office building of 2,985sqm. The Council remain committed to the development of the site that can create a new and unique business location that maximises economic growth in County Durham and delivers jobs in new and growing sectors. Whilst

Plot C is now currently under construction and nearing completion, this year's AMR reports that no floorspace has been completed.

Policy 4 Housing Allocations

2.34. Policy 4 allocates sites that have been considered the most appropriate to deliver the new homes we need to ensure that we meet our Local Housing Need (LHN), making effective use of land and utilising previously developed land where it is available and viable. These allocations, together with the other elements of housing supply such as sites with planning permission and under construction, will provide the range and choice of sites to meet our needs and deliver the preferred spatial strategy for the distribution of housing in County Durham.

SD4 Number of units approved and completed on allocated sites

Number of housing units approved on allocated sites:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 200 units Ash Drive Willington (H26) • 500 units Sherburn road (H6)
Number of Completions on allocated sites:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 17 units (full site) completed on Hawthorn House Newton Hall (H2) • 10 completions (out of 60) on Former Gilesgate School (H1)
Target:	Annual Housing Delivery Target - based on the Housing Trajectory
Performance against target:	The housing trajectory which accompanied the adoption of the plan did not anticipate any completions on these allocated sites when applying the definition of a deliverable site from the planning practice guidance. Within the updated housing trajectory, the 2 sites (H1 and H2) have now been brought forward to reflect the change in circumstances.

2.35. On the sites allocated for housing, 700 units were approved on housing allocations across 2 sites. This was 500 units approved on Sherburn Road (H6) and 200 units approved at Ash Drive Willington (H26).

2.36. There have been no completions on these sites within 2021/22, however, there have been 27 completions on allocated sites that were approved in 2020/21. 17 units (full site) were completed on Hawthorn House (H2) and 10 completions out of the 60 units approved at Gilesgate School (H1).

SD5 Five year land supply position/delivery test

Five year land supply position	5.47 years
Delivery Test Result	145%
Target:	At least a five year supply and meeting the delivery test in accordance with the NPPF
Performance against target:	Target met (5.47 years housing land supply. Housing Delivery Test met.)

- 2.37. The Housing Delivery Test (HDT) provides the Government’s official measure of housing delivery performance at local authority level. It measures net additional dwellings in a local authority area against the homes required, using national statistics and local authority data ¹. The HDT is calculated using a percentage measurement of the number of net homes delivered against the number of homes required, as set out in the relevant strategic policies, over a rolling three-year period. The calculation uses net additional dwellings, with adjustments for net student and net other communal accommodation.
- 2.38. County Durham has passed the HDT for 2022 with a result of 145% and is therefore above the required ‘pass mark’ of 95% where no action needs to be taken. This is higher than last year, due to a higher number of completions over the 3-year period.
- 2.39. National planning policy require Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) to maintain a five-year supply of deliverable sites (against housing requirements) to ensure choice and consumption in the market for land. Based on this, as at 1st April 2022 the council can demonstrate a supply of housing of 5.47 years against its Local Housing Need. This is slightly lower than last year’s housing land supply figure, due to a number of factors. This year has seen significantly higher completions than last, moving housing units out of the supply as they have now been delivered. This also takes into account the sites which fall within the catchment of the Teesmouth and Cleveland Special Protection Area (SPA)/Ramsar and are affected by nutrient neutrality ². Where a site does not have full planning permission or conditions relating to drainage/water still need to be discharged, they have been pushed out of the 5-year supply.

SD6 Delivery of infrastructure requirements as set out in the policy

Delivery of infrastructure requirements as set out in the policy	H2 is now complete however this didn't have any requirements set out in Policy 4.
Target:	100%
Performance against target:	N/A

- 2.40. Policy 4 sets out infrastructure requirements for housing allocations where they are required. These have been identified throughout the SHLAA and allocation selection process to deliver the necessary improvements or infrastructure to enable the development to go ahead without any adverse impacts.
- 2.41. As the only housing allocation which has been completed had no Policy 4 infrastructure requirements, there has been no infrastructure in relation to this policy delivered this year. This will change as more sites are brought forward for delivery.

Policy 5 Durham City Sustainable Urban Extensions

- 2.42. In order to meet housing needs and to promote sustainable patterns of development, land at Sniperley Park and Sherburn Road are allocated for planned urban extensions and have been removed from the Green Belt. Development is required to be comprehensively

¹ https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/728523/HDT_Measurement_Rule_Book.pdf

² <https://www.local.gov.uk/pas/topics/environment/nutrient-neutrality-nn-and-planning-system>

masterplanned and to demonstrate how the phasing of development on these sites will have regard to the provision and timing of the infrastructure and services necessary to support them.

Sniperley Park

- 2.43. The Sniperley Park site is covered by Policy 5 (Durham City's Sustainable Urban Extensions) which allocates urban extensions to Durham City and removed the site from the Green Belt. Two major applications have been submitted for the site. The application covering the largest area (DM/21/03574/OUT) seeks demolition of existing buildings adjacent to B6532 and outline planning permission (all matters reserved except access) for a maximum of 1,550 dwellings (Use Class C3), a local Centre (use classes E and F2), public house (use class sui generis) and primary school (use class F1), associated infrastructure and landscaping.
- 2.44. The application covering the smaller site area (DM/21/02360/FPA) is a hybrid planning application consisting of outline planning permission (all matters reserved) for an extension to the Sniperley Park and Ride and full planning permission for the development of 370 dwellings associated access and works and demolition of former farm buildings.
- 2.45. The Council took the decision to lead on the production of a Masterplan for Sniperley as it was not readily apparent that the main parties were working collaboratively as planning submissions were being prepared. The masterplan is a means to guide the future planning, design and development of the site as it moves towards delivery. A public consultation was undertaken in order to seek views from interested parties from 29 November 2021 to 14 January 2022. The Masterplan was adopted by the Council on 22nd June 2022 following consideration of the comments received.
- 2.46. Both proposals are subject to appeals to the Planning Inspectorate against non-determination of the applications. In light of this, committee members were asked to consider reports in light of this and make resolutions based upon the decision they would make were the application to be determined in the usual manner. This resolution will be carried forward for consideration at the Public Inquiry. On 6th September 2022 members endorsed recommendations of 'minded to refuse' for both applications: <https://democracy.durham.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?Cid=318&Mid=14548&Ver=4>. A public inquiry is scheduled for January 2023.

Sherburn Road

- 2.47. Banks Property were granted outline planning permission for up to 500 dwellings on the Sherburn Road allocation on 22nd March 2022. The development will provide 25% affordable housing on site as required by policy 15 of the CDP. As part of the development, there will be improvements to existing open spaces and recreational facilities in the Belmont area, as well as the delivery of off-site green belt compensatory improvements and increased public access. Financial contributions towards upgrading healthcare provision, primary and secondary school capacity in the area and improvements to the Laurel Avenue Community Centre will also be provided in line with the requirements set out in policy 5 of the CDP.

- 2.48. A reserved matters application for 470 dwellings has been submitted and validated on 8th July 2022 and is currently pending consideration, this will address the detail of the development including design and layout.

SD8 Delivery of infrastructure requirements as set out in the policy and an agreed phasing plan

Delivery of infrastructure requirement as set out in the policy and an agreed project plan:	N/A (no sites have commenced yet)
Target:	On track in accordance with the phasing plan
Performance against target:	N/A

SD7 Gross Housing units approved and completed by site

Number of units approved on allocated sites:	500
Number of completions on allocated sites:	0 completions
Target:	Annual Housing Delivery Target – based on the housing trajectory
Performance against target:	N/A

Policy 6 Development on Unallocated Sites

- 2.49. This policy recognises that, in addition to the development of allocated sites, there will be situations where future opportunities arise for additional new development over and above that identified in the development plan for that area. This policy sets out circumstances where such opportunities will be acceptable.

SD9 Number of housing units permitted and completed on unallocated sites of 11 or fewer

Number of housing units permitted on unallocated sites of 11 units or fewer	230 units approved
Number of housing units completed on unallocated site of 11 units or fewer.	102 units approved
Target:	No target
Performance against target:	N/A

SD10 Number of housing units permitted and completed on unallocated sites of 12 units or greater

Number of housing units permitted on unallocated sites of 12 units or fewer	1,598 units approved
Number of housing units completed on unallocated sites of 12 units or fewer.	1,552 units completed
Target:	No target
Performance against target:	N/A

- 2.50. Policy 4 and 5 identify the housing site allocations for the plan, however Policy 6 sets out how applications for new housing on unallocated sites will be assessed.

- 2.51. The indicators monitor housing schemes on unallocated sites of 11 or fewer and schemes of 12 or more on unallocated sites. The figures show 230 units approved and 102 completed on smaller sites and 1,598 units approved and 1,552 completed on larger sites. Compared with last year's figures, all approvals have decreased, with both smaller and larger sites completions increasing from last year. The decrease in approvals could be due to the adoption of the CDP, and less windfall sites approved, and development is being directed to the most sustainable locations through policy 4 and policy 6. The increase in completions reflects the overall high completion numbers this year.

SD11 Amount of employment space permitted and completed on unallocated sites

Amount of employment space permitted:	8,325.5sqm
Amount of employment space completed:	676sqm
Target:	No target
Performance against target:	N/A

- 2.52. Whilst Policy 2 sets out employment allocations for new employment uses, Policy 6 sets out instances where new employment uses will be acceptable on unallocated sites.
- 2.53. For the purposes of this indicator, it has been split into two to cover employment space permitted and employment space completed. The results are discussed further below.

Table 7 Amount of employment space permitted on unallocated sites

Monitoring year	E(g)(i) office	E(g)(ii) R&D	E(g)(iii) Industrial Processes	B2	B8	Total
20/21 (Nov – Mar)	225sqm	0	581sqm	0	0	806sqm
21/22	1419.5sqm	0	410sqm	448sqm	6048sqm	8325.5sqm

- 2.54. Table 7 shows that 8325.5sqm of employment space has been approved on unallocated sites across the County over the monitoring period. The table above shows that a significant amount of this floorspace fell within the B8 use class (Storage or Distribution), with the next highest falling within the E(g)(i) (office) use class. The total is made up by uses within the B2 (General Industrial) class and E(g)(iii) (Industrial Processes) use class. The figures for this year's monitoring period are significantly higher than last years, although it should be noted that last year's figures only reported from the adoption of the Plan (5 months).
- 2.55. The largest of these approvals was an application for 7 storage units, totalling 3172sqm, at land east of Burger King at Thinford Park. Also of note was an approval for 557sqm of office floorspace at the former Mainstream USA site at Diamond Terrace, Durham City.

Table 8 Amount of employment space completed on unallocated sites

Monitoring year	E(g)(i) office	E(g)(ii) R&D	E(g)(iii) Industrial Processes	B2	B8	Total
21/22	95sqm	0	581qm	0	0	676sqm

- 2.56. From last years permitted floor space (806sqm), from proportionate investigation, the AMR can report that 676sqm has been completed. This includes the development of a steel

framed storage building on land adjacent to the Esh Winning protected employment site, a timber structure associated with a car valeting business in Chester-le-Street and the redevelopment of Wolsingham CIU Club which now includes some first floor offices.

SD12 Amount of retail floor space permitted beyond a defined centre

Retail floor space permitted	6,306.1sqm
Target:	No Target
Performance against target:	N/A

2.57. Whilst Policy 9 directs retail floorspace to town centres defined within the retail hierarchy, there are instances where retail floorspace will be permitted outside of these centres on unallocated sites. This will be where an applicant has complied with the requirements of the sequential test, and if applicable, the impact test.

2.58. There has been 6,306.1sqm of retail floorspace permitted beyond a defined town centre across the county over the monitoring period. The majority of this floorspace was covered by 2 applications, the largest of which was an approval for a retail unit of 3717sqm on the former Mono Containers site at Dragon Lane. The proposal would see the development of a large single retail unit on a long term vacant site situated on the edge of the defined Sherburn Road/Dragonville District Centre. Also of note was a variation of condition approval at the Morrison store at Dalton Park which allowed a further 1115sqm floorspace by way of a mezzanine. Elsewhere other applications included a small foodstore in Spennymoor, further retail floorspace at a petrol filling station in Barnard Castle and an extension to the existing edge of centre Lidl store in Spennymoor.

Table 9 Amount of retail floorspace permitted on unallocated sites beyond a defined centre

Monitoring year	Retail floorspace permitted
20/21 (Nov – Mar)	280sqm
21/22	6,306.1sqm

2.59. The figures for this year’s monitoring period are significantly higher than last years, although it should be noted that last year’s figures only reported from the adoption of the Plan (5 months).

SD13 Number of valued facilities or services lost by settlement or neighbourhood

Valued facilities or services lost	0
Target	0
Performance against target	Target Met

2.60. In some of County Durham smaller settlements and communities, a local shop/convenience store or community facility is of great importance to the local population. Policy 6 sets out criteria within the policy which seeks to guard against the loss of valued facilities or services within settlements and neighbourhoods on unallocated sites. There have been no approvals that would propose such losses and therefore such facilities lost over the monitoring period.

This reflects the findings from last year's AMR and again the performance target set by the indicator is met.

3. Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

- 3.1. A key priority of the council and its partners is to improve economic performance and reduce deprivation in County Durham to ensure that all its residents have equal access to quality job opportunities. The visitor economy is an important and resilient part of the County Durham economy but there remains a great deal of untapped potential. The Plan aims to strengthen County Durham's role as a visitor/tourist destination, building on and adding to, the strength of existing attractions, townscapes and landscapes, encouraging the development of new visitor attractions and accommodation and increasing the contribution of Durham's rural areas to the overall value of the county's visitor economy.

Policy 7 Visitor Attractions

- 3.2. Policy 7 recognises the importance of the tourism sector to the economy of County Durham and provides a series of criteria for assessing applications for new or extensions to existing visitor attractions. The policy aims to ensure that visitor attractions are sustainably located, conform with their setting, and are a viable addition to the county's tourism offer. It also sets out additional criteria for proposals which would be located in the countryside, in order to avoid, minimise or mitigate harm.

CE1 Number of new and expanded visitor attraction approved and completed

Number of new and expanded visitor attractions approved:	14 approved
Number of new and expanded visitor attractions completed:	3 completed
Target:	No target
Performance against target:	N/A

- 3.3. This indicator monitors number of new and expanded visitor attractions that are approved and completed. Approved applications have only been counted where they are an entirely new attraction or an addition to an existing attraction which may draw in visitors. Minor extensions such as car parks have not been included in the figures.
- 3.4. Over the monitoring period, there have been 14 approvals for a visitor attraction proposal, including one wedding venue in Shildon and one in Newton Aycliffe, refurbishment to the Durham Miners Hall, and a public house in Bishop Auckland.
- 3.5. In the previous monitoring period – October 21st 2020 (adoption date) to March 31st 2021 – four applications were approved. Of these, three have been completed, which are a wedding venue at Dalton Pumping Station, glamping pods at Eden Grange Fisheries and a Viking Village at Kynren Flatts to be used to provide a pre-show immersive experience.

Policy 8 Visitor Accommodation

- 3.6. Policy 8 gives recognition to the importance of the tourism sector to the economy of County Durham and provides a series of criteria for assessing applications for visitor accommodation. The policy aims to ensure that visitor accommodation conforms with its setting and is not used for permanent residential occupation. The policy goes on to provide

further criteria for sites which would be located in the countryside, and for camping, caravan, glamping or chalet proposals.

CE2 Net additional bed spaces

Net additional bed spaces approved:	469 new bedspaces approved
Target:	No net loss
Performance against target:	Target Met

3.7. This indicator monitors the number of net additional bedspaces. This figure has been calculated based on approved planning applications over the monitoring period. No bedspaces were counted for applications with no permanent bedspaces, such as caravan parks where the number of visitors would fluctuate, as they would bring their own accommodation with varying bed capacities. Permanent bedspaces in fixed structures such as static caravans and glamping pods have been counted.

3.8. Over the monitoring period, there have been 469 bedspaces approved, including holiday cottages in Consett, Shepherds huts and log cabins in Bishop Auckland and a static caravan park in Eastgate with 82 permanent caravans. There has been a significant increase in applications from the previous monitoring period, as well as the majority being larger scale developments. This may be attributed to the ending of COVID-19 restrictions, leading to the recovery of the tourism sector, and the popularity of the 'staycation'. In the previous monitoring period 117 new bed spaces were approved, of these 63 have been completed.

Ensuring the Vitality of Town Centres

3.9. Over the past 3 years town centres have faced increasing challenges, the outbreak of Covid-19 in 2020 and resulting lockdowns have accelerated processes of change that were already underway within town centres with changing consumer behaviour and the rise of e-commerce, mobile technology and internet shopping. As town centres transition back following the Covid-19 pandemic, setting out a strategic planning framework for town centres is as important as ever in providing locations where businesses can thrive and people want to visit.

Policy 9 Retail Hierarchy and Town Centre Development

3.10. Policy 9 sets out a retail hierarchy of centres across the County. The policy sets out a framework to protect these centres from development that would impact on them.

TC1 Vacancy rates in town centres

Average vacancy rate (Sub Regional, Large Town and Small Town Centres):	16.1%
Average vacancy rate (District Centres):	5.5%
Target:	Vacancy rates below national rate ³
Performance against target:	Target partly met (Please refer to item 3.11 for more information)

³ High Street Average 14,1%, Retail Park Average 10.6%, source Local Data Company, 1st Quarter vacancy rates 2022

- 3.11. In order to understand how the centres within the retail hierarchy are performing, town centre surveys are conducted annually. The following data follows surveys in June/July 2022 and provides details of how the town centres within the retail hierarchy have performed during the monitoring period. It provides details of vacancy rates in terms of vacant units within Sub Regional, Large Town and Small Town Centres as identified within the hierarchy. It is noted that the indicator TC1 is a similar indicator to that which the Council have reported on through previous published AMRs prior to adoption of the CDP. For context therefore, the table below shows the data from the last 3 monitoring periods.

Table 10 Vacancy Rates with Sub Regional, Large Town and Small Town Centres

Centre	Vacancy Rate (%) 18/19	Vacancy Rate (%) 19/20	Vacancy Rate (%) 20/21	Vacancy Rate (%) 21/22
Barnard Castle	9.9	9.3	9.9	10.6
Bishop Auckland	24.4	22.9	27.7	26.3
Chester-le-Street	9.6	12.9	14.5	13.1
Consett	10.5	9.5	13.1	12.1
Crook	10.6	7.8	11.4	12.1
Durham City	11.9	16.1	16.2	14.3
Ferryhill	9.9	10	8.9	13.3
Newton Aycliffe	18.3	22.3	26.2	20.4
Peterlee	26	26.8	32.3	32.8
Seaham	9.9	9.2	7.3	6
Sildon	9.5	11.6	15.8	16.8
Spennymoor	17.2	22.5	17.3	14.8
Stanley	18.6	16.4	15.8	16.7
Average	14.33	15.17	16.64	16.1

- 3.12. Peterlee, Bishop Auckland and Newton Aycliffe continue to have the highest percentage of vacant units within the County, however it is noticeable that the number of vacant units has declined in Bishop Auckland and significantly in Newton Aycliffe, which has also had the biggest decrease in vacancy of all centres surveyed, with 6 less units vacant. It is also positive to see that as well as Newton Aycliffe and Bishop Auckland, vacancy rates had decreased in Chester-le-Street, Consett, Durham City, Seaham and Spennymoor.
- 3.13. There has also been an increase in the number of centres, up from 5 to 7, which have vacancy rates below the national average. These are Barnard Castle, Chester-le-Street, Consett, Crook, Ferryhill and Seaham, which has the lowest vacancy rate within the whole of the County at just 6%, significantly below the national average. Overall, the average vacancy rate stands at 16.1%, which is also a fall on last years figure (16.64%) but is 2% above the national average.
- 3.14. Whilst the improving picture in some the County's town centre is encouraging, the Council continue to strive to bring further improvements recognising the continued challenges facing town centres and now have recently adopted masterplans in Bishop Auckland, Chester-le-Street, Crook, Peterlee, Newton Aycliffe and Stanley. These seek to improve and address some of the issues which are facing these town centres.

Table 11 Vacancy Rates within District Centres

Centre	Vacancy Rate (%) (units) 18/19	Vacancy Rate (%) 19/20	Vacancy Rate (%) 20/21	Vacancy Rate (%) 21/22
Arnison Centre	9.1	12.1	20.6	8.8
Dragonville/Sherburn Road	5.9	2.7	2.3	2.3
Average	7.5	7.4	11.45	5.55

- 3.15. Policy 9 defines the Arnison Centre and Dragonville/Sherburn Road as District Centres. Both of the defined District Centres have large mainstream convenience foodstore anchors and also a higher order non-food retail offer which also reflects the origins of both centres as out of centre retail park developments. The District Centres do however lack the local service function (banks, professional services etc.) of traditional centres. For the purposes of the indicator therefore, they have been compared against the national vacancy rate for retail parks which stands at 10.6%.
- 3.16. Table 11 identifies that the Arnison Centre has a vacancy rate of 8.8%, which is a significant fall on last years figure of 20.6% and is now below the national average. This represents 4 less vacant units within the centre. Dragonville/Sherburn Road has a low vacancy rate at just 2.3%, this figure remains unchanged from last year.
- 3.17. Whilst the more traditional town centres have a vacancy rate above the national average, the retail parks have a vacancy rate below the national average. Given this it is considered that the target for the indicator has been partly met.

TC2 Approved and completed retail floorspace outside of town centres that are over 1,500sqm for convenience and 1,000sqm comparison

Approved retail floorspace outside of a town centre that is over 1,500sqm convenience and 1,000sqm comparison	4832sqm
Completed retail floorspace outside of a town centre that is over 1,500sqm convenience and 1,000sqm comparison	0sqm
Failed the required impact test	0sqm
Target:	None delivered which failed the required impact test
Performance against target:	Target met

- 3.18. The policy sets a retail impact threshold whereby an applicant has to submit an impact assessment for any retail proposal outside of a town centre that exceeds this threshold. This considers the impact of their proposals on the defined centres within the County. The policy states that where an application fails the impact assessment, it should be refused.
- 3.19. Policy 6 and Indicator SD12 reported on the amount of retail floorspace approved on unallocated sites located outside of a defined centre. Of those approvals two were above the impact thresholds set out in Policy 9. These were the proposed retail store at the Mono Containers site on Dragon Lane (3717sqm) and the proposed mezzanine at the Morrisons store at Dalton Park (1115sqm). These applications were subject to an impact test and in both instances were found to have passed the impact test, the proposals were not found to

have significant adverse impacts on defined centres. Given this, it is considered that the target set by the indicator has been met.

Supporting a Prosperous Rural Economy

3.20. Ninety percent of the county's population lives east of the A68 in forty percent of the county area, yet rural communities do not only exist within the west of the county. County Durham's rural areas vary widely in character from remote and sparsely populated areas in the Pennine Dales, to the larger villages located within the former coalfield communities in the centre and east. These areas do not have good access to more urban areas and the services and facilities in those areas including housing and employment.

Policy 10 Development in the Countryside

3.21. Policy 10 seeks to control development within the countryside, directing new development to sites within the built-up area, those well-related to a settlement or those specifically allocated for development. It sets out a framework for assessing development in the countryside, guarding against inappropriate development.

RE1 Appeals upheld contrary to this policy

Appeals:	7
Appeals Allowed:	1
Target:	None upheld at appeal
Performance against target:	Target not met

3.22. It is important that policies are being used to uphold planning decisions made by the Council if the applicant subsequently appeals that decision.

3.23. Over the monitoring period there were 7 appeals of applications refused against Policy 10. Of these appeals, 6 were dismissed and 1 was allowed (APP/X1355/W/21/3275023). This was an application that proposed the conversion of an existing agricultural structure into a family dwelling south of Old Quarrington. The application was refused against Policy 10, criteria (q) and (r) and Policy 26. This related to highway safety issues in terms of impacts on existing users of the bridleway footpath, over which future occupiers of the proposed dwelling would need to gain access to the development. The inspector found that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable intensification of traffic to such a degree that it would compromise the safety, and recreational experience, of users of the bridleway. The inspector consequently found no conflict with Policy 10 or Policy 26.

3.24. Whilst the policy is performing well at appeal, given that the afore mentioned appeal was allowed, the target set by the indicator has not been met.

RE2 Number of new agricultural or other rural land based enterprise ventures (approved and completed)

Number of new agricultural or other rural land based enterprise ventures approved:	19
Number of new agricultural or other rural land based venture completed:	11
Target:	No target
Performance against target:	N/A

- 3.25. For the purposes of this indicator, it has been split into two to cover new agricultural or other rural land based enterprise ventures space permitted, and those that have been completed.
- 3.26. There have been 19 agricultural or other land based enterprise ventures that have been approved over the monitoring period. Many of these approvals were for holiday accommodation proposals, notably for shepherd huts and glamping pods. There were approvals for this type of development in locations such as Copley, West Pelton, Shotley Bridge and south of Durham City. A number of applications were also approved to convert buildings to holiday lets at locations such as Croxdale, Copley, Ireshopeburn, High Stoop, Butterknowle, Westgate, Barnard Castle and Escomb. Other such enterprises approved were wedding venues at Eden Grange and Croxdale, a farm shop at Dalton Moor, Murton and a commercial livery and riding centre just outside Stanley.
- 3.27. From last years approved new ventures, from proportionate investigation, the AMR can report that 11 have been completed. These include the change of use of Dalton Pumping Station to a wedding venue and a timber wedding ceremony building at Bradbury. In terms of holiday accommodation, completions included glamping pods at Edmundbyers, Etherley Grange and Eden Grange and holiday lets at Wycliffe Grange. Other completions included a dog kennel facility near Shotton Colliery.

RE3 Numbers of buildings brought back into use for economic generating uses

Approved proposals that will bring building back into economic generating uses:	8
Buildings brought back into economic generating uses:	2
Target:	No target
Performance against target:	N/A

- 3.28. For the purposes of this indicator, it has been split into two to cover applications approved that propose to bring buildings in the countryside back into economic generating uses and where following the approval, the building has been brought back into such use.
- 3.29. In terms of approvals, there were 8 applications approved that propose to bring buildings in the countryside back into economic use. These include proposals for holiday lets, a farm shop, a storage and distribution warehouse and a heritage centre in locations such as Croxdale, Copley, Dalton Moor, Escomb, Westgate and Ireshopeburn.
- 3.30. From last year's approvals, there have been 2 buildings that have now been brought back into economic use, the conversion of a barn at Wycliffe Grange to a holiday let and the change of use of Dalton Pumping Station to a wedding venue.

RE4 Number of community facilities within the countryside being lost to alternative non community use (approved)

Facilities lost:	0
Target:	Zero
Performance against target:	Target met

3.31. As identified in the monitoring of Indicator SD13, the value of community facilities is of great importance. This is particularly the case in the countryside. Policy 10 sets out criteria which seeks to guard against the loss of community facilities within the countryside. There have been no approvals that would propose such losses and therefore no such facilities lost over the monitoring period.

RE5 Proportion of new dwellings (excluding rural exceptions, replacement, conversions, subdivisions and those associated with a rural enterprise) within the countryside approved and completed

Proportion of new dwellings (excluding rural exceptions, replacement, conversions, subdivisions and those associated with a rural enterprise) within the countryside approved	0.03% 1 unit
Proportion of new dwellings (excluding rural exceptions, replacement, conversions, subdivisions and those associated with a rural enterprise) within the countryside completed	2.32% 39 units
Target:	Reducing trend
Performance against target:	Approvals- Target met Completions- Target not met

3.32. This indicator breaks down approvals and completions in the countryside and reflects Policy 10.

3.33. In 2021/22, there was 1 house approved in the countryside, out of 2,528 approved overall equating to 0.03% of the units approved in total. Of the gross completions total of 1,681 this year, 39 completions were in the countryside, equating to 2.32% of all completions.

3.34. These figures are low which would be expected, and approvals have decreased significantly from 7.8% (186 houses) last year which is meeting the target of reducing the trend. This reduced trend is due to the adoption of the CDP and the implications of policy 10. Completions this year has increased from 1.3% last year, and although this has not met the target to reduce the trend, it will be due to existing permissions from before the adoption of policy 10 which are still being delivered on site. This will continue to be monitored annually and it is expected that the completion figure will start to decrease once older permissions are completed.

Policy 11 Rural Housing and Employment Exception Sites

3.35. Policy 11 recognises that there are circumstances where affordable and specialist housing and employment related development is needed which would be contrary to Policy 6 (Development on Unallocated Sites) and Policy 10 (Development in the Countryside). These are known as exception sites.

RE6 Number of housing units approved and completed on exception sites

Number of houses approved on exception sites:	0
Number of houses completed on exceptions sites:	0
Target:	No target
Performance against target:	N/A

3.36. Over the monitoring period, there have been no approved housing exception sites and there have been no completions.

RE7 Amount of employment floorspace approved and completed on exception sites

Amount of floorspace approved on exception sites:	0
Amount of floorspace completed on exception sites:	0
Target:	No target
Performance against target:	N/A

3.37. Over the monitoring period, there have been no approved exception employment floorspace. There has been no completion of exception employment floorspace.

RE8 Number of new businesses created on exception sites

Number of businesses created:	0
Target:	No target
Performance against target:	N/A

3.38. Over the monitoring period, there have been no businesses created.

Policy 12 Permanent Rural Workers Dwellings

3.39. Isolated new houses in the countryside require special justification for planning permission to be granted. One of the few circumstances in which isolated residential development may be justified is when there is an essential need for agricultural, forestry and other full-time rural workers to live permanently at, or in the immediate vicinity of, their place of work. Policy 12 sets out criteria where such applications will be assessed.

RE9 Number of applications for rural dwellings approved

Number of rural dwellings approved:	6
Target:	No target
Performance against target:	N/A

3.40. In 2021-22, six rural workers dwellings have been approved in the period, two new dwellings and four conversions.

Policy 13 Equestrian Development

- 3.41. Many parts of the county, including within the Green Belt, are experiencing growth in horse riding as an outdoor recreation and leisure pursuit and subsequently an increase in demand for land to graze and stable horses. Policy 13 sets out criteria for assessing equestrian development proposals.

RE10 Appeals upheld contrary to this policy

Appeals:	0
Appeals Allowed:	0
Target:	None upheld at appeal
Performance against target:	Target met

- 3.42. Over the monitoring period, there has been no appeals against applications that have been refused against Policy 13.

Policy 14 Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land and Soil Resources

- 3.43. This policy seeks to conserve and protect best and most versatile agricultural land and associated soil resources. It sets out the circumstances when development of the best and most versatile agricultural land will be permitted and how soil resources will be managed and conserved in a viable condition and used sustainably in line with accepted best practice.

RE11 Percentage of eligible schemes accompanied by an Agricultural Land Clarification Assessment

Number of eligible schemes:	6
Schemes accompanied by assessment:	6
Target:	100%
Performance against target:	Target met

- 3.44. Agricultural Land Classification Assessments are picked up as part of the validation process so this indicator should always be 100%. As such over the reporting period there were 6 applications received on BMV agricultural land and all contained assessments. The target has therefore been met.

RE12 Appeals upheld contrary to this policy

Appeals:	0
Appeals Allowed:	0
Target:	None upheld at appeal
Performance against target:	Target met

- 3.45. Over the monitoring period, there has been no appeals against applications that have been refused against Policy 14.

4. Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes

- 4.1. Local Plans are required to proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes and thriving local places the County needs.
- 4.2. This section covers the need to provide affordable housing, housing that is the right type and meets the needs of all sections of society including older people, children, students, travellers and those that wish to build their own homes.

Policy 15 Addressing Housing Need

- 4.3. Policy 15 seeks to meet the need for affordable housing and to meet the housing needs of older people and people with disabilities. The policy requires that affordable housing will be sought on sites of 10 or more units, for 25% of units in the highest value areas to 10% in the lowest. On sites of 10 or more units, 10% of the homes provided should be for affordable home ownership (starter homes, discount market sale housing and other affordable routes to home ownership). Any contribution above 10% should be provided as affordable housing for rent.
- 4.4. In designated rural areas, the policy requires that schemes of between 6 and 9 units will provide a financial contribution towards the delivery of affordable housing.
- 4.5. Policy 15 also aims to meet the needs of older people and people with disabilities. On sites of 5 units or more, 66% of dwellings must be built to Building Regulations Requirement M4 (2) (accessible and adaptable dwellings) standard.
- 4.6. On sites of 10 units or more, a minimum of 10% of the total number of dwellings on the site are required to be of a design and type that will increase the housing options of older people. These properties should be built to M4(2) standard and would contribute to meeting the 66% requirement set out above. They should be situated in the most appropriate location within the site for older people. Appropriate house types considered to meet this requirement include:
 - level access flats;
 - level access bungalows; or
 - housing products that can be shown to meet the specific needs of a multi-generational family

QH1 **Percentage** of approved and completed housing units that meet the specific needs of older people by tenure type

Percentage of approved housing units that meet the specific needs of older people by tenure type	245 units, 11% of homes approved on sites of 10 units or more meet the needs of older people.
Percentage of completed housing units that meet the specific needs of older people by tenure type	106 bungalows completed, 6.3% of total completions.
Target:	10% of private or intermediate housing provided on all sites to meet specific needs of older people in terms of design, form and layout.
Performance against target:	Target met

- 4.7. This indicator has been split into two parts, one for older persons housing approved and a second for older persons housing completed. The target of 10% relates only to approvals, as this is the element controlled through the policy. We would however expect approved development to come forward and what has been approved to be delivered on each site. However, due to varying site build out rates it is not possible to have a target for completions by year.
- 4.8. In 2021/22, 11% of units approved on sites of 10 units or more will meet the needs of older people. These are mainly bungalows, and a small number of level access flats. As last year, this was a new indicator and this data was not monitored prior to this, the approval figures reported were based on the period 21st October 2020 – 31st March 2021, therefore it is not possible to directly compare with the previous AMR data on this indicator.
- 4.9. With regards to completions, as there is not a target within this indicator for the completion of older persons units, this data is not collected. However, in 2021/22, 106 bungalows have been completed, which is 6.3% of total completions. This has almost doubled from last year where 54 bungalows were completed. Although bungalows are not the only house types which accord with the policy, they will contribute towards the requirement to meet the needs of older people.

QH2 Percentage of affordable units delivered by viability area

Percentage of affordable units delivered by viability area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highest - 9 units (29%) • High – 11 units (35%) • Medium – 7 units (23%) • Low – 4 units (13%)
Target:	Highest 25%, High 20%, Medium 15%, Low 10%
Performance against target:	Please refer to item 4.10 for more information

- 4.10. This indicator considers affordable units delivered by viability area. In line with the policy, affordable housing is to be delivered in line with the percentage requirement of the viability as follows: Highest 25%, High 20%, Medium 15%, Low 10%.
- 4.11. Whilst the indicator sets a target for percentage of completions by viability area, this doesn't show a true reflection of what will be delivered across the site once it has been built out. It is expected that once a site is built out the target will be met. However, it is

recognised that varying site build out rates and the phasing of the affordable units within the build out, can have a significant impact on annual reporting. It is therefore not possible to monitor this indicator for completions by year in a way that provides meaningful data for monitoring purposes.

- 4.12. The above data therefore shows the percentage of affordable completions in each viability area, as a proportion of the total affordable completions, as this provides a more meaningful indicator (albeit in line with build out rates and in line with site phasing) showing that a larger proportion of the affordable units are in the highest value areas.

QH3 Affordable housing units approved and completed by tenure and viability area

Affordable housing units approved by tenure and viability area	520 affordable units approved <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 345 units affordable rent • 119 affordable home ownership • 56 unit tenure not specified
Affordable completions through Section 106 Agreements	31 – Breakdown of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highest - 9 units • High – 11 units • Medium – 7 units • Low – 4 units
Affordable completions through Homes England Grant	505
Total affordable units completed	536 - Breakdown of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 411 Affordable Rent • 6 Affordable Home Ownership • 13 Help to buy shared ownership • 75 Rent to buy • 31 Tenure not specified
Target:	Affordable housing with a tenure mix of 70% affordable rented housing to 30% intermediate products.
Performance against target:	Please refer to item 4.13 for more information

- 4.13. This indicator considers affordable housing units approved and completed, by tenure and viability area. The indicator has been split into two parts, one for affordable units approved and one for units completed on the basis that the data available to monitor differs between the two.
- 4.14. In the reporting period and relating to approvals by tenure, there were 119 units approved for affordable home ownership and 345 units approved for affordable rent. The tenure for 56 of the affordable units approved are unknown.
- 4.15. Since the target of a tenure mix of 70% affordable rented housing to 30% intermediate products was set for this policy, changes to national policy have resulted in a different target tenure mix. The requirement is now that the first 10% of affordable housing provided on site should be affordable home ownership, with the remainder (if any, depending on viability area) to be affordable rent. Therefore, going forward this indicator will be monitored in line with this approach.

- 4.16. With regards to completions by viability area, there have been 31 affordable units completed through Section 106 Agreements this year, 9 in the highest viability area, 11 in the high viability areas, 7 in the medium viability areas and 4 across the low viability areas.
- 4.17. With regards to affordable housing completed through Homes England grants this year, there were 411 Affordable Rent, 6 Affordable Home Ownership, 13 Help to buy shared ownership and 75 Rent to buy units.

Policy 16 Durham University Development, Purpose Built Student Accommodation and Houses in Multiple Occupation

- 4.18. This policy provides a means to consider Durham University development, proposals for purpose built student accommodation and proposals for houses in multiple occupation in the Durham City area. Durham University has published a Strategy for the period 2017-27, which contains an Estate Masterplan. Part 1 of this policy will be used to assess applications brought forward by the University. Part 2 of the policy relates to purpose built student accommodation and will be used to assess and applications for such proposals from the University or other accommodation providers. Part 2 of the policy allocates suitable sites for student accommodation. Part 3 of the policy relates to houses in multiple occupation.

QH4 Number of new bedspaces in HMOs approved

Number of new bedspaces in HMOs approved	73
Target:	Related to identified need
Performance against target:	N/A

- 4.19. A House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) under planning legislation is defined as a house or flat occupied by a certain number of unrelated individuals who share basic amenities and is classified by the Use Class Order as C4 (between three and six residents); and Sui Generis (more than six residents). In County Durham the majority of HMOs are located in Durham City and are occupied by Durham University students.
- 4.20. Planning permission is not required for changes of use from Class C3 (residential) to Class C4 (HMO) unless an Article 4 Direction has been made for a particular locality. In Durham City, Part 3 of this policy will apply to the assessment of such proposals, given the likelihood of occupation as an HMO.
- 4.21. During the monitoring period 73 bedspaces have been approved, this is an increase on last year's figure of 23. The target specifies that it is related to identified need, however, at this point in time there is no assessment of identified need for HMO bedspaces.

QH5 Number of units approved and completed on allocated PBSA sites

Number of units approved and completed on allocated PBSA sites	0
Target:	No target
Performance against target:	N/A

- 4.22. During the monitoring period there has been no units approved or completed on the allocated PBSA sites. This was also reported in last year’s AMR.


QH6 Percentage change of total HMOs in Durham City

Percentage change	Please refer to item 4.23 for more information
Target:	No target.
Performance against target:	N/A


- 4.23. For this indicator data is collected on the spatial concentrations of student exempt properties as a proportion of total residential properties. The policy approach recognises that it is the cumulative impact of HMOs that has an impact upon residential amenity and can change the character of an area over time. This indicator helps to monitor the impact of the policy by understanding what changes there have been in student HMO numbers across the city. The postcode geography utilised in the AMR is on the basis that it provides a small scale and constant geography to monitor change over time.
- 4.24. In order to assess the percentage of student exempt properties, the council use council tax information consisting of those properties with Class N exemption mapped using the council’s GIS mapping system. Council tax data provides an independent, secondary and consistent data set to understand the presence of student properties within general market housing. An exemption from council tax is only possible if the property is solely occupied by students.
- 4.25. As context to the evolution of the policy and Article 4 Direction in Durham City, on 13th April 2016 the council adopted an interim policy on student accommodation. Article 4 Directions mean that planning permission is required for the change of use from a family home to a house in multiple occupation (HMO). Article 4 Directions were made for the centre of Durham City on 16th September 2016 and Newton Hall, Framwellgate Moor on 13th May 2017. An additional Article 4 Direction was introduced for Mount Oswald, Carrville and Belmont on 14 January 2022. The revised student accommodation policy of the CDP (Policy 16 - Durham University Development, Purpose Built Student Accommodation and Houses in Multiple Occupation) was adopted at full Council on 21st October 2020.
- 4.26. This indicator helps to monitor the impact of the Policy and provides a wider understanding of concentrations of student HMOs across Durham City.
- 4.27. Map 1 below shows the percentage of residential properties (per postcode) benefiting from a student exemption from council tax in Durham City as a proportion of total residential properties (published in November 2021). The darker the shaded area, the greater the concentration of HMOs in that location. From reviewing the map, it is clear that the concentrations of Class N exempt properties vary across the city, with the greatest concentrations in the viaduct area and the city centre. There are further pockets of higher density student populations where there is purpose built student accommodation and college halls of residence.

- 4.28. Map 2 shows the same data for the Framwellgate Moor, Newton Hall and Pity Me Article 4 Area where concentrations remain low. It can be observed that there are a number of postcode areas without any student Class N exempt properties and that Class N exempt properties are generally spread across the area in low concentrations where they are present. The obvious exception to this is the high density area adjacent to the University Hospital of North Durham, which has two blocks of purpose built student accommodation which are made up of a number of individual flats.
- 4.29. As the new Article 4 Area for Mount Oswald, Carville and Belmont was not introduced until January 2022 a map showing this data will be included in the next iteration of the AMR.

Map 1 Durham City Article 4 Area November 2021




Map 2 Framwellgate Moor, Newton Hall and Pity Me Article 4 Area November 2021




- 4.30. The HMO market in Durham City is a dynamic one and this is reflected in the data. Data is collected in April and November each year to ensure up to date information is available for decision making and for the purpose of monitoring, to provide an understanding as to which areas of the city are seeing changes and to identify potential trends in student Class N exemptions.
- 4.31. Map 3 below shows the percentage change by postcode for Class N exempt properties between November 2020 and November 2021. Map 4 below shows the same information between April 2021 and April 2022. The blues and greens highlight a decline in student HMOs and the orange and reds show where numbers are increasing.
- 4.32. It should be noted that in some areas of the city changes in percentages can look more significant because of the small number of dwellings within the postcode area, for example the large dark blue area to the north east of the city on the map 3, where the change in status of one dwelling has made noticeable difference. This is also reflected in the large orange area to the south east of the city which has seen a very small increase in student exempt properties, but in an area with very few houses. There have also been some further conversions to the upper floors of city centre buildings which can be seen through the higher percentage changes within the town centre.
- 4.33. More information and up to date percentage mapping for the Article 4 designations in Durham City can be found at: <https://www.durham.gov.uk/article/2499/Multiple-occupancy-homes>

Map 3 Percentage change by postcode in Class N student exemptions November 2020 – November 2021



Map 4 Percentage change by postcode in Class N Student exemptions April 2021 – April 2022



QH7 Number of new bedspaces in PBSA approved

Number of new bedspaces in PBSA approved	0
Target	Related to identified need
Performance against target	N/A

- 4.34. Purpose Built Student Accommodation (PBSA) is accommodation built or converted, with the specific intent of being occupied by students, either with individual en-suite units or sharing facilities. PBSA is a building which is not classified as Use Class C4 or anything licensable as an HMO.
- 4.35. During the monitoring period there has been no units approved and therefore no new bedspaces to report. This was also reported in last year's AMR.

QH8 Appeals upheld to this policy

Appeals	6
Appeals allowed	3
Target	None upheld at appeal
Performance against target	Target not met

- 4.36. It is important that policies are being used to uphold planning decisions made by the Council if the applicant subsequently appeals that decision.
- 4.37. Over the monitoring period there were 6 appeals of applications refused against Policy 16. Of these appeals, 3 were allowed and 3 were dismissed. Below discusses the cases that have been allowed.
- 4.38. The first appeal allowed was a 2 storey-part single storey extension to the rear of 75 Whinney Hill, Durham, the proposal was to change from a 4 bedroom C4 HMO to a 6 bedroom C4 HMO (APP/X1355/D/20/3258480). Although the inspector considered that the proposals would be contrary to Part 3(a) of Policy 16, it was further assessed that there was limited specific evidence that the occupation of two additional bedspaces in the existing HMO would be detrimental to the area. The inspector also noted that the site benefited from permitted development rights and indicated that this was a fallback position. A scheme was provided that showed how permitted development could be utilised to provide 6 bedrooms at the property by extending at ground floor level. The appeal was allowed with the inspector giving this 'fallback position' significant weight, also satisfied that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the living conditions of nearby residents with regard to noise and disturbance and the character and appearance of the area.
- 4.39. The second appeal allowed was a proposal for the flexible use as a dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) and a House in Multiple Occupation (Use Class C4) at 8 Laburnum Avenue, Durham (APP/X1355/W/21/3284723). The inspector concluded that there was sufficient evidence to warrant an exception to CDP Policy 16 (Part 3) which seeks to prevent the change of use of properties to HMOs where this would be detrimental to the range and variety of housing stock in any particular area. In coming to this conclusion over the concentration of students, the inspector used alternative data sources and methods of assessment to those outlined in the Policy. Further to this the inspector drew on evidence provided by the appellant in the

form of an email from an estate agent confirming that the property had been on the market and this had indicated limited levels of interest in it.

- 4.40. Subsequently the Council have raised concerns with the planning inspectorate with regards to the use and interpretation of Policy 16 in relation to the decision at 8 Laburnum Avenue. It is considered by the Council that the approach taken by the inspector conflicted with the approach set out in the Policy and the supporting text in relation to assessing the housing stock in the area and also the inspector's acceptance of the limited information in terms of marketing. The Council have also highlighted concerns over the inspector's assessment of the proposal at 75 Whinney Hill against Part 3 (a) of the Policy in terms of the inspector's comments when stating that there was limited evidence that further additional bedspaces in the existing HMO would be detrimental to the area.
- 4.41. The third appeal allowed was a proposal at 21 Market Place, Durham for the erection of part two storey, part single story extension to the rear to form 1no. self contained 5 bed HMO (C4) to 1st and 2nd floor and additional retail office, storage, and welfare facilities to the ground floor. It also included the erection of a single storey rear extension to the existing Card Factory premises to form a new stockroom, office, and welfare facilities to the ground floor (APP/X1355/W/21/3275009 & APP/X1355/Y/20/3265941). The application was refused contrary to officer recommendation against Policy 16 in terms of concerns over imbalances in the community and the proposal having a detrimental impact on surrounding residential amenity and character of the area. The inspector concluded that the surrounding area could reasonably be characterised as having predominantly commercial uses within the 100m radius of the appeal site and therefore the appeal proposal would fall within the exemption set out in Criterion i of Policy C16, Part 3. It would therefore be in accordance with Policy 16. The inspector also found no conflict with Policy 44 and 45 discussed later under Policy 44 and 45.
- 4.42. Whilst there are concerns with how the policy is being interpreted by Inspectors, given that the above appeals were allowed, the target set by the indicator has not been met.

Policy 17 Sites for Travellers

- 4.43. County Durham has significant numbers of Gypsies and Travellers. Most live in housing but a sizeable population live on six council sites and a number of authorised private sites across the county. Policy 17 sets criteria for assessing new sites and extensions to existing sites.

QH9 Net additional Traveller pitches or plots approved and completed by type and meeting the 2015 planning definition

Net additional plots and pitches approved (2015 definition):	0
Net additional plots and pitches completed (2015 definition):	0
Target:	No target
Performance against target:	N/A

- 4.44. In the 2015 revision, Planning Policy for Traveller Sites introduced a changed definition of Gypsies and Travellers for planning purposes. This excluded members if these communities who have permanently stopped travelling. There have been no new traveller pitches or

plots approved and completed by type, meeting the 2015 planning definition over the monitoring period.

QH3 Net additional Traveller pitches or plots approved and completed by type and meeting the wider 2012 definition

Net additional plots and pitches approved (2012 definition):	0
Net additional plots and pitches completed (2012 definition):	0
Target:	Pitches for 6 Gypsy and Traveller households delivered by 2035
Performance against target:	N/A

4.45. There have been no new traveller pitches or plots approved and completed by type and meeting the wider 2012 definition over the monitoring period.

4.46. County Durham has six permanent Gypsy, Traveller sites:

- 13 double pitches at Tower Road, Greencroft, Stanley;
- 19 double pitches at Drum Lane, Birtley;
- 19 double pitches at Adventure Lane, West Rainton;
- 25 single pitches at St Phillip's Park, Coundon Grange;
- 25 double pitches at Ash Green Way, Bishop Auckland; and
- 25 double pitches at East Howle, Ferryhill

As per the above, there has been no change in the number of pitches in the reporting year.

QH11 Net additional Travelling Show People pitches approved and completed

Net additional plots and pitches approved:	0
Net additional plots and pitches completed:	0
Target:	No target
Performance against target:	N/A

4.47. No additional Travelling Show people pitches were approved or completed, sites remain at Coxhoe, Tudhoe and Thornley.

QH12 Status of five year supply of pitches and plots

Performance achieved:	5 year supply achieved
Target:	At least 5 year supply
Performance against target:	Target met

4.48. The Durham Traveller Site Needs Assessment (TSNA) (2018) identified a need for pitches for 6 additional Gypsy and Traveller households over the period 2016 to 2035. It set a five-year supply requirement for the period from April 2016 of 1.5 households. The five-year supply requirement has been exceeded with pitches for 6 households delivered by 2020. A private site to accommodate 2 households granted planning permission in 2016 was completed in 2018. In addition, 4 vacant pitches on council sites came back into use in 2020.

Table 12 Performance against 5-year supply requirement from April 2016 to March 2020

Performance against 5 year supply requirement	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Total
Target (G&T households)	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	1.5
Delivery (G&T households)	0	0	2	0	4	6

4.49. Whilst the target for pitches for 6 additional households set in the TSNA has been met, the council will continue to monitor demand and has identified capacity for further pitches should they be needed. There is capacity for an additional 14 pitches within the council's existing social sites. In addition, 101 of the council's social pitches managed by the council are double pitches. Most of these are occupied by single households but were designed with the intent that they could provide accommodation for two households.

Policy 18 Children's Homes

4.50. Policy 18 sets criteria for assessing for proposals for children's homes. Often these are homes for the most vulnerable children and young people in society, many have special educational needs or disabilities, including social, educational and mental health difficulties and many are victims of abuse or neglect. The policy sets requirements for evidence that the needs of young people will be met in terms of access to any services and facilities and to ensure that any necessary safeguards are put in place, including having had regard to any crime or safety concerns of the particular area. Consideration must also be given to existing residents in terms of amenity.

QH13 Appeals upheld contrary to this policy

Appeals:	0
Appeals allowed:	0
Target:	None upheld at appeal
Performance against target:	Target met

4.51. Over the monitoring period, there has been no appeals against applications that have been refused against Policy 18.

Policy 19 Type and Mix of Housing

4.52. Policy 19 requires all new housing developments to provide an appropriate mix of dwelling types and sizes, taking account of existing imbalances in the housing stock, site characteristics, viability, economic and market considerations.

QH14 Housing units approved and completed by dwelling type and size

Housing units approved by dwelling type	Bungalows - 171 Flats - 72 Detached Houses- 834 Semi-detached - 507 Terraced - 373 Not specified- 571
Housing units approved by dwelling size	1 bed- 41 2 bed- 392 3 bed- 1032 4+ bed- 533 Not specified- 530
Housing units completed by dwelling type	Bungalows- 106 Flats - 21 Detached Houses - 462 Semi-detached 398 Terraced - 134 Not specified- 560
Housing units completed by dwelling size	1 bed- 4 2 bed- 272 3 bed- 459 4+ bed- 323 Not specified- 623
Target:	No target
Performance against target	N/A

4.53. As set out above, the data shows that there were a range of types of dwellings both approved and completed in 2021/22. From the available data, it shows that there were more detached houses approved and completed, followed by semi-detached, however there was still a good mix of other house types being delivered. With regards to bedrooms, 3-bedroom houses were highest in both approval and completion data, followed by 4-bedrooms and then 2-bedrooms. This is all consistent with the trends in last year's data. It should also be noted that 171no. bungalows were approved and 106no. bungalows were completed, which will also help to meet the needs of older people and People with Disabilities in accordance with policy 15 (Addressing Housing Need).

4.54. Overall, this shows that there are a good range of house sizes and types coming forward as part of both approved planning applications and schemes being delivered in line with policy 19.

QH15 Numbers on the self and custom-build register

Numbers of self and custom-build register	97 (in total)
Target:	No target
Performance against target:	N/A

- 4.55. Durham County Council's self and custom build register has been open for entries from April 2016. Each entry onto the register falls within a 'base period'. The first base period began on the day the register was established (1 April 2016) and ended on 30 October 2016. Each subsequent base period is 12 months beginning immediately after the end of the previous base period (31st October to 30 October each year). Therefore, for the purpose of this indicator, the base period we will be reporting on is the 6th base period, during which, 15 individuals were added to the council's register. The table below shows the total number of individuals and groups on the register up to October 2021.

Table 13 Self and Custom Build Register

Base Period	Date	Individuals	Groups/Associations	Total Entries
1	1 April 2016 to 30 October 2016	7	1	8
2	31 October 2016 to 30 October 2017	22	0	22
3	31 October 2017 to 30 October 2018	22	0	22
4	31 October 2018 to 30 October 2019	19	0	19
5	31 October 2019 to 30 October 2020	11	0	11
6	31 October 2020 to 30 October 2021	15	0	15
Total	n/a	96	1 Group (made up of 4 individuals)	97

QH16 Numbers of planning permissions granted which are capable of delivering serviced plots

Numbers of planning permissions granted which are capable of delivering serviced plots	195
Target:	More of equivalent planning permissions granted which are capable of delivering serviced plots than numbers on the self and custom build register
Performance against target	On track

- 4.56. Local authorities must grant planning permission for enough suitable serviced plots of land to meet the demand for self-building and custom housebuilding in their area. The level of demand is established by reference to the number of entries added to an authority's register during a base period. A serviced plot of land has to have access to a public highway and have connections for electricity, water and wastewater, or can be provided with access to these things within the duration of a granted permission.
- 4.57. At the end of each base period authorities have 3 years in which to permission an equivalent number of plots of land, which are suitable for self-build and custom housebuilding, as there are entries on the register for that base period. Associations of individuals should be counted as a single entry on the register but planning practice guidance states that the rationale for joining the register as a member of an association will be for a self-build and custom housebuilding project to be in close proximity to other members of the association. Taking this into account, the council has assumed that each member of an association will require their own plot on a single site.

- 4.58. Having regard to the above, the council currently has a duty to grant planning permission for the following self-build and custom housebuilding plots:

Table 14 Numbers on Self-Build Register

Base Period	Date	Individuals	Groups/ Associations	Total	Date Planning Permission has to be granted by
1	1 April 2016 to 30 October 2016	7	4	11	30 th October 2019
2	31 October 2016 to 30 October 2017	22	0	22	30 th October 2020
3	31 October 2017 to 30 October 2018	22	0	22	30 th October 2021
4	31 October 2018 to 30 October 2019	19	0	19	30 th October 2022
5	31 October 2019 to 30 October 2020	11	0	11	30 th October 2023
6	31 October 2020 to 30 October 2021	15	0	15	30 th October 2024
Total	n/a	96	4	100	

- 4.59. The first base period ran from 1 April 2016 to 30 October 2016 and 11 individuals were added to the register in this time; given this the council had a duty to grant planning permission for 11 plots that are suitable for self-build and custom housebuilding between the period 31 October 2016 and 30 October 2019 (i.e. the 3 years following the end of the base period). During the period 31 October 2016 to 30 October 2019 the council granted planning permission for 79 plots and so the duty was met for the first base period.
- 4.60. The second base period ran from 31 October 2016 to 30 October 2017 and 22 individuals were added to the register in this time; given this the council had a duty to grant planning permission for 22 plots that are suitable for self-build and custom housebuilding between the period 31 October 2017 and 30 October 2020 (i.e. the 3 years following the end of the base period). During the period 31 October 2017 to 30 October 2020 the council granted planning permission for 123 plots and so the duty was met for the second base period.
- 4.61. The third base period ran from 31 October 2017 to 30 October 2018 and 19 individuals were added to the register in this time; given this the council had a duty to grant planning permission for 19 plots that are suitable for self-build and custom housebuilding between the period 31 October 2018 and 30 October 2021 (i.e. the 3 years following the end of the base period). During the period 31 October 2018 to 30 October 2021 the council granted planning permission for 157 plots and so the duty was met for the third base period.

5. Protecting Green Belt Land

- 5.1. Great importance is attached to our Green Belt, which covers a total land area of 8,591 hectares. The Green Belt's essential characteristic is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The county's Green Belt is designated in three distinct areas:

- **City of Durham Green Belt** (surrounds Durham City, extends to the east of Bearpark and then southwards towards Croxdale and then northeastwards to Sherburn and West Rainton.)
- **North East Durham Green Belt** (located to the north of Seaham and forms a strategic gap between Seaham and Ryhope in the south of neighbouring authority, Sunderland. The Green Belt extends between Lord Byron's Walk and Ryhope Dene and includes land to the west of Tuthill Quarry to Ryhope railway adjacent to Seaton Village and to the north of the B1404 towards the administrative boundary).
- **North Durham Green Belt** (reaches around Chester-le-Street and along the north of the A693, encircles Urpeth and Ouston and then eastwards towards Tyneside. The Green Belt seeks to prevent coalescence of Perkinsville, Pelton, Beamish, High Handenhold, Kibblesworth and Birtley and maintains the open countryside between Chester-le-Street and Pelton. To the east, the Green Belt maintains open countryside between Shiney Row, Washington (Fatfield, Harraton and Rickleton), Bournmoor and Fencehouses.)

Policy 20 Green Belt

- 5.2. There is a presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated. Policy 20 states that development proposals within the Green Belt will be determined in accordance with national planning policy. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out a number of exceptions: buildings for agriculture and forestry; appropriate facilities for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation and for cemeteries; proportionate extensions or alterations of a building; replacement buildings which are not materially larger; limited infilling and limited affordable housing for community needs and partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land which do not have a greater impact on openness. The NPPF also sets out other forms of development which may not be inappropriate in the Green Belt including: mineral extraction; engineering operations and transport infrastructure.

GB1 Number of planning applications and type of development approved in the Green Belt contrary to this policy

Applications approved contrary to policy:	0
Target:	No planning applications approved in the Green Belt contrary to this Policy
Performance against target	Target met

- 5.3. During 2021/22 there have been no applications approved within the Green Belt that are contrary to policy. An application (DM/21/02896/FPA) to redevelop existing stables at Fernhill, Newcastle Road, Crossgate Moor, Durham to provide a new dwelling was refused in November 2021. The decision was subsequently appealed (APP/X1355/W/22/3297345), and the outcome of that case will be reported within the 2022/23 AMR.
- 5.4. There have been three appeal decisions relating to schemes in the Green Belt during 2021/22, all of which were dismissed. These concerned a single storey dwelling at Rainton Gate (APP/X1355/W/20/3264212); the partial demolition of agricultural building and conversion to holiday cottage at Crossgate Moor, Durham (APP/X1355/W/21/3271529);

and a development proposing a pair of semi-detached houses within the garden curtilage of an existing property at Waldrige (APP/X1355/W/21/3286233).

6. Delivering Sustainable Transport

- 6.1. The council is committed to delivering a high quality integrated and sustainable transport network which supports our aspirations for a strong economy, a vibrant tourism offer and improved quality of life for all of our residents, including reducing air pollution and emissions of CO2. The county's dispersed settlement pattern does however create specific transport issues that need to be addressed through policies within the Plan.

Policy 21 Delivering Sustainable Transport

- 6.2. Policy 21 sets a framework for considering the transport implications of new development. It also helps to provide more sustainable transport choices when new proposals are being considered.

ST1 Appeals upheld contrary to this policy

Appeals:	5
Appeals allowed:	0
Target:	None upheld at appeal
Performance against target:	Target met

- 6.3. Over the monitoring period there were 5 appeals of applications refused against Policy 21. On each occasion the inspector dismissed the appeal. The target set by the indicator has therefore been met.

Policy 22 Durham City Sustainable Transport

- 6.4. Policy 22 of the County Durham Plan (CDP) and the Durham City Sustainable Transport Delivery Plan (DCSTDP) 2019-35 provide a policy framework and a package of transport proposals that supports sustainable transport in Durham City.
- 6.5. The monitoring section for Policy 22 is to assess whether the council and relevant partners are being effective in promoting sustainable transport in the city and progressing travel plans and through sustainable transport interventions are able to reduce the demand to travel by car.

ST2 Percentage of employees in Durham City walking, using public transport or cycling to work

Target:	Increasing above the baseline
Performance against target:	N/A

- 6.6. Prior to completion of the 2020/21 AMR we had received travel to work survey responses from 3 major employers in the City. Durham University, Durham County Council and Northumbria Water Ltd (NWL) have all returned large samples after surveying their respective workforces.
- 6.7. All data was taken prior to the start of the pandemic, and we hoped to use it as a baseline for future years. In last year's AMR we noted that it was imperative that the same organisations continue to monitor travel to work habits of staff who are travelling into

Durham City. Unfortunately, there is no statutory requirement for any of the surveys to be carried out on an annual basis and with Covid recovery and economic pressures prioritised, even large organisations do not have resources to prioritise travel surveys.

- 6.8. The Council’s travel team have been unable to acquire any new data in 2021/22 for Durham County Council or for Northumbrian Water.
- 6.9. Notwithstanding the above, we have though had a return from Durham University for 2021 data that has built into the table below. Its worth mentioning that post Covid we have very different travel patterns with many office workers, choosing to work from home. At the University, most staff now work a minimum of 2 days in the office.

Table 15 Durham University Travel to Work

% of staff travelling by sustainable mode	Durham University 2020 (pre-pandemic)	Durham University 2021 (post pandemic)	Trend
Walk	19%	7%	Decrease
Cycle	8%	5%	Decrease
Bus	12%	5%	Decrease
Train	6%	3%	Decrease
Car ⁴	55%	41%	Decrease
Work from Home	n/a	38%	Increase

- 6.10. The University has been working on green travel plans for a number of years. Its parking is also constrained and monitored closely which may explain why a great number of staff have taken up more sustainable transport modes for their journey to work.
- 6.11. Looking the 2021 data, everything has changed post covid and working from home has had a significant impact on all mode percentages. Travel Surveys results will look very different post pandemic.
- 6.12. The tables below for Northumbria Water and Durham County Council are a repeat of the tables presented in last year’s AMR. The Council will endeavour to acquire new travel data in future years.

Table 16 Northumbria Water (NWL) Travel to Work

% of staff travelling by sustainable mode	Northumbria Water 2018
Walk	4%
Cycle	6%
Public Transport	4%
Work from Home	1%
Motorcycle/Moped	1%
Car	84% (Broken down as Car Share (passenger) (4%) Car Share (Driver) (8%) Car (Alone) (89%))

⁴ Include those car sharing driver (3.5%) passenger (2.74%), in taxis (0.05%), motorcycles (0.43%) and vans (0.5%)

- 6.13. There were no surveys done at NWL in 2019 or 2020 but it is the intention to do one for NWL in 2021. The above data for 2018 tells us that nearly 90% of staff are reliant on the private car for journeys to work.

Table 17 Durham County Council Travel to Work

% of staff travelling by sustainable mode	Durham County Council - 2020 (pre-pandemic)
Walk	4%
Cycle	1%
Public Transport	7%
Car	88%

- 6.14. The data for 2020 show that although the main Council buildings are located in accessible locations, 88% of staff are reliant on the private car to travel to work. Post pandemic, it is expected that travel to work habits will change dramatically after the increase in working from home and the surge in walking and cycling. Next years AMR will provide these findings.

ST3 Percentage of pupils walking, cycling or using public transport to school

Target:	Increasing trend above the baseline figure.
Performance against target:	N/A

- 6.15. For the purposes of this indicator all junior schools have been monitored (30 schools in 2019/20 and 20 schools in 2020/21). Unfortunately, no data has yet been collected for 21/22 but we are expecting new survey data to be available in November 2022 and then the following years data to be collected in June 2023. At the time of writing, the Council are confident that this will be a reliable data set which will be obtained for future years.
- 6.16. The data and commentary presented below is the same as last year's AMR.
- 6.17. The Council have installed a system called ModeShift Stars where the Council store data on travel modes for schools. Collecting data has already begun for primary schools in Durham City, where a 'hands up surveys' are done every summer and winter with some data for Jan 2020 and Jan 2021 already on the ModeShift Stars system. The results of the first surveys have been combined to provide data for a baseline year 2019/20 and 2020/21.

Table 18 Travel to School Data

Percentage by Mode	2019/20 BASELINE YEAR	20/21	Trend
Walking	40%	39%	No change
Cycle	2%	2%	No change
Dedicated School bus	10%	10%	No change
Public Service Bus	1%	1%	No change
Park and Stride	12%	5%	Reduction
Car Share	4%	4%	No change
Car	35%	39%	Increase

- 6.18. The obvious change is less park and stride and more car trips. It is highly likely this is caused because of fears over the Covid-19 pandemic.
- 6.19. It is evident that there is not a lot of change at this stage although it was clear that there had been less park and stride since the pandemic. A greater number of survey years will help show longer term trends to analyse changes from baseline year.

ST4 Accessibility of Durham City Centre, Aykley Head Strategic Employment Site and other Durham City employment centres (access within one hour and by 08:30 by bus) from percentage of County Durham households

Target:	Increasing trend above the baseline figure.
Performance against target:	Please refer to item 6.20 for more information

- 6.20. The purpose of this indicator is to understand what percentage of households inside of County Durham (from a total of 253,564 households) could ‘in theory’ reach the City of Durham’s key employment sites by using the existing timetable public bus service within 60 minutes.
- 6.21. The origins would be residential dwellings and the destinations would be the 7 employment sites as set out by the County Durham Plan in Policy 2.
- 6.22. The 60 minutes journey time includes the walk from the dwelling (origin) to the public transport stop, any interchange of public transport and then arriving at the bus station (destination). The journey assumes arrival at the first stop 1 minute before the initial departure, with any subsequent interchange waiting times included as part of the final journey time

Table 19 Accessibility of Employment Allocations by Bus

Durham City Employment Allocations in CDP	No. of households in County Durham (from a total of 253,564 households)	No. of households in County Durham (from a total of 253,564 households)	% of County Durham households who can access within 60mins by bus BASELINE 2021	% of County Durham households who can access within 60mins by bus 2022	Trend – Increase or Decrease in Accessibility
Abbey Road	129,927	115,312	51.24	45.48%	Decrease
Abbey Woods	133,837	117,809	52.78%	46.46%	Decrease
Aykley Heads	154,263	144,965	60.84%	57.17%	Decrease
Belmont Industrial Estate	69,305	102,828	27.33%	40.55%	Increase
Dragonville	139,043	127,506	54.84%	50.28%	Decrease
Durham City Centre	182,931	171,324	72.14%	67.57%	Decrease
Durham Science Park	150,179	126,189	59.23%	49.77%	Decrease

- 6.23. All but one of the employment sites in Durham City above are showing a net decrease in accessibility when compared to the baseline year of 2021. The decreases amount to around 4 – 6% reduction in County Durham residents able to access employment sites in Durham City.
- 6.24. This reflects the reduction of frequency in the public transport network and associated timing changes as post covid travel patterns have changed which has led to a reduction of people using public transport to access employment.
- 6.25. As well as travel patterns changing, operators have had to deal with ongoing problems with recruiting drivers and Covid absences of drivers which has made it difficult to maintain a full level of service. They operators have been left with little option but to make changes and reduce the levels of service.
- 6.26. Only one site, at Belmont Industrial Estate has seen an increase in accessibility. This is because the service 65 was re-routed to operate into the estate at peak times from October last year. That service connects with services from further afield in Durham on a morning thus increasing the catchment.
- 6.27. Unsurprisingly, Durham City centre is still the most accessible location by bus with 67.57% of the county’s households within 60 minutes of this employment site. This is because the bus station in the city is the hub of the County’s bus network which makes the surrounding built up area the best-connected area for those wishing to use public transport as a means of getting to work. Although it has had increase in accessibility due to the re-routing of the service 65, Belmont Industrial Estate remains the poorest served employment site with only 40% of the County’s residents able to reach the site within an hour if they use the bus.

ST5 Levels of nitrogen dioxide at Durham Air Quality Management Area

Performance achieved	Reduction of levels of nitrogen dioxide in 2020 in two key monitoring stations.
Target:	Reduction of levels nitrogen dioxide in AQMA year on year.
Performance against target:	Target partly met

- 6.28. There are four locations where air quality is monitored within the city. A summary of the annual mean air quality monitoring results (nitrogen dioxide concentrations) obtained in 2019, 2020 and 2021 at locations where the monitors are sited across Durham City is as follows:

Table 20 Air Quality in Durham City

Location	2019 µg/m ³	2020 µg/m ³	2021 µg/m ³	Performance against target
Air Quality Monitor at Gilesgate Roundabout	36.94	33.51	26.1 (89%)	Reduction from previous year and baseline year
Air Quality Monitor at Crossgate Peth (AQ Mesh Monitor)	22.10 (See Note 1 below)	23.99	18.0 (77.5%)	Reduction from previous year and baseline year
Air Quality Analyser at Leazes Road (AQ Mesh Monitor)	46.7 (See Note 2 below)	35.08	41.8 (97.4%)	Increase from previous year but reduction from baseline year
Air Quality Monitor on the approach to the junction at Neville's Cross (IGAS Monitor)	No Result (See Note 3 below)	17.06	23.1 (75.6%)	Increase from 2020

Notes:

1. There was only data available for 9 months during 2019 for the monitor located at Crossgate Peth i.e. a percentage capture rate of 75 percent.
 2. The air quality analyser was relocated to the site at Leazes Road in May 2019 and no data was obtained for other months of the year due to the interruption of power to the monitor. The annual mean result is therefore representative of a 47 percent capture rate.
 3. The IGAS monitor was purchased in 2019 and sited at Neville's Cross in late October and therefore there is no meaningful data available for that year. (Below 3 months data obtained during the year).
 4. The percentage capture rates are shown in brackets below the annual mean concentration levels for 2021. It should be noted that the Air Quality Analyser is a DEFRA approved method of monitoring concentrations of nitrogen dioxide whereas the portable air quality monitors are not. The air quality monitors measure concentrations using electrochemical sensors that are subject to measurement fluctuations and error.
 5. In addition to the above monitoring, the concentrations of nitrogen dioxide are measured using diffusion tubes at a network of locations across Durham City. This method involves exposing a tube for a set period prior to being sent away for laboratory analysis. There were only 2 locations where the measured concentrations of nitrogen dioxide exceeded the annual mean objective (40 µg/m³) in 2021 which were as follows:
 - (i) 1 Sutton Street (Crossgate Peth) where the annual mean measured 42.06 µg/m³.
 - (ii) 68/68A Gilesgate where the annual mean measured 41.42 µg/m³.
- 6.29. The above results have been bias corrected for the laboratory method of analysis. It is noted that there may be more exceedances of the objective (40µg/m³) if a locally derived bias correction factor is used. A locally derived correction factor may be derived from the results from the triplicate diffusion tubes that are located adjacent to the air quality analyser.

6.30. The table shows that in two locations there was a reduction in nitrogen dioxide since 2020, at Gilesgate roundabout and at Crossgate Peth, however nitrogen dioxide had increased at Leazes Road and at the Neville’s Cross junction. The target therefore has been partly met.

ST6 Traffic levels in Durham City including the amount crossing Milburngate Bridge and using the A167

Target:	Decreasing trend below baseline figure.
Performance against target:	N/A

6.31. To get a comprehensive picture of traffic levels in Durham City, it was decided to monitor a range of sites across the City. To only monitor Milburngate Bridge and the A167 would have given us an insight into key areas but would not have given the full picture of how the entire network is operating.

6.32. It is also worth noting that 2020 was an unusual year because of the start of the pandemic, so traffic counts were always going to be reduced. 2021 was likewise an unusual year with a lockdown in operation between January and March. The impact of the lockdowns is reflected in the following results.

6.33. The full detailed results and summary of 2021 are presented in the following pages. They are compared directly with the baseline year of 2019 which was not impacted by the pandemic.

6.34. In total, 19 sites have been monitored throughout the City and presented here. Of the 19 sites, 14 sites have seen a significant decrease in traffic since 2019, 1 site has no data and 3 sites have seen an increase in traffic. There were two significant increases in traffic at Merryoaks and Crossgate Peth, but we think this was linked to the closure of Old Elvet Bridge in 2021 and people need to take alternative routes. So overall, mainly because of the pandemic, traffic levels in 2021 are significantly lower than 2019.

6.35. The roads and areas chosen are:

- A167
- A691
- A690
- A177
- A181
- Gilesgate Sunderland Road
- Newton Hall Framwelgate Moor.

Map 5 Traffic Counting Sites in Durham City




Table 21 – Traffic Counts in Durham City

Location of Counter on A167	2019 AADT Northbound	2019 AADT Southbound	Coverage	2021 AADT Northbound	2021 AADT Southbound	Coverage	% Change from 2019 Northbound	% Change from 2019 Southbound	Trend from Baseline Year
1. Merryoaks	6498	6118	69%	7807	7370	89%	20.14%	20.46%	Increase
2. Sniperley	11122	11991	55%	8003	10524	84%	-28.04%	-28.46%	Decline
3. Pity me	10054	9903	61%	8912	8724	77%	-11.36%	-11.91%	Decline

Location of Counter A691	2019 AADT Northwest	2019 AADT Southeast	Coverage	2020 AADT NorthWest	2020 AADT SouthEast	Coverage	% Change from 2019 Northwest	% Change from 2019 Southeast	Trend from Baseline Year
4. Sniperley	6841	6840	74%	5865	5843	83%	-14.27%	-14.27%	Decline
5. Framwellgate Peth	12114	11347	n/a	9703	10449	66%	-19.90%	-7.91%	Decline

Location of Counter A690	2019 AADT	2019 AADT	Coverage	2021 AADT	2021 AADT	Coverage	% Change from 2019	% Change from 2019	Trend from Baseline Year
6. Nevilles Cross Bank	9529 (SW)	9747(NE)	76%	7882 (SW)	(NE) 8000	98%	-17.28% (SW)	-17.28% (NE)	Decline
7. Crossgate Peth	6766 (E)	5838 (W)	91%	5614 (E)	7332 (W)	94%	-13.49 (E)	25.59 (W)	Increase
8. Castle Chare	6882 (E)	7926 (W)	56%	6984(E)	8514 (W)	99%	1.48 (E)	1.48% (W)	Increase
9. Milburngate Westbound	20831 (W)	Westbound only	83%	17374 (W)	Westbound only	100%	-30.65% (W)	n/a	Decline
10. Milburngate Eastbound	18649 (E)	Eastbound only	58%	14700(E)	Eastbound Early	98%	-32.11% (E)	n/a	Decline
11. Leazes Road	17412 (E)	17937 (W)	96%	15558(E)	16517 (W)	95%	-10.65% (E)	-7.92% (W)	Decline

Location of Counter A177	2019 AADT	2019 AADT	Coverage	2021 AADT	2021 AADT	Coverage	% Change from 2019	% Change from 2019	Trend from Baseline Year
12. Farewell Hall	3823 (NE)	4098 (SW)	71%	1971 (NE)	2387 (SW)	64%	-48.44% (NE)	-48.44% (SW)	Decline
13. Houghall	7433 (SE)	7915 (NW)	82%	5632 (SE)	5339 (NW)	78%	-24.23% (SE)	-30.02% (NW)	Decline

Location of Counter A181	2019 AADT	2019 AADT	Coverage	2021 AADT	2021 AADT	Coverage	% Change from 2019	% Change from 2019	Trend from Baseline Year
14. Sherburn Road	4872 (NW)	5403 (SE)	69%	5026 (NW)	4879 (SE)	89%	3.16 % (NW)	3.16% (SW)	Increase
15. Dragonville	7045 (W)	7908 (E)	32%	NO DATA (W)	NO DATA (E)	0%	n/a	n/a	n/a

Gilesgate	2019 AADT South West	2019 AADT North East	Coverage	2021 AADT South West	2021 AADT North East	Coverage	% Change from 2019	% Change from 2019	Trend from Baseline Year
16. Sunderland Road	5428 (SW)	4669	34%	4838 (SW)	4364 (NE)	68%	-10.87% South West	-6.53% North East	Decline

Newton Hall/ Framwellgate Moor	2019 AADT	2019 AADT	Coverage	2021 AADT	2021 AADT	Coverage	% Change from 2019	% Change from 2019	Trend from Baseline Year
17. Finchale Road	7115 (NE)	7072 (SW)	34%	6309 (NE)	6446 (SW)	68%	-32.24% (NE)	-32.24% (SW)	Decline

18. Front Street Pity Me	3784 (S)	3390 (SW)	35%	3761 (S)	3090 (N)	52%	-18.34% (S)	-17.84(N)	Decline
19. Rotary Way	8158 (East)	East Only	38%	7948 (E)	East only	9%	-2.57% (E)	n/a	Decline

Commentary on Traffic Levels in 2021

6.36. Although 2021 was not as bad a year for lockdowns as 2020, the year was still impacted by a significant lock down with the schools and workplaces locked down in January and February 2021. Most locations reopened 8th March 2021.

6.37. Therefore, although traffic levels generally increased in 2021 when compared with 2020 levels, they were still significantly lower than 2019. Below is a summary of changes by road.

A167

- Unusually, traffic has increased significantly (20%) from 2019 at Merryoaks. This was likely caused by the closure of Old Elvet Bridge during this period.
- Traffic has decreased significantly (around 28%) at Sniperley and at Pity Me (11%).

A691

- Traffic declined at both locations measured on the A167
- Traffic levels declined by 14% at Sniperley and by 20% at Framwellgate Peth Northbound and 8% Southbound.

A690

- Neville's Cross Bank traffic was like 2020 with a decline in both directions of 17%.
- Milburngate Bridge and Leazes Road were higher than 2020 levels but still significantly reduced from the 2019 baseline year with reductions of 21% Eastbound and 16% Westbound on the bridge. Leazes Road was reduced from the baseline year by only 10% Eastbound and 8% westbound.
- Castle Chare counter shows a marginal increase on 2019 data
- Crossgate Peth was the most unusual result because traffic had declined by 17% East bound but increased 25% Westbound. The closure of Old Elvet Bridge this could explain the increase in the traffic numbers of westbound traffic using Crossgate Peth.

A177

- Traffic has declined dramatically on both locations measured on the A177.
- Traffic was reduced at both Farewell Hall by around 48% in both directions and Houghhall by 24% and 30%.

A181

- The traffic at Sherburn Road had increased from 2019 by 3.16% and was significantly increased from 2020 by around 20%.
- No data available for Dragonville.

Gilesgate

- Sunderland Road traffic was reduced from 2019 by 10% and 6%

Newton Hall/Framwellgate

- Finchale Road, Front Street and Rotary way all saw traffic levels decline between 2019 and 2022.
- Finchale Road had the largest decrease in traffic with reduction of vehicles over 30%.

Policy 23 Allocating and Safeguarding Transport Routes and Facilities

6.38. Policy 23 safeguards the routes and associated infrastructure of the Leamside Line and Bowburn Industrial Estate Access Road. The policy states that any development preventing the future development of these routes will not be permitted.

ST7 Planning applications approved within safeguarded areas which prevent development of routes and facilities

Approved schemes:	0
Target:	No applications approved
Performance against target:	Target met

6.39. The indicator monitors the number of applications approved contrary to Policy 23. Over the monitoring period no applications have been approved within the safeguarded areas which would prevent the development of these safeguarded routes. The target has therefore been met.

Policy 24 Provision of Transport Infrastructure

6.40. Policy 24 supports the development of new and improved transport infrastructure, should it meet the criteria set out in the policy. The criteria ensures that new transport infrastructure is necessary, minimises any harmful impacts that may result from the development and prioritises the sustainable modes of transport.

ST8 Number of major transport infrastructure schemes identified in the IDP that have been approved and completed

Approved schemes:	0
Target:	No target
Performance against target:	N/A

6.41. The indicator monitors the number of Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) schemes that have been approved and completed. Over the monitoring period there have been no relevant applications submitted.

6.42. As there were no relevant applications made during the previous monitoring period, there have been no complete schemes.

7. Supporting High Quality Infrastructure

- 7.1. Infrastructure can take many forms:
- physical, such as roads, utilities and energy supply networks;
 - social, such as community buildings, education, health facilities, sport and recreation and employment or training opportunities; and
 - environmental, such as heritage assets, areas for wildlife and green infrastructure.
- 7.2. We have worked with statutory undertakers, utility companies and other agencies to identify the need for new infrastructure. If additional infrastructure is not delivered alongside new development, it can put pressure on existing facilities that may not have the ability or capacity to cope with the additional demand. This may have a detrimental impact on the existing population.

Policy 25 Developer Contributions

- 7.3. It is important to ensure that development proposals contribute to improvements in infrastructure capacity to mitigate for the additional demands that new development creates. By securing financial contributions through planning obligations, developers help fund the physical, social and environmental infrastructure that is needed to make development acceptable and ensure that the development mitigates its impact upon existing infrastructure.

Q11 Amount of money agreed through planning obligations

Money agreed	£5,309,449.17
Target:	No target
Performance against target:	N/A

- 7.4. The total amount of money to be provided under any planning obligations which were entered during the reported year is £5,309,449.17. This figure does not consider indexation (inflation/deflation) that may be applied when the money becomes due. This year's figure is an increase on last year's figure of £3,460,581.86.

Q12 Amount of money received through planning obligations.

Money received	£5,459,073.68
Target:	No target
Performance against target:	N/A

- 7.5. The total amount of money received from planning obligations during the reported year was £5,459,073.68. This year's figure is an increase on last year's figure of £3,314,964.21.

Q13 Amount of money spent through planning obligations.

Money spent	£1,307,313.62
Target:	No target
Performance against target:	N/A

7.6. The total amount of money from planning obligations spent during the reported year was £1,307,313.62. Of this amount £210,916.58 was spent by a third party on behalf of Durham County Council. These figures are below last year's figures of £1,643,444.65 and £371,118.75.

Q14 Number of applications where required contributions have been waived.

Number of applications	0
Target:	No target
Performance against target:	N/A

7.7. There were no applications approved where required contributions were waived, as per last years monitoring period.

Policy 26 Green Infrastructure

7.8. Green Infrastructure (GI) is the network of green and blue spaces and corridors that exist within and between cities, towns and villages. As well as public open space, it includes wildlife sites, river corridors, coastlines, mountains, moorland, woodland and agricultural land and is integral to the health and quality of life of sustainable communities. The policy sets out a strategic approach to planning for the creation, protection, enhancement, and management of networks of biodiversity and to plan for biodiversity at a landscape scale across local authority boundaries.

Q15 Amount of Green Infrastructure lost on approved sites

Green Infrastructure lost	0ha
Target:	No target
Performance against target:	N/A

7.9. For the purposes of this indicator, this has considered the loss of sites defined within the Council's Open Space Needs Assessment (OSNA) and any other large strategic GI losses of sites outside of the OSNA definition. Data has been sourced from IDOX reports noting the use of Policy 26, this has looked at approvals in the previous monitoring period and where relevant cross referenced with housing approvals in the housing monitoring database. As per last year, this highlighted that there has been no GI lost over the monitoring period.

Q16 Amount of new Green Infrastructure created on approved sites

Green Infrastructure created	0.87ha
Target:	No target
Performance against target:	N/A

7.10. For the purpose of this indicator, this has considered new green infrastructure enhanced through developer contributions which are a result of new development, notably housing development. Data has been sourced from the housing monitoring database which notifies when a housing development has been completed. A manual check of the application has determined that 0.87ha of GI has been created. This is an increase on last year's figure of 0ha.

Q17 Amount of new Green Infrastructure enhanced on approved sites

Green infrastructure enhanced	0ha
Target:	No target
Performance against target:	N/A

7.11. For the purpose of this indicator, this has considered new green infrastructure enhanced through developer contributions which is the result of new development, notably housing development. Data has been sourced from the housing monitoring database which notifies when a housing development has been completed. A manual check of the applications has determined that, as per last year, there has been no new Green Infrastructure enhanced over the monitoring period.

Q18 Loss of Open Space Needs Assessment sites by hectare and number of sites where there is no compensation or mitigation provided.

OSNA sites lost:	0
Target:	Zero
Performance against target:	Target met

7.12. Data has been sourced from IDOX reports noting the use of Policy 26. This has been cross referenced with housing approvals in the housing monitoring database which has highlighted that, as per last year, there has been no GI lost where there has been no compensation or mitigation provided. The target has therefore been met.

Policy 27 Utilities, Telecommunications and Other Broadcast Infrastructure

7.13. Policy 27 sets out criteria for considering proposals for new or extensions to existing energy generation, utility transmission facilities, telecommunication masts or other broadcast and broadband equipment which facilitate the electronic transfer of data.

Q19 Appeals upheld contrary to this policy

Appeals:	4
Appeals allowed:	0
Target:	None upheld at appeal
Performance against target:	Target met

7.14. It is important that policies are being used to uphold planning decisions made by the Council if the applicant subsequently appeals that decision.

7.15. Over the monitoring period there were 4 appeals of applications refused against Policy 27. On each occasion the inspector dismissed the appeal. The target set by the indicator has therefore been met.

Policy 28 Safeguarded Areas

7.16. Policy 28 defines safeguarded areas on the policies map. These are Major Hazard Sites, Major Hazard Pipelines, the defined Teesside and Newcastle International Aerodrome Safeguarding Areas, the High Moorsely Metrological Office radar site, Fishburn Airfield,

Shotton Airfield and the Peterlee Drop Zone. Development proposals within these areas are considered under Policy 28 through a series of criteria.

QI10 Appeals upheld contrary to this policy

Appeals:	0
Appeals allowed:	0
Target:	None upheld at appeal
Performance against target:	Target met

7.17. Over the monitoring period, there has been no appeals against applications that have been refused against Policy 28.

Requiring Good Design

7.18. The Council are committed to a high standard of architecture, urban design, sustainability and innovation. This is to ensure new development enhances and complements existing high-quality areas and raises the design standards and quality of areas in need of regeneration. New development should provide local people with civic pride, make them feel safe and secure and help improve the overall image of the county and reflect local distinctiveness.

Policy 29 Sustainable Design

7.19. Policy 29 addresses all new development in the built environment including new housing and other new buildings, as well as extensions, alterations and changes of use of existing buildings. It aims to ensure that development is well-designed, responds to the local context and incorporates appropriate energy standards.

SD1 Density of new housing schemes on allocated and windfall sites

Performance achieved:	Please refer to item 7.20 for more information
Target:	30 dwellings per hectare and where applicable the allocation yield
Performance against target:	Target met

7.20. This indicator monitors the density of new major residential developments, based upon the number of dwellings per hectare (dph). The Policy sets down a requirement for at least 30 dph (net) in sustainable locations, and to ensure more efficient use of land and support for services. Lower densities may be acceptable however, including in less-central locations for example, or, where it is necessary to ensure good design and development that is compatible with its surroundings and character. Lower densities may also be suitable in order to secure particular house types, to help meet local needs, and to meet particular infrastructure requirements.

7.21. Net density measures the number of dwellings provided within the development site, plus certain essential elements, including: site specific roads; pavements and incidental spaces/small areas of verge; and, open space. Gross density encompasses the whole site envelope, which can include public infrastructure, such as: main/arterial roads; more significant areas of open space; sustainable drainage systems and features; significant

landscape buffers; and, in some instances non-residential development (e.g. schools and shops).

- 7.22. The following table identifies relevant residential schemes that were approved within the 21/22 monitoring period. They comprise: Full Planning Applications (FPA); Reserved Matters Applications (RM); and Variation of Condition Applications (VOC). Outline applications were omitted from the sample as they do not include sufficient detail to provide accurate data and are often subject to amendments (including for example in relation to the number of dwellings provided and the net build area).

Table 22 Density of approved housing sites

Application Details (Reference, Address, Approval Date)	Dwellings (no.)	Gross Site Area (ha)	Net Site Area (ha) ⁵	Density (Net) ⁶
DM/20/03358/VOC - Variation of conditions no.2 (compliance with approved plans) and no. 4 (landscaping) so as to replace 11no. split level dwellings with 9no. standard house type design and 1no. split level dwelling in addition to amendments to the proposed retaining wall solution pursuant to planning permission 7/2011/0447/DM (substitution of house types on 228 plots) Land to the East Of Spout Lane, Shildon Approved 30 April 2021	278	9	Approx 8.7	32
DM/20/00511/RM - Reserved matters (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) for the erection of 201 dwellings (Phase 2 and 3) in addition to the discharge of conditions 6 (materials) 8 (means of enclosure), 9 (land contamination), 11 (archaeology), 17 (drainage) and 18 (energy) pursuant to outline planning permission 3/2012/0278 (as amended by DM/18/01423/NMA) Phases 2 and 3 at Bracks Farm, Bishop Auckland Approved 7 May 2021	201	11.47	6.17	33

⁵ Approximate figures where they are indicated

⁶ Figures rounded

Application Details (Reference, Address, Approval Date)	Dwellings (no.)	Gross Site Area (ha)	Net Site Area (ha) ⁵	Density (Net) ⁶
DM/20/03758/RM - Reserved matters relating to planning approval ref: DM/15/02341/VOC for the construction of 39no. affordable rent bungalows for the over 55s Plot D at Former Black And Decker, Green Lane, Spennymoor Approved 18 May 2021	39	1.38	1.38	28
DM/20/00386/RM - Erection of 123 dwellings and associated works (reserved matters pursuant to planning permission DM/15/02326/OUT) (Amended Description) Land North of West Chilton Terrace, Chilton Approved 27 May 2021	123	Approx 6.4	Approx 5	25
DM/20/03354/FPA - Revised application for residential development of 18 affordable homes - 2 and 3 bedroom (resubmission) Site of Former Magistrates Court, Ashdale Road, Consett Approved 14 June 2021	18	0.52	0.48	38
DM/20/03044/FPA - Erection of two additional dwellings (total of 76) from planning permission DM/18/03277/OUT (Amended 14th December 2020). Land to the West of Davis Crescent, Langley Park Approved 21 July 2021	76	Approx 4.6	Approx 3.4	22

Application Details (Reference, Address, Approval Date)	Dwellings (no.)	Gross Site Area (ha)	Net Site Area (ha) ⁵	Density (Net) ⁶
DM/20/02896/RM - 469 dwellings (reserved matters) Land to the North of Lowhills Road and West of Thorpe Road, Little Thorpe Approved 11 August 2021	469	Approx 20.4	Approx 14	34
DM/20/02983/RM - Reserved matters (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) for the erection of 105 dwellings pursuant to outline planning permission DM/17/02333/OUT and discharge of conditions 6 (archaeology), 8 (CMP), 9 (access), 10 (internal highways), 11 (drainage), 12 (trees), 14 (levels) and 20 (landscape buffer) Land to the North East of Castledene Road, Delves Lane Approved 26 August 2021	105	3.34	3.15	33
DM/21/00319/RM - Approval of reserved matters (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) relating to planning permission DM/14/00338/OUT Land to the rear of Delamere and Lamorna, Station Road West, Coxhoe Approved 9 September 2021	50	2	Approx 1.7	29

Application Details (Reference, Address, Approval Date)	Dwellings (no.)	Gross Site Area (ha)	Net Site Area (ha) ⁵	Density (Net) ⁶
<p>DM/21/01072/RM - Reserved matters application (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) for the erection of 145no. dwellings pursuant to outline planning permission DM/16/04062/OUT and discharge of conditions 15 (disposal of foul and surface water), 19 (CMP), 20 (coal legacy), 21 (archaeology) and 22 (land contamination - parts a, b and c discharged, part d not discharged) (amended description 17/09/2021)</p> <p>Land to the North of Etherley Moor, Bishop Auckland</p> <p>Approved 17 September 2021</p>	145	9.46	Approx 6	24 Predom Larger 4 bed detached Significant infra
<p>DM/20/01080/FPA - Demolition of Council Depot and construction of 21 no residential dwellings and associated landscaping</p> <p>Bullion Depot, Bullion Lane, Chester-le-Street</p> <p>Approved 25 January 2022</p>	21	0.28	0.28	75
<p>DM/20/03422/FPA - 8 no. affordable bungalows and 2 no. affordable dormer bungalows with associated parking and landscaping</p> <p>Vacant Land at Ramsey Crescent, Bishop Auckland</p> <p>Approved 10 February 2022</p>	10	0.32	0.32	31
<p>DM/21/02127/FPA - Development of 89 no dwellings including hard and soft landscaping, public open space, highways and associated works</p> <p>Land at Ridding Road and Rowan Court and The Oaks, Esh Winning</p> <p>Approved 21 February 2022</p>	89	2.1	Approx 1.7	52

Application Details (Reference, Address, Approval Date)	Dwellings (no.)	Gross Site Area (ha)	Net Site Area (ha) ⁵	Density (Net) ⁶
DM/21/02381/RM - Application for reserved matters for 401 dwellings and associated works and approval of conditions 6, 7, 10 and 11 pursuant to planning permission 3/2011/0521 Land to the South of St Phillips Close, Auckland Park Approved 21 February 2022	401	15.96	Approx 13	31
DM/19/03541/FPA - Erection of 20 unit 1 and 2 bedroom apartment block Land to the South of 9 Rutter Street, Langley Moor Approved 10 March 2022	20	0.17	0.17	118
DM/21/00970/RM - Reserved Matters approval for 13 affordable dwellings at Lambton Cell C1 Land to the South East of Bowes Gate Lodge, Lambton Park Approved 23 March 2022	13	0.35	0.35	37
DM/21/03180/FPA - Demolition of 24no. apartments and garages and erection of 15no. bungalows 9-16 Fir Tree And 22-28 Maple Avenue, Shildon Approved 30 March 2022	15	0.58	0.58	26 Sewer easement communal garden

7.23. A total of 17 housing schemes were approved during the monitoring period, which were relevant to density monitoring. Taking an average reading across these schemes (excluding the outlier of 118 dph) an average density of over 32 dph was recorded, and therefore the monitoring target was met.

7.24. Looking at the data in more detail, a total of 11 developments were built to at least minimum density requirements. Typically these schemes were larger developments where a range of house types and styles can be incorporated, helping to achieve efficient use of land.

- 7.25. Six schemes were approved at lower densities. The developments at Green Lane Spennymoor and Station Rd West Coxhoe were just under the target (at around 28 and 29 dph) however both schemes were quite small scale edge of settlement proposals. Both developments provided extensive highway accessibility, car parking and back gardens which impacted upon site yield. Further limiting factors included the scheme at Green Lane being for bungalows and the Coxhoe site being a slightly 'awkward' shape and layout.
- 7.26. The scheme at Etherley Moor includes significant areas of open space, SUDs and landscape areas, while the housing mix is focussed on larger detached properties. The development at Davis Crescent also includes significant open space and landscaping, along with extensive highway infrastructure to provide access past the cemetery. This site was approved contrary to officer recommendation. Both sites are in edge of settlement locations where the density minimum may be relaxed in accordance with policy stipulations. The development at Shildon provides bungalows and the site also incorporates a sewage easement. The scheme at Chilton is an edge of settlement site, which forms the second phase to a larger new development. The development is introducing larger detached dwellings and a more spacious layout incorporating significant open space to integrate with an existing recreation area. Lower yields are therefore considered acceptable in accordance with the policy guidance.
- 7.27. Overall, the policy continues to operate as intended.

SD2 Proportion of housing schemes which are put forward for Building for Life 12 accreditation and achieve it

Performance achieved:	Please refer to item 7.28 for more information
Target:	100%
Performance against target:	N/A

- 7.28. No schemes have been put forward for Building for Life 12 accreditation.

SD3 Schemes receiving one or more red scores through internal Building for Life design review

Performance achieved:	Please refer to item 7.29 for more information
Target:	Zero
Performance against target	Target not met

- 7.29. This indicator monitors the effectiveness of the Council's internal design review process, which is based upon the Building for Life Standards. Proposals are assessed against the standards and given a traffic light score. A red score indicates that the scheme fails to meet the standard. In accordance with Policy 29, red scores are grounds for refusal, unless there are significant overriding reasons to allow a red score. However, the Council works with developers to help them improve upon the design as far as possible, so that schemes are not passed with red scores.
- 7.30. Where a scheme receives a red score, applicants are given advice on what needs to be improved so that they can ideally achieve a green score. Normally, the modified proposal is then reassessed at a subsequent design review session, or further amendments are agreed with officers to ensure conformity with the Standards. Schemes can be reassessed several

times until a satisfactory outcome is achieved. If applicants choose to ignore the outcome of design review, and a proposal has a red score at decision time, the proposal should be refused or recommended for refusal by committee, unless there are significant overriding reasons to allow the red score.

- 7.31. The following table gives a breakdown of the proposals by application type that were assessed at design review during the 2021-22 monitoring period.

Application Type	Number of Development Proposals
Full Planning Application	22
Outline	7
Pre-Application	13
Reserved Matters	14
Variation of Condition	0
Total	56

- 7.32. A total of the 56 separate schemes were assessed at design review, with some proposals receiving follow-up reviews. The majority of these schemes are either pending a decision or at the informal planning stage and therefore still under review and not reported upon. The following table identifies the schemes that have been determined. Two schemes were refused during this period: at Peases West in Crook and Cadger Bank in Lanchester. Both schemes had red scores in respect to the Building for Life Standards. Of the 14 schemes that were approved, only two schemes had red scores remaining. The commentary section of the table explores the reasons for approving these schemes in more detail, however in respect of the development at Esh Winning (The Oaks), the decision maker considered that the merits of the proposal outweighed the policy conflicts. In respect to the proposal in Bishop Auckland (South of St Phillips Close) while the red score technically remained at the decision stage, conditions and amendments were included to address the concerns around drainage and open space which were considered sufficient to cover off this issue. While the target was not met during the monitoring period, the design review process, and policy requirement set down under Policy 29, continue to operate as intended and to provide a positive framework for achieving significant design improvements and higher standards within new residential proposals throughout the County.

Table 23 Design Code Assessments

Application Details (Reference, Address)	Red score at approval/refusal stage (BfL Standard No.)	Commentary
DM/20/02896/RM Land to the North of Lowhills Road, Peterlee Approved	None	Complies with Policy
DM/20/03558/OUT Land to the east of Regents Court, Sherburn Road Approved	None	Complies with Policy
DM/21/02127/FPA The Oaks, Esh Winning Approved	Yes (Standard Nos: 6, 10, 11, 12)	In this case the scheme was considered at design review on several occasions, and through this process a number of design improvements were made to the scheme. However, ultimately a planning balance was performed by the decision maker who considered that the benefits of the proposal - which included provision of bungalows, affordable provision and remediation and redevelopment of a cleared site, along with energy betterment of above building regulation standards, amongst other things – was sufficient to overcome the policy conflicts.
DM/20/03054/RM Land to the West of Davis Crescent, Langley Park Approved	None	Complies with Policy
DM/21/00855/FPA Land to the North of Peases West Sports Centre, Crook Refused	Yes (Standard Nos: 5, 6, 7, 10, 11)	Scheme refused in line with Policy
DM/20/02983/RM Land North East of Castledene Road, Delves Lane Approved	None	Complies with Policy

Application Details (Reference, Address)	Red score at approval/refusal stage (BfL Standard No.)	Commentary
DM/21/01072/RM Land North of Etherley Moor, Bishop Auckland Approved	None	Complies with Policy
DM/21/00319/RM Rear of Delamere and Lamorna, Station Rd W, Coxhoe Approved	None	Complies with Policy
DM/21/02025/RM Land East of Porter Gardens, Bishop Auckland Approved	None	Complies with Policy
DM/21/01520/FPA Land at Colliery Road, Bearpark Approved	None	Complies with Policy
DM/21/02606/RM land To The East Of Hollinside, Barnard Castle Approved	None	Complies with Policy
DM/21/01832/FPA Land West of Durham Road, Wolsingham Approved	None	Complies with Policy

Application Details (Reference, Address)	Red score at approval/refusal stage (BfL Standard No.)	Commentary
DM/21/02381/RM Land South of St Philips Close, Auckland Park Approved	Yes (Standard Nos: 11)	<p>In response to the areas of concern, some further SuDS improvements were made in the form of reducing the gradient of one of the basins from a previous 1 in 3 to 1 in 5 and the introduction of additional roadside swales. The late stage of submission of these amendments meant no further detailed consultation could occur with the Drainage Team. However, in the opinion of the decision maker the amendments made steps to address the concerns raised regarding basin design and swale shortages. A condition exists on the outline planning permission in relation to drainage and a final scheme could be agreed via its discharge.</p> <p>In relation to the public open space, draft revised proposals were received making a commitment to provide a children's play area as opposed to just trim trail features and again a condition could resolve the final detail.</p>
DM/21/03839/FPA Land North of Delves Lane, Consett Approved	None	Complies with Policy
DM/21/03893/RM Phase 2B Integra 61, Bowburn Approved	None	Complies with Policy
DM/22/00184/OUT Land West of Briardene, Cadger Bank, Lanchester Refused	Yes (Standard Nos: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6)	Scheme refused in line with Policy

Promoting Healthy Communities

- 7.33. The planning system can play an important role in facilitating interaction and creating healthy, safe and inclusive communities. The Plan seeks to embed health and wellbeing considerations throughout, to achieve healthy places with safe, accessible and inclusive environments for people to come together.

Policy 30 Hot Food Takeaways

- 7.34. Policy 30 sets a framework for assessing proposal for hot food takeaways. The key driver for this is reducing levels of obesity. Large concentrations of hot food takeaways within our town centres can have the opposite effect by encouraging unhealthy eating habits. An over-concentration of hot food takeaways can also have a detrimental impact on vitality and viability. The policy recognises that where an application is proposed within a centre where the numbers of hot food takeaways already exceed 5% or a new proposal would lead to it exceeding 5%, closer scrutiny is required.

HC1 Percentage of units within Sub Regional, large town, small town and district centres in use or with planning permission for A5

Performance achieved:	See tables 24 and 25
Target:	Hot food takeaways not increasing to or exceeding 5%
Performance against target:	Target not met

- 7.35. The following provides details of the percentage of hot food takeaways in Sub Regional, Large Town, Small Town and District centres. It follows surveys in June/July 2022. This is an indicator that is similar to what the Council have reported on through previous published AMRs, so as well as containing last years data, the table below shows data from 19/20 and 18/19.

Table 24 Percentage of Hot Food Takeaways

Centre	% of hot food takeaway 18/19	% of hot food takeaway 19/20	% of hot food takeaway 20/21	% of hot food takeaways 21/22
Arnison Centre	0	0	0	0
Barnard Castle	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3
Bishop Auckland	4.5	4.8	5	5.3
Cheste-le-Street	4.3	4.3	4.6	5.2
Consett	6.8	6.8	7.2	6.7
Crook	7.1	7.8	7.9	8.6
Dragonville/Sherburn Road	2.9	2.7	2.3	2.3
Durham City	2.6	2.6	2.4	2.9
Ferryhill	8.8	10	10	10
Newton Aycliffe	5.8	5.8	5.8	5.8
Peterlee	0.8	0.8	0.8	0
Seaham	5.9	5.9	5.3	6
Sildon	8.4	8.4	8.4	8.4
Spennymoor	6.9	6.9	7.9	7.9
Stanley	3.4	3.4	3.3	5

- 7.36. As can be seen from Table 24, there are now 9 centres where the number of hot food takeaways exceed 5%, this is an increase from 7 reported on in last year's AMR. Ferryhill has the highest percentage of hot food takeaways (10%), although this figure has now remained stable for the past 3 years. Crook now has the second highest number of hot food takeaways (8.6%) with Sildon and Spennymoor also having high numbers, albeit these

have remained stable over the past year. It is noted that the figure for the Arnison Centre stands at 0% despite McDonald's and KFC being present. These uses are recorded as Class E (b) as they provide facilities for the consumption of food and drink on the premises and are not a traditional takeaway under the Use Class Order 2020.

- 7.37. In assessing applications for new hot food takeaways in centres which exceed 5%, consideration is given to whether the proposals would detract from the vitality and viability of a centre. In assessing such applications regard is had to the existing levels of vacant units within the centre. In particular, where vacancy rates are above the national average, weight is given to the contribution that the proposal would make to reducing this. In addition, the frontage is required to be of good design avoiding the use of roller shutters where possible. Encouragement will also be given to uses that are not solely to support the night-time economy. Whilst therefore there will be instances whereby new proposals will be approved, the target is to reduce hot food takeaway levels particularly in centres where there is already a heavy concentration.

Table 25 Centres where hot food numbers are increasing or decreasing

Centre	% change in number of hot food takeaway uses
Arnison Centre	No change
Barnard Castle	No change
Bishop Auckland	+0.3
Chester-le-Street	+0.6
Consett	-0.5
Crook	+0.7
Dragonville/Sherburn Road	No change
Durham City	+0.5
Ferryhill	No change
Newton Aycliffe	No change
Peterlee	-0.8
Seaham	+0.7
Sildon	No change
Spennymoor	No change
Stanley	+1.7

- 7.38. Table 25 shows that there are 6 centres where the numbers of hot food takeaways have increased over the monitoring period. Durham City has seen a 0.5% increase in the numbers of hot food takeaways which represents an increase in 2 hot food takeaways. Durham does however still retain low levels of hot food takeaways with the overall percentage at 2.9%, well below the 5% threshold where new proposals require closer scrutiny. The increases in the other 5 centres (Bishop Auckland, Chester-le-Street, Crook, Seaham and Stanley) represent just one more unit in hot food takeaway use. The majority of centres have seen no change, with the numbers of hot food takeaways falling in Consett and Peterlee.
- 7.39. As there are centres which have seen an increase in the number of hot food takeaways and still centres which exceed 5% in terms of hot food takeaways, the target is not met. It is however encouraging that the overall levels have either not changed or reduced in the majority of centres.

Policy 31 Amenity and Pollution

- 7.40. Policy 31 is used to assess the impacts of a proposed development on amenity, new development should be integrated without unacceptably impacting on existing business, community facilities or a person's general amenity. The policy also allows consideration of where development would have unacceptable impacts on the environment.

HC2 Appeals upheld contrary to this policy

Appeals:	9
Appeals allowed:	1
Target:	None upheld at appeal
Performance against target:	Target not met

- 7.41. It is important that policies are being used to uphold planning decisions made by the Council if the applicant subsequently appeals that decision.
- 7.42. Over the monitoring period there were 9 appeals of applications refused against Policy 31. Of these appeals, 8 were dismissed and 1 was allowed (APP/X1355/W/21/3276266). This was an application that proposed reserved matters of a dwelling in relation to a single plot as part of an outline approval of 14 dwellings in Lanchester. The application was refused at committee, contrary to officer recommendation. The inspector deemed that the proposal would not cause material harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring house in respect of outlook, light or privacy. The inspector therefore found that the proposal would therefore accord with Policy 29, 31 and the Residential Amenities SPD.
- 7.43. Whilst the policy is performing well at appeal, given that the afore mentioned appeal was allowed, the target set by the indicator has not been met.

Policy 32 Despoiled, Degraded, Derelict, Contaminated and Unstable Land

- 7.44. Despoiled land is land which has been affected by the removal of material assets i.e. mineral resources which have affected the condition of the land. Degraded land is land that has lost some degree of its natural productivity due to human-caused processes. Derelict land is land that has become damaged by industrial or other development possibly with the remains of previous buildings and structures upon it. Contaminated land can be regarded as any land which is in such a condition by reason of substances in, on or under the land, that it can cause a risk to human health, property or the wider environment.
- 7.45. New development can provide an opportunity to address the risk associated with despoiled, derelict, degraded, contaminated or unstable land by bringing about its improvement through remediation. When new development is proposed it is essential that the developer undertakes investigations and risk assessments and undertake any necessary remedial measures to ensure that any despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land issues are satisfactorily addressed.

HC3 Number of eligible schemes that are supported by appropriate investigations

% of eligible schemes that are supported by appropriate investigations:	70%
Target:	100%
Performance against target:	Target not met

- 7.46. For the purposes of this indicator, approved applications during the time period citing policy 32 have been reviewed. There have been 202 applications approved with 142 application including screening assessments, risk assessments or contamination reports as part of the application submission. Out of the 60 applications where no information was provided 34 applications reviewed by the council's Contaminated Land officer recommended informatives, conditions or provided advice based on their knowledge of the site specifics or outside agencies consulted. The number of applications submitted with the supporting information is a similar percentage to the 2020/21 figure of 71.6% of applications.

8. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

- 8.1. Addressing climate change is of importance for sustainable development and a key priority of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). It is therefore important to encourage the prudent use of non-renewable resources, contribute to reducing emissions and stabilising climate change (mitigation) and take into account the unavoidable consequences (adaptation).

Policy 33 Renewable Energy

- 8.2. Policy 33 encourages renewable energy development where it is appropriately located, and gives significant weight to the social, environmental, and economic benefits of renewable development.

CC1 Energy generated from renewable sources (MWh)

Energy generated:	545,522 MWh
Target:	Increase above the baseline figure (2018)
Performance against target:	Target met (see table and text below)

- 8.3. The indicator monitors the energy, (in MWh) generated from renewable sources. The data on capacity of renewable sites is supplied by the government one year in arrears, so the most recent data published is for 2021.

Table 26 Renewable Energy Generated in County Durham

MWh Renewable Energy Generated	2018	2019	2020	2021
County Durham	505,899	497,389	512,850	545,522

- 8.4. The data includes photovoltaics, onshore wind, hydro, anaerobic digestion, sewage and landfill gas, municipal solid waste, and animal and plant biomass. Offshore wind and wave energy are not counted as they are not possible to situate within the County's boundaries.
- 8.5. This data shows growth in renewable energy generation from 2018-2021. The impact of CDP Policy 33 should become more apparent in future updates to the AMR, although early findings indicate an increase in renewable energy generated.

Policy 34 Wind Turbine Development

- 8.6. Policy 34 gives support to wind turbine development where it is located in an area identified as suitable on the policies map, and where it has community support. The policy also sets out a number of criteria that wind turbine development should meet in order to prevent harm to the environment and landscape, and to prevent risk from toppling or shadow flicker. It gives further protection to the AONB and Yorkshire Dales National Park and clarifies how proposals for extensions to or repowering of wind farms should be assessed.

CC2 Appeals upheld contrary to this policy

Appeals:	0
Appeals allowed:	0
Target:	None upheld at appeal
Performance against target:	Target met

8.7. Over the monitoring period, there has been no appeals against applications that have been refused against Policy 34.

CC3 Renewable energy capacity of approved and completed schemes

Energy generated:	135.4 MW
Target:	Increasing trend above the baseline figure (2018)
Performance against target:	Target not met (see table and text below)

8.8. The data on capacity of approved turbines is supplied by the government one years in arrears, so that the most recent data relates to 2021

Table 27 Capacity of installed wind turbine development in County Durham

Capacity of installed wind turbine development (MW)	2018	2019	2020	2021
County Durham	140.3	135.4	135.4	135.4

8.9. These figures continue to show a slight decreasing trend in renewable energy capacity of installed wind turbine development in the County, the figure has however remained stable over the past 3 years.

Policy 35 Water Management

8.10. Policy 35 highlights the importance of water quality and where development is in close proximity to a watercourse then opportunities to improve the river environment and water quality should be explored. This could include naturalising watercourse channels, improving the biodiversity and ecological connectivity of watercourses, safeguarding and enlarging river buffers with appropriate habitat or mitigating diffuse agricultural and urban pollution. The policy also requires that on all new development there is no net increase in surface water runoff for the lifetime of the development and provides a hierarchy for how surface water run-off must be managed.

CC4 Number of water bodies which show Water Framework Directive improvement as a direct consequence of new development

Target:	An increasing trend.
Performance against target:	N/A

- 8.11. This indicator was included within the monitoring framework in order to highlight schemes which directly affected water bodies, in order to encourage new development to provide water framework directive improvements as part of the design process. There have been no schemes which meet these criteria within this monitoring period.

CC5 Percentage of major developments which include SuDS

Performance achieved	100%
Target:	100%
Performance against target:	Target met

- 8.12. For the purposes of this indicator, approved applications for major development during the time period citing policy 35 have been reviewed to determine if they included approved SuD Schemes and/or the inclusion of appropriate conditions to ensure their delivery. All major developments which required SuDS did include SuDS. The target for this indicator is therefore met for this monitoring period.

Policy 36 Water Infrastructure

- 8.13. Policy 36 sets out the criteria for disposing of foul water flows from new development. Priority should be given, where possible, to accommodate any additional flows within existing sewage treatment works. Where new sewage treatment works are required there will need to be a balance between meeting higher discharge standards, the environmental benefits of the development and the protection of the existing environment and amenity.

CC6 Number of major developments permitted where connection to a mains sewer is not possible and an alternative solution has not been secured

Performance achieved	Zero
Target:	Zero
Performance against target:	Target met

- 8.14. Non-mains drainage systems, such as package treatment plants and septic tanks should only be employed in non-sewered areas. Where they are required, careful consideration of their siting and design will be required to ensure that there is no adverse impact upon ground water, water quality or existing ecosystems.
- 8.15. For the purposes of this indicator, approved applications for major development during the time period citing policy 36 have been reviewed and all proposals have been connected to a main sewer as per the policy requirement.

Policy 37 Durham Coast and Heritage Coast

- 8.16. Policy 37 seeks to guard against inappropriate development within the Durham Heritage Coast or wider Coastal Zone that have the potential to individually or cumulatively impact on their setting.

CC7 Appeals upheld contrary to this policy

Appeals:	0
Appeals allowed:	0
Target:	None upheld at appeal
Performance against target:	Target met

8.17. Over the monitoring period, there has been no appeals against applications that have been refused against Policy 37.

CC8 Status of proposed extension of Heritage Coast around Dene Mouth

Target:	Completed by 2035
Performance against target:	N/A

8.18. The Heritage Coast Partnership approached Natural England in March 2021 to request that the Durham Heritage Coast be extended.

8.19. In their response to this request Natural England were pleased to hear that the Partnership felt that areas which were originally left out of the Heritage Coast have now been improved sufficiently to warrant consideration for inclusion within the existing Heritage Coast.

8.20. The work to produce a detailed assessment report, which assesses the relevant qualities of the area for inclusion in a Heritage Coast, to support our submission has not significantly progressed during this monitoring period but is ongoing.

9. Conserving and enhancing the natural and historic environment

- 9.1. County Durham has a wealth of attractive natural and historic assets which present unique opportunities for residents, businesses and visitors. There is a need therefore to successfully balance the protection and enhancement of these assets with the requirement for new development to meet our need for new homes and jobs. New development in and around our historic towns and villages must complement their built heritage and natural landscapes. Policy 38 North Pennines Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
- 9.2. Large parts of the North Pennines are designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). Policy 38 recognises the importance and sensitivity of the AONB and the need to conserve and enhance it as an environmental and economic asset and therefore seeks to guard against development that would harm the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB.

CE1 Appeals upheld contrary to this policy

Appeals:	0
Appeals allowed:	0
Target:	None upheld at appeal
Performance against target:	Target met

- 9.3. Over the monitoring period, there has been no appeals against applications that have been refused against Policy 38.

Policy 39 Landscape

- 9.4. The Durham landscape is one of enormous contrasts and diversity. From its western boundary high in the summit ridges of the North Pennines, to the limestone cliffs of the North Sea coast, remote moorlands and pastoral dales give way to fertile settled farmlands. Policy 39 is used to assess the landscape impacts of any proposed development in order to guard against development that would cause unacceptable harm.

CE2 Appeals upheld contrary to this policy

Appeals:	4
Appeals allowed:	0
Target:	None upheld at appeal
Performance against target:	Target met

- 9.5. It is important that policies are being used to uphold planning decisions made by the Council if the applicant subsequently appeals that decision.
- 9.6. Over the monitoring period there were 4 appeals of applications refused against Policy 39. On each occasion the inspector dismissed the appeal. The target set by the indicator has therefore been met.

Policy 40 Trees, Woodland and Hedges

- 9.7. Policy 40 recognises the important contribution trees, woodlands and hedges make to the beauty, diversity and distinctiveness of our rural landscapes and the beauty and liveability of our townscapes. The policy seeks to prevent the loss of, or damage to trees, woodlands and hedges, by retaining, protecting or as a last resort replacing them through the development process.

CE3 Net loss of trees/woodlands/hedges as a result of new development

Net loss:	0
Target:	No net loss of trees/woodlands/hedges
Performance against target	Target met

- 9.8. For the purpose of this indicator, approved applications for development during the time period citing Policy 40 have been reviewed, none of which affected trees and hedges.

CE4 Loss of Ancient Woodland (hectares)

Hectares lost:	0
Target:	No loss of Ancient Woodland
Performance against target:	Target met

- 9.9. Policy 40 also recognises the special protection afforded to Ancient Woodland as an irreplaceable habitat. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) says that planning permission should be refused for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland, and the loss of aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons, and a suitable compensation strategy is in place.
- 9.10. For the purpose of this indicator, approved applications for development during the time period citing Policy 40 have been reviewed, none of which affected Ancient Woodland.

Policy 41 Biodiversity and Geodiversity

- 9.11. Policy 41 seeks to guard against development that will cause significant harm to biodiversity or geodiversity. Proposals for new development are also required to actively enhance biodiversity in order to provide net gains.

CE5 Appeals upheld contrary to this policy

Appeals:	1
Appeals allowed:	0*
Target:	None upheld at appeal
Performance against target:	Please refer to item 9.12 for more information

- 9.12. It is important that policies are being used to uphold planning decisions made by the Council if the applicant subsequently appeals that decision.

9.13. Over the monitoring period there was 1 appeal of an application refused against Policy 41. This was an outline application for 36 dwellings at Tudhoe Colliery (APP/X1355/W/21/3289081). Whilst the inspector dismissed the appeal against Policies 6, 21 and 35, it was concluded that the proposal would meet the requirements of Policy 41 which the Council had found conflict with and had been cited as a reason for refusal.

CE6 Percentage of proposal permitted which would result in a loss of biodiversity or geodiversity where mitigation or compensation has been secured

Performance achieved:	Please refer to item 9.14 for more information
Target:	Zero
Performance against target:	Target not met

9.14. For the purpose of this indicator, approved applications for development during the time period citing Policy 41 have been reviewed. Within this review period, out of 429 applications, there was one application where Ecology colleagues had raised no objections to the proposals subject to the conditioning of the Method Statement, appended to the Preliminary Ecology Assessment. Yet, in this instance, this requirement was not conditioned. The Method Statement sets out the methods which must be employed during the works to minimise the risk of disturbing protected species such as bats. The report identified that there was a low risk at the time as there was no visible evidence of bats being present when the survey took place. Nonetheless, the property in question had features that were suitable for bats to roost. Therefore, whilst this target has not been met, there has been no recorded loss in biodiversity. However, mitigation to prevent any potential future loss has not been secured.

Policy 42 Internationally Designated Sites

9.15. Policy 42 seeks to guard against development that would adversely impact upon sensitive Internationally Designated Sites. There are certain internationally designated sites within the county that are already experiencing recreation and urbanisation impacts on site integrity. These are:

- Northumbria Coast Spa/Ramsar site
- Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA/Ramsar site
- Durham Coast SAC
- Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast potential SPA

9.16. Policy 42 states that development that has the potential to have an effect on internationally designated sites, either individually or in combination with other plans or projects will need to be screened in the first instance to determine whether significant effects on the site are likely and if so, will be subject to an Appropriate Assessment. If following Appropriate Assessment, taking mitigating measures into account, it is established that harm is likely to occur, or if there is uncertainty over the effects of a planning proposal, the Council will be required to proceed on a precautionary basis and not grant consent. The Council would only be able to grant consent under these circumstances if three additional, sequential tests (known as derogations) are met. These tests must be interpreted strictly and include:

- No feasible less damaging alternative solutions to the proposal exist;
- Imperative reasons for overriding public interest can be demonstrated; and
- Compensatory measures can be secured.

CE7 Number of applications approved which have a likely significant effect upon the integrity of an internationally designated site

Applications approved	0
Target:	No applications approved which contravene the requirements of the Habitats Regulations 2017 (or subsequent amendments) or adversely impact upon sensitive Internationally Designated Sites.
Performance against target:	Target met

- 9.17. The Council has developed a coastal avoidance and mitigation strategy to implement a programme of monitoring and mitigation measures to address potential adverse effects on County Durham’s Coastal European Protected Sites, which can be caused from increased visitor pressures resulting from new planned residential and tourist development.
- 9.18. Detailed developer guidance is provided to explain the responsibility of the Council and developers in respect of HRA, the stages in the process and sets out in great detail the coastal avoidance and mitigation measure. This has ensured that no application has been approved which contravenes the requirements of Habitat Regulations since the adoption of the Plan.

CE8 Appeals upheld contrary to this policy

Appeals:	0
Appeals allowed:	0
Target:	None upheld at appeal
Performance against target:	Target met

- 9.19. Over the monitoring period, there has been no appeals against applications that have been refused against Policy 42.

Policy 43 Protected Species and Nationally and Locally Protected Sites

- 9.20. Policy 43 seeks to guard against development that would adversely impact upon Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), National Nature Reserves (NNRs), Local Sites (Geology and Wildlife) and Local Nature Reserves.

CE9 Appeals upheld contrary to this policy

Appeals:	0
Appeals allowed:	0
Target:	None upheld at appeal
Performance against target:	Target met

- 9.21. Over the monitoring period, there has been no appeals against applications that have been refused against Policy 43.

Policy 44 Historic Environment

- 9.22. Heritage assets, designated and non-designated, are irreplaceable, so any harm or loss will require clear and convincing justification. This policy aims to ensure that County Durham’s heritage assets are preserved and enhanced so that they can continue to make an important contribution to the environment, economy, quality of life and lifelong learning for this and future generations.

CE10 Number of heritage assets lost

Assets lost	3
Target:	No heritage assets subject to unjustified loss
Performance against target:	Target met (Please refer to item 9.23 for more information)

- 9.23. A total of three heritage assets were lost during the monitoring period, which comprised:
- Masters House, Manual Instruction Block, Bicycle Sheds, Walls, Gates, Piers and Railings at Easington Colliery School
 - Former Girls Block South at Easington Colliery School
 - Former Boys Block North at Easington Colliery School

However, all three losses were justified in policy terms on public benefit, so the performance target was met.

CE11 Number of heritage assets removed from At Risk Registers as a result of the implementation of a permitted scheme

Number of heritage assets on the ‘at Risk Register’	53
Target:	100% of heritage assets removed from the At Risk Register, that relate to permitted schemes
Performance against target	On track (Please refer to item 9.24 for more information)

- 9.24. There has been a reduction in the number of buildings on the At Risk Register (compiled by Historic England) which has come down from 57 to 53 heritage assets from the previous monitoring period. The At Risk Register breaks down as follows: buildings and structures (25); places of worship (4); archaeology (17); parks and gardens (1) and Conservation Areas (6).
- 9.25. The assets that were removed from the register include:
- Church of St Andrew, Dalton-le-Dale and Church of St Helen, Church Kelloe - both removed as a result of extensive work funded by NHLF
 - Bowburn Conservation Area removed as threat from adjacent development now clearly understood and Neighbourhood Plan adopted offering strong protection to CA and NDHA
 - Shildon Conservation Area removed as result of significant investment in fabric of key assets, preparation and Historic Area Assessment and strategy for improvement through Levelling Up Funding

- Trimdon Village Conservation Area removed as a result of improvement in the condition of built fabric and environment and dismissal of appeal for housing which would have harmed setting.

9.26. However, the archaeological sites of Park Level Mine Jigger House and Crushing Mill Water Wheel, (Killhope Museum) have been added to the register as a result of surface flooding and deterioration of key structures. Museum Estate and Development Fund (MEND) funding has subsequently been secured from Arts Council England to undertake urgent works and business planning and fundraising strategy in preparation to rescue the asset with the aim to remove it from the register.

9.27. It is likely that several assets (Gainford Hall, Dovecote south of Gainford Hall, Iron Gates and Railings Lambton Castle, and, Low Harperley Farmhouse) will be removed from the list during the 2022-23 monitoring period as a result of planning determinations.

CE12 Appeals upheld contrary to this policy

Appeals:	6
Appeals allowed:	2
Target:	None upheld at appeal
Performance against target:	Target not met

9.28. It is important that policies are being used to uphold planning decisions made by the Council if the applicant subsequently appeals that decision.

9.29. Over the monitoring period there were 6 appeals of applications refused against Policy 44. Of the appeals four were dismissed and two were allowed. Of these two allowed appeals, both were applications that were approved contrary to officer recommendation. The first of these was a proposal for the retention of land for 2 parking spaces at Ainsley Street, Durham (APP/X1355/W/21/3274720). The proposal was considered to have an adverse visual impact within the streetscene and conservation area and also not considered to be in keeping with the character and appearance of other parking spaces within the area, thereby failing to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area. It was therefore found to be contrary to policy 44. The inspector disagreed however, considering that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area and the Conservation Area.

9.30. The other appeal allowed was a proposal at 21 Market Place, Durham for the erection of part two storey, part single story extension to the rear to form 1no. self contained 5 bed HMO (C4) to 1st and 2nd floor and additional retail office, storage, and welfare facilities to the ground floor. It also included the erection of a single storey rear extension to the existing Card Factory premises to form a new stockroom, office, and welfare facilities to the ground floor (APP/X1355/W/21/3275009 & APP/X1355/Y/20/3265941). The application was refused contrary to officer recommendation. The application was refused against Policy 16 (discussed under Policy 16), the proposed extension was also considered an incongruous feature that would detract from the setting of a listed building and have a significant detrimental impact on the nearby Heritage Assets resulting in less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset with no public benefit to outweigh this harm. It was therefore found to be contrary to Policies 44 and 45. In allowing the appeal the inspector found that the proposal would preserve the

special historic interest of the Grade II listed building, the setting of adjoining listed buildings and the character and appearance of Durham City Conservation Area and therefore would not conflict with Policy 44 and 45.

- 9.31. Given that the above appeals were allowed, the target set by the indicator has not been met.

Policy 45 Durham Castle and Cathedral World Heritage Site

- 9.32. Through the 1972 World Heritage Convention, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) has identified the formal recognition and management of World Heritage Sites (WHS) as a key means of conserving the world's cultural and natural heritage for present and future generations. The designation of the Durham Cathedral and Castle WHS in 1986 recognised its national and international significance. Policy 45 guards against development that would result in harm to the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage Site or its setting.

CE14 Appeals upheld contrary to this policy

Appeals:	1
Appeals allowed:	1
Target:	None upheld at appeal
Performance against target:	Target not met

- 9.33. It is important that policies are being used to uphold planning decisions made by the Council if the applicant subsequently appeals that decision.
- 9.34. Over the monitoring period there was 1 appeal of an application refused against Policy 45. This was a proposal at 21 Market Place, discussed under Policy 44 (APP/X1355/W/21/3275009 & APP/X1355/Y/20/3265941). Given that this appeal was allowed, the target set by the indicator has not been met.

Policy 46 Stockton and Darlington Railway

- 9.35. Policy 46 seeks to guard against development that would impact on the historic route of the Stockton and Darlington Railway (S&DR) of 1825, the Black Boy and Haggerleases branch lines and the Surtees Railway, together with their associated structures, archaeological and physical remains and setting.

CE15 Appeals upheld contrary to this policy

Appeals:	0
Appeals allowed:	0
Target:	None upheld at appeal
Performance against target:	Target met

- 9.36. Over the monitoring period, there has been no appeals against applications that have been refused against Policy 46.

10. Minerals and Waste

- 10.1. National planning policy requires the council to plan for the needs of mineral extraction and waste management in order to ensure that there is a sufficient supply of minerals to provide the infrastructure, buildings, energy and goods the country needs, and that waste is managed in a sustainable and efficient manner in accordance with the waste hierarchy.

Policy 47 Sustainable Minerals and Waste Resource Management

- 10.2. Policy 47 seeks to promote, encourage and facilitate the development of a sustainable resource economy in County Durham. It sets out the need for waste to be managed in line with the waste hierarchy in sequential order. It also seeks to support opportunities for on site management of waste where it arises, encouraging the co-location of waste development. In terms of mineral extraction, the policy seeks to minimise the amount of waste during extraction, it encourages the concurrent working of two or more minerals from the same site and seeks to permit proposals for aggregate recycling facilities.

MW1 Percentage of proposals permitted that either minimise waste production; help prepare waste for re-use and increase the capacity and capability of the county's network of waste management facilities to reuse, recycle and recover value from waste materials

Performance achieved	100%
Target:	100%
Performance against target:	Target met

- 10.3. In the 2021/22 monitoring period two planning applications were submitted of which one was granted planning permission and one which is still pending determination. The proposal which was granted planning permission will improve process operations at an existing waste management facility but will not in itself increase waste management capacity or capability. Further details are provided under Policy 60.

MW2 Percentage of proposals permitted that enable the disposal of waste via landfill or via the incineration of waste without energy recovery where an alternative treatment solution is available at a higher level in the waste hierarchy

Performance achieved:	0%
Target:	None.
Performance against target:	Target met

- 10.4. During the monitoring period no proposals were permitted which would allow the disposal of waste via landfill or via the incineration of waste. Two proposals for the incineration of waste were refused, both of which would have recovered value from waste via energy and or heat. While no planning applications were refused for landfill, two planning applications were refused for proposals which would have allowed the disposal of inert waste to land. Further details are provided under Policy 60.

MW3 Capacity (tonnage) of secondary and recycled aggregate management facilities

Tonnage of secondary and recycled aggregate management facilities	An additional 75,000 capacity received planning permission.
Target:	Increase the capacity of secondary and recycled aggregate management facilities (against the baseline figure).
Performance against target:	N/A

10.5. One planning permission was granted for a new secondary aggregate recycling facility during the monitoring period. A further planning application is pending determination. Further details are provided under Policy 60.

MW4 Appeals upheld contrary to this policy

Appeals:	0
Appeals allowed:	0
Target:	None upheld at appeal
Performance against target:	Target met

10.6. Over the monitoring period, there has been no appeals against applications that have been refused against Policy 47.

Policy 48 Safeguarding Minerals Sites, Minerals Related Infrastructure and Waste Management Sites

10.7. Policy 48 safeguards and protects minerals sites, minerals related infrastructure and waste management sites from non-mineral and non-waste related development. Therefore it sets out criteria for considering such development that would result in the loss of existing or allocated minerals processing facilities and minerals related transportation infrastructure and waste management sites.

MW5 Percentage of relevant approved development proposals that do not have an adverse effect or lead to the loss of a safeguarded Minerals Site, Minerals Related Infrastructure or Waste Management site

Percentage achieved :	100%
Target:	100% of relevant approvals are consistent with policy
Performance against target:	Target met

10.8. Since adoption of the Plan, no planning permissions were granted which would have an adverse effect or lead to the loss of a safeguarded Minerals Site, Minerals Related Infrastructure or Waste Management site.

MW6 Percentage of relevant proposals within a Minerals and Waste Site Safeguarding Zone where the compatibility of the proposed development with the safeguarded Minerals Site, Minerals Related Infrastructure or Waste Management site is considered as part of the consideration of the proposal

Target:	100%
Performance achieved:	0%
Performance against target:	N/A (Please refer to item 10.9 for more information)

10.9. During the monitoring period no planning applications were reported as being made within a Minerals and Waste Site Safeguarding Zone.

MW7 Appeals upheld contrary to this policy

Appeals:	0
Appeals allowed:	0
Target:	None upheld at appeal
Performance against target:	Target met

10.10. Over the monitoring period, there has been no appeals against applications that have been refused against Policy 48.

Policy 49 Primary Aggregates Provision

10.11. Policy 49 sets out how throughout the Plan period a steady and adequate supply of primary aggregates will be maintained.

MW8 Annual and cumulative sales of sand and gravel

Performance achieved.	Sales 2017 = 330,000 tonnes Sales 2018 = 446,000 tonnes Sales 2019 = 537,000 tonnes Sales 2020 = 438,000 tonnes Cumulative production 2017 to 2020 = 1,751,000 tonnes.
Target:	The extraction of 5.4 million tonnes of sand and gravel at a rate of no less than 285,000 tonnes per annum over the 19 year period 1.1.2017 to 31.12.2035.
Performance against target:	On track

10.12. Sand and Gravel sales are the quantity of aggregate which was extracted and sold from all of County Durham’s hard and soft rock quarries which produce sand & gravel. No further information is currently available on sales of sand and gravel other than that which was reported in last year’s Annual Monitoring Report. Sales information for 2021 will be published in the Council’s next Local Aggregate Assessment which will report upon 2021 sales.

MW9 Annual and cumulative sales of crushed rock

Performance achieved.	Sales 2017 = 2.636 million tonnes Sales 2018 = 3.484 million tonnes Sales 2019 = 3.256 million tonnes Sales 2020 = 2.613 million tonnes Cumulative production 2017 to 2020 = 11.989 million tonnes
Target:	The extraction of 53.2 million tonnes of crushed rock at a rate of no less than 2.8 million tonnes per annum over the 19 year period 1.1.2017 to 31.12.2035.
Performance against target:	On track

10.13. Crushed rock sales are the quantity of crushed rock aggregate which was extracted and sold from all of County Durham’s hard rock quarries. It excludes all mineral used for non-aggregate purposes. No further information is currently available on sales of crushed rock other than that which was reported in last year’s Annual Monitoring Report. Sales information for 2021 will be published in the Councils next Local Aggregate Assessment which will report upon 2021 sales.

MW10 Additional permitted reserves of carboniferous limestone

Performance achieved	6.97 million tonnes of carboniferous limestone approved
Target:	That planning permission will be granted to permit the release of an additional 14.2 million tonnes of carboniferous limestone over the 19 year period 1.1.2017 to 31.12.2035.
Performance against target:	On track

10.14. One planning application (DM/18/02483/MIN) was approved on 6 June 2019 to allow a north-western extension to Heights Quarry. This application granted permission to a total of 6.97 million tonnes of carboniferous limestone including 3.7 million tonnes in the extension area. A planning application to extend Hulands Quarry to the east was submitted was validated on 27 May 2022 and is now pending consideration.

MW11 Crushed rock land bank years

Landbank	Landbank (2020) = 31.2 years
Target:	To maintain at least a minimum 10 year land bank of crushed rock.
Performance against target:	Target met

10.15. Landbanks of aggregate mineral reserves are used principally as an indicator of the security of aggregate minerals supply and to indicate the additional provision that needs to be made for new aggregate extraction and alternative supplies in Local Plans. The NPPF advises that the landbank indicator which must be maintained for crushed rock is at least 10 years. No further information is currently available on the crushed rock landbank than that which was reported in last year’s Annual Monitoring Report. Landbank information for 2021 will be published in the Councils next Local Aggregate Assessment which will report upon 2021 sales, permitted reserves and landbanks.

MW12 Sand and Gravel land bank (years)

Land Bank	Landbank 2020 = 11.98 years
Target:	To maintain at least a minimum 7 year land bank of sand and gravel.
Performance against target:	Target met

10.16. Landbanks of aggregate mineral reserves are used, principally as an indicator of the security of aggregate minerals supply and to indicate the additional provision that needs to be made for new aggregate extraction and alternative supplies in Local Plans. The NPPF specifies that the landbank indicator which must be maintained for sand and gravel is at least 7 years. No further information is currently available on the sand and gravel landbank other than that which was reported in last year's Annual Monitoring Report. Landbank information for 2021 will be published in the Councils next Local Aggregate Assessment which will report upon 2021 sales, permitted reserves and landbanks.

Policy 50 Locational Approach to the Future Supply of Primary Aggregates

10.17. Policy 50 sets out the locational approach for aggregate working over the Plan period including for different types of crushed rock and sand and gravel.

MW13 Percentage of permissions granted on sites or extensions to sites located on land outside and land not adversely affecting designated and defined areas and in accordance with specific policy criteria

Permissions:	0
Target:	Zero
Performance against target	Target met

10.18. No planning applications were approved during the monitoring period.

Policy 51 Meeting Future Aggregate Requirements

10.19. Policy 51 sets out how future aggregate requirements in County Durham will be met over the plan period and provides decision making criteria for allocated sites, non-allocated sites and existing permitted reserves.

MW14 Appeals upheld contrary to this policy

Appeals:	0
Appeals allowed:	0
Target:	None upheld at appeal
Performance against target:	Target met

10.20. Over the monitoring period, there has been no appeals against applications that have been refused against Policy 51.

Policy 52 Brick Making Raw Materials

10.21. Policy 52 sets the criteria for assessing proposals for new workings to meet the raw material needs of brickwork within County Durham and for new workings which are intended to serve brickworks outside of County Durham.

MW15 Number of years of approved reserves at brickworks in County Durham

Performance achieved:	Please refer to item 10.22 for more information
Target:	To maintain a minimum 25 year stock of permitted reserves at brickworks in County Durham.
Performance against target:	N/A

10.22. Following the closure of Eldon Brickworks in 2012, only one brickworks remains operational in County Durham. This is located at Todhills, near Byers Green. The Todhills brickworks is supplied with coal measures mudstone by the adjacent Long Lane Quarry. In accordance with NPPF requirements a revised landbank period or stock of permitted reserves figure of 25 years has now been incorporated within Policy 52 (Brickmaking Raw Materials) of the adopted County Durham Plan. The number of years of approved reserves (data based on end dates of planning permission) currently stands at less than 25 years by virtue that planning permission expired in 2019. In January 2019 the operators of Todhills Brickworks submitted a planning application to continue mineral extraction at Long Lane Quarry until 2043 and the creation of a new quarry to the south of Todhills brickworks. This planning application is awaiting determination but if permitted will supply the long term needs of this brickworks.

MW16 Number of years of approved reserves at the Union Brickworks at Birtley in Gateshead

Number of years of approved reserves:	21 years
Target:	In association with Gateshead Council to maintain a minimum 25 year stock of permitted reserves at the Union Brickworks at Birtley
Performance against target:	Target not met

10.23. County Durham supplies glacial clay to the Union Brickworks in Gateshead, via the adjacent Birtley Quarry which is located in County Durham. In accordance with NPPF requirements a revised landbank period or stock of permitted reserves figure of 25 years has now been incorporated within Policy 52 (Brickmaking Raw Materials) of the adopted County Durham Plan. The number of years of approved reserves (data based on end dates of planning permission which requires all mineral extraction to cease by 13 February 2044) currently stands at less than 25 years (22 years). In addition, it should be noted that paragraph 13.16 of the Newcastle/ Gateshead 'One Core Strategy - Planning for The Future Core Strategy and Urban Core Plan' refers to potentially workable deposit of brick clay at Lamesley in Gateshead which is safeguarded.

Policy 53 Surface Mined Coal and Fireclay

10.24. Policy 53 sets the decision making criteria for assessing proposals for the extraction of coal and/or fireclay.

MW17 Appeals upheld contrary to this policy

Appeals	0
Appeals allowed	0
Target:	None upheld at appeal.
Performance against target:	N/A

10.25. Over the monitoring period, there has been no appeals against applications that have been refused against Policy 53.

Policy 54 Natural Building and Roofing Stone

10.26. Policy 54 sets the decision making criteria for new and extensions to existing natural building and roofing stone quarries.

MW18 Quantity of new permitted reserves granted

Performance achieved	Please refer to item 10.27 for more information
Target:	To maintain a steady, adequate and diverse supply of natural building and roofing stone
Performance against target:	N/A

10.27. No new permitted reserves of natural building and roofing stone were granted planning permission during AMR year 21/22. No planning applications were submitted or were pending determination during the monitoring year.

Policy 55 Reopening of Relic Building Stone Quarries for Heritage Projects

10.28. Policy 55 sets the criteria for assessing proposals to temporarily reopen, on a time limited basis, relic natural building and roofing stone quarries, including those identified by Historic England through the Strategic Stone Study or for new extraction adjacent to or close to these quarries to extract small quantities of stone required for heritage projects.

MW19 Quantity of new permitted reserves granted on relic sites for natural building and roofing stone working

Performance achieved	Please refer to item 10.29 for more information
Target:	No target
Performance against target:	N/A

10.29. No new permitted reserves were granted planning permission during AMR year 21/22. No planning applications were submitted or were pending determination during the monitoring year.

Policy 56 Safeguarding Mineral Resources

10.30. Policy 56 seeks to prevent planning permission from being granted for non-mineral development that would lead to the sterilisation of mineral resources. It sets out where development may be applicable within these areas.

MW20 Number of eligible schemes within the County's Mineral Safeguarding Area, that are supported by a Mineral Assessment

Performance achieved	Please refer to item 10.31 for more information
Target:	100%
Performance against target:	Target not met

10.31. This monitoring indicator has been monitored only since the adoption of the County Durham Plan. Not all planning applications within a Mineral Safeguarding Areas require a Mineral Assessment as some planning applications are considered exempt (as defined in Appendix C C2 of the County Durham Plan).

10.32. Of the 24 planning applications monitored none were accompanied by a Mineral Assessment. The majority of planning applications monitored were small planning applications and many were located within or adjoining the built up framework of settlements. This reflects the fact that many Mineral Safeguarding Areas in County Durham are extensive and have also washed over settlements. The majority of the planning applications which were monitored did not require a Mineral Assessment as they were exempt, for example they related to an application which involved infilling in an otherwise built up frontage within a settlement (exempt development category 1); or alterations and extensions to existing buildings including applications for new or improved accesses (exempt development category 3); or a change of use of existing buildings (exempt development category 4). On occasion this reasoning was not provided within the Committee Reports which accompanied these planning applications.

10.33. In considering some pre-application enquiries and planning applications Council officers have also reviewed the available information and advised that a Mineral Assessment is not in fact necessary. This is because officers have assessed that the application site would be unlikely to ever be suitable for minerals extraction, sterilisation would be minimal or where a planning application overlies a coal mineral safeguarding area a Coal Mining Risk Assessment has been submitted which has provided an indication that mineral is not of a thickness or at depth which would enable recovery to be economic. This approach is considered consistent with policy and is to ensure that Mineral Assessments are not unnecessarily requested.

10.34. The most problematic mineral which is safeguarded is coal due to the extent of the area safeguarded within the County which covers most of Central Durham. This mineral has been safeguarded due to the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework which continues to identify coal as a mineral of local and national importance and the requires local planning authorities to safeguard minerals of local and national importance and the consideration of their prior extraction if sterilising development were to occur. Experience has shown that Coal Mining Risk Assessments when submitted where applications are in the

Coalfield Development High Risk Area have been most useful in understanding the incidence and depth of coal resources.

10.35. During the monitoring period no significant sterilisation of mineral resources has been permitted following the grant of planning permission. Only one planning application was reported within a Committee Report where sterilisation was identified in a Committee Report as being contrary to Policy 56, however, this related to a variation of a condition application and should therefore have been considered as exempt e.g. exemption criterion 10 - applications to remove or amend a condition attached to an existing planning permission.

Policy 57 The Conservation and Use of High Grade Dolomite

10.36. Policy 57 sets out how the long term conservation and future use of high grade dolomite will be achieved.

MW21 Number of planning applications approved which sterilise areas believed to be underlain by high grade dolomite

Performance achieved	0
Target:	Zero
Performance against target:	Target met

10.37. No planning applications were pending consideration or were approved over the monitoring period.

MW22 Number of planning applications permitted which lead to the use of high grade dolomite reserves for lower grade uses

Performance achieved	0
Target:	Zero
Performance against target:	N/A

10.38. One planning application (DM/18/03884/VOCMW) was pending determination on the 31.03.22. This application at Thrislington East Quarry East near West Cornforth seeks to vary planning permission No. 7/2006/0179CM (DCC Reference: CMA/7/55) to allow a change to the working method and working hours for Phase 2 and variation to the associated S106 agreement in terms of the percentage of High Grade Dolomite removed from the site.

Policy 58 Preferred Areas for Future Carboniferous Limestone Extraction

10.39. Two allocations are shown on the CDP policies map. Policy 58 sets out detailed policy considerations applicable to both of these allocations.

MW23 Quantity of additional permitted reserves of carboniferous limestone granted following the grant of planning permission to enable extensions to Hulands Quarry and Heights Quarry

Performance achieved	3.7 million tonnes
Target:	11.9 million tonnes
Performance against target:	On track

10.40. One planning application (DM/18/02483/MIN) was approved on 6 June 2019 to allow a north-western extension to Heights Quarry. This application granted permission to a total of 6.97 million tonnes of carboniferous limestone including 3.7 million tonnes in the extension area. A planning application to extend Hulands Quarry to the east was submitted was validated on 27 May 2022 and is pending consideration.

Policy 59 Strategic Area of Search to the South of Todhills Brickworks

10.41. A strategic area of search is shown on the CDP policies map. Policy 58 sets out detailed policy considerations applicable to this area of search.

MW24 Number of years of approved reserves at Todhills Brickworks

Performance achieved:	Please refer to item 10.42 for more information
Target:	To maintain a minimum 25 year stock of permitted reserves at Todhills Brickworks
Performance against target:	On Track

10.42. The number of years of approved reserves (data based on end dates of planning permission) currently stands at less than 25 years by virtue that planning permission expired in 2019. In January 2019 the operators of Todhills Brickworks submitted a planning application (DM/19/00051/MIN) to continue mineral extraction at Long Lane Quarry until 2043 and the creation of a new quarry to the south of Todhills brickworks. This planning application is awaiting determination but if permitted will supply the long term needs of this brickworks.

Policy 60 Waste Management Provision

10.43. Policy 60 sets criteria for proposals for the provision of new or enhanced waste management capacity.

MW25 Waste Management Capacity Gap (calculated periodically)

Performance achieved:	Please refer to item 10.44 for more information
Target:	No Target
Performance against target:	N/A

10.44. To date the waste management capacity gap has not been recalculated. The following key waste parameters however have been monitored:

1) Quantity of waste received at waste management facilities in County Durham and the North East of England

10.45. Table 60.1 below provide information on waste received at waste management facilities in County Durham and the North East of England in 2021 (and for 2016 for comparison which was the base year for the County Durham Plan and its capacity gap calculation). It is important to note that the Environment Agency's waste received information does not represent waste arisings for a particular area but instead is indicative of which area or region initially managed the waste. A proportion of the waste received at some sites is also sometimes subsequently transferred to other sites for further management i.e. recycling,

recovery, treatment or disposal. In the absence of waste arisings information, waste received information can be and is often used as a proxy for waste arisings.

10.46. The table below show that in 2021 a total of 2,016,152 tonnes of waste was received at waste management facilities in County Durham. This is a very small rise in the overall quantity of waste which was reported as being received in 2020 when 2,004,892 tonnes of waste was received. However, it is nonetheless a 31.7% increase in the overall quantity of waste which was received in 2016.

10.47. The quantities of all waste received in County Durham in 2021 can be compared to the equivalent figures for the North East region in 2021 as a whole. In particular, it can be seen that while in 2021 County Durham’s waste management facilities received 19.26% of all waste received, it received 23.55% of all inert construction and demolition waste, 16.4% of all household, commercial and industrial waste and 6.5% of all hazardous waste.

10.48. Similar to the position in previous monitoring periods the most significant issue of note, is that County Durham continues to manage significantly more waste than it is reported to originate within the County.

Table 28 - Quantity of waste received in 2021 (and 2016 for comparison), (all figures in tonnes)

Quantity of waste received in 2021 and 2016 for comparison	2021 County Durham – (Durham waste only)	2021 County Durham - (All waste received)	2021 North East - (All waste received)	2016 County Durham – (Durham waste only)	2016 County Durham - (All waste received)	2016 North East - (All waste received)
Total Volume of waste received	656,786	2,016,152	12,391,960	780,731	1,529,720	10,464,106
Total volume of inert/ construction and demolition waste	263,660	1,121,678	4,263,725	413,529	899,571	4,762,524
Total quantity of household commercial and industrial waste	389,762	866,627	7,295,779	365,302	621,630	5,274,485
Total quantity of hazardous waste	3,365	27,848	832,455	1,900	8,519	427,097

Source: Environment Agency Waste Data Interrogator 2022.

2) Amount of waste (tonnage) imported into/exported out of County Durham per annum and by stream

10.49. Waste management facilities in County Durham manage waste which arises within County Durham and also manage waste which first arose in other local authority areas outside of County Durham. Similarly, some waste which arises within County Durham is also managed

at waste management facilities outside of County Durham. The movement of waste between different local authority areas is a normal occurrence and is due to a variety of factors including contractual arrangements, the operational networks of private waste management companies as well as geographical proximity. The North East of England has a highly integrated waste management market.

Waste Imported in 2021

10.50. In 2019 1,359,365.3 tonnes of waste which had a recorded origin of outside of County Durham was received by waste management facilities in County Durham. This waste included 858,017.95 tonnes of inert/construction and demolition waste, 476,864.25 tonnes of household, commercial and industrial waste and 24,483.1 tonnes of hazardous waste. This reflects the concentration of recycling, treatment and inert and non-hazardous landfill facilities within County Durham.

Waste exported in 2021

10.51. In 2021 in 681,028 tonnes of waste which was recorded as having an origin in County Durham was received at waste management facilities outside of County Durham. This included 172,385 tonnes of inert construction and demolition waste, 473,375.52 tonnes of household, industrial and commercial waste and 35,267.89 tonnes of hazardous waste. In total 516,673 tonnes of this waste was received at sites in the North East, with 394,044.9 tonnes of waste being received at sites in the Tees Valley, 95,251.4 tonnes of waste being received at sites in Tyne and Wear and 27,376.7 tonnes being received at sites in Northumberland. In relation to the waste which was recorded as having an origin in County Durham which was received at sites in the Tees Valley, 382,537.4 tonnes of which was received at waste management sites in Stockton-on-Tees, Hartlepool and Redcar and Cleveland, reflecting the large number of specialist waste incineration and treatment sites in these waste planning authority areas. A proportion of this waste, 122,002.32 tonnes was destined for incineration in a number of specialist EFW facilities including the Wilton 11 EFW Plant and the Teesside EFW plant which incinerates residual municipal waste from County Durham.

Net flows in 2021

10.52. Net flows of waste in 2021 were minus 678,337 tonnes of waste. This means more waste was imported into County Durham than was exported from County Durham. This included a significant net inflow of 685,632.86 tonnes of inert construction and demolition waste. The flows of household industrial and commercial waste were broadly in balance, with a minor net inflow of only 3,488.72 tonnes. In addition 10,784.8 tonnes more hazardous waste was exported than was imported. The overall net flow figure shows how County Durham imports more waste than it exports and is in overall terms demonstrating net self-sufficiency in the management of its own waste whilst also making a significant contribution to the management of the inert construction and demolition waste stream.

3) Waste Fate

10.53. Waste fate can be defined as what eventually happens to the waste, for example by disposal into voids (landfill), or on land (landraise), by incineration with or without energy recovery or by recovery of treatment.

10.54. Understanding how waste is managed is important as it enables the council to assess how waste is being managed in accordance with the waste hierarchy. In terms of waste fate in 2021 the majority of waste received was either subject to recovery (42%) (848,564 tonnes), landfilled (41%) (826,691 tonnes), transferred for disposal (7%) (140,992 tonnes), incinerated (6%) (129,292 tonnes) or subject to treatment (3%) (70,219 tonnes).

10.55. While 41% of waste received in 2021 was landfilled, it should be noted that 91.1% of landfilled waste was inert waste which was disposed at both former and existing mineral sites as part of landfilling or site restoration operations. All inert waste which is landfilled is required by law to be subject to recycling prior to the residual waste being disposed to landfill. A large proportion of waste was also subject to other forms of recovery and treatment in the County.

Table 29 - Waste Received Waste Fate 2020 (All figures in tonnes)

Broad Waste Type	Incineration	Landfill	Recovery	Transfer (D)	Other Fate	Treatment	Total
All Wastes	129,292	826,691	848,564	140,992	394.66	70,219	2,016,152
Household /Ind/Com	121,016	72,067	463,598	139,839	394.66	69,711	866,627
Inert	7,643	753,260	360,774	0	0	0	1,121,678
Hazardous	632.54	1,363	24,192	1152.067	0	507.66	27,848

Source: Environment Agency Waste Data Interrogator 2022.

4) Remaining Landfill Capacity in County Durham and North East England

10.56. Monitoring this indicator is important because County Durham's landfill sites provide regionally important landfill void space and because national policy requires waste planning authorities to plan for residual waste disposal. The table below shows remaining landfill void space by landfill site type for both County Durham and the North East of England. In particular, it identifies the importance of the remaining landfill sites and remaining void space in County Durham for inert waste compared to the North East position overall. There are four operational landfill sites in County Durham. All four remaining landfill sites lie on the East Durham Limestone Plateau east, north east or south east of Durham City.

- Bishop Middleham Quarry, Old Quarrington and Cold Knuckles Quarry and Crime Rigg Quarry are all inert landfills (L05 Inert Landfill) and are licensed to accept only inert construction and demolition waste (inert/c+d) and are also active quarries producing a range of aggregate products.
- A fourth sites Aycliffe Quarry Landfill (L02 - Non-Hazardous with SNRHW⁷ Cell) is licensed to accept non-hazardous waste and is also licensed to accept hazardous waste in a specially constructed waste cell.

⁷ Stable Non-Reactive Hazardous Waste cell.

- A fifth site known as Joint Stocks Quarry Landfill is licensed as a non-hazardous landfill (L04 – Non-Hazardous) site but is now closed and in recent years has been undergoing restoration using soils and inert / construction and demolition waste.

Table 30 Remaining Landfill Void Space in County Durham and the North East in 2021, 2020 and 2016 (all figures in thousands of cubic metres).

Landfill Site Type	County Durham remaining landfill void space in 2021.	North East remaining landfill void space in 2021.	County Durham remaining landfill void space in 2020.	North East remaining landfill void space in 2020	County Durham remaining landfill void space in 2016.	North East remaining landfill void space in 2016.
L01 - Hazardous Merchant Landfill	0	4,486	0	4,643	0	6,985
L02 - Non-Hazardous with SNRHW Cell	400	1,485	728	2,027	2,064	4,284
L04 – Non-Hazardous	1,768*	7,959	1,781*	7,840	1,700*	10,759
L05 Inert Landfill	7,258	8,170	7,261	8,681	7,340	10,236
Total	9,426	22,101	9,770	22,193	11,104	32,266

* Capacity at Joint Stocks Quarry Landfill not available as site is under restoration. Source: Environment Agency Remaining landfill capacity: England as at end 2021, 2020 and 2016.

- 10.57. Despite no further landfill capacity being permitted in County Durham during 2021 and 826,991 tonnes being tipped in 2021, remaining landfill capacity for all types of waste has only fallen by 344,000 cubic metres compared to 2020.
- 10.58. The extent of remaining landfill void space at the County's one L02 - Non-Hazardous with SNRHW Cell Landfill site (Aycliffe Quarry Landfill) has fallen by 45% from 728,000 cubic metres in 2020 to 400,000 cubic metres in 2021. Sizeable reductions in remaining void space at this site have occurred since 2019 when it was reported that 1,721,036 cubic metres of void space remained available. For comparison, when the County Durham Plan capacity gap was prepared in 2018 using 2016 based information, 2,064,587 cubic metres of remaining void space was reported as remaining available at this site. Within the North East of England as a whole remaining L02 - Non-Hazardous with SNRHW Cell Landfill site capacity void space has fallen by 65% from 4,284,694 cubic metres in 2016 to 1,485,654 cubic metres. In 2021. In 2021 County Durham's one L02 - Non-Hazardous with SNRHW Cell Landfill site contained 27% of the North East's L02 - Non-Hazardous with SNRHW Cell Landfill site remaining capacity.
- 10.59. The extent of remaining landfill void space at the County's three L05 Inert Landfill sites has fallen by less than 1% from 7,261,368 cubic metres in 2020 to 7,258,377 cubic metres at the end of 2021. For comparison when the County Durham Plan capacity gap was prepared in 2018, the latest available information at that time was 2016 based and at that time

7,340,326 cubic metres of remaining void space was reported as remaining available in County Durham. In 2021 County Durham's three L05 Inert Landfill sites contained 89% of the North East's remaining inert landfill capacity.

- 10.60. The County's one remaining L04 – Non-Hazardous landfill site (Joint Stocks Quarry Landfill) is reported to contain 1,768,339 cubic metres of capacity. However, this site has now been closed for a number of years and in recent years has only accepted inert material for restoration purposes.
- 10.61. Further details of individual remaining landfill capacity are set out in the Council's Waste Technical Paper.

MW26 New waste management capacity permitted by waste type and management type

Performance achieved:	75,000 tonnes per annum secondary aggregate recycling facility
Target:	No Target
Performance against target:	N/A

- 10.62. In the 2021/22 monitoring period, two planning applications were submitted of which one was granted planning permission and the other is still pending determination.
- The grant of planning permission related to a new materials reception area at an existing Anaerobic Digester at Newton Aycliffe.
 - The planning application which is pending determination is a proposal to improve agricultural land through use of 12,129 cubic metres of inert material (19,406 tonnes).
- 10.63. Three planning applications from the last monitoring period (2020/21) were refused planning permission, one was approved and one was still pending determination.
- The refusals related to 1) landraising (300,000 tonnes of inert material) at a site near Lumley; 2) an energy from waste facility (60,000 tonnes of commercial and industrial waste per annum) at Consett. This application was appealed (awaiting outcome); 3) a hazardous and clinical waste incinerator (12,500 tonnes of waste per annum) at Newton Aycliffe. This application was also appealed (awaiting outcome).
 - The grant of planning permission related to an aggregate recycling facility (75,000 tonnes per annum) at Thrislington West Quarry. Planning permission had previously been granted for this facility but had lapsed.
 - The planning application which is pending consideration is for an aggregate recycling facility, concrete block manufacturing plant utilising recycled aggregate (300,000 tonnes per annum of construction, demolition and excavation waste and 50,000 tonnes of commercial and industrial waste) at Peterlee North West Industrial Estate.
- 10.64. One planning application from the 2018/19 monitoring period was also refused planning permission in the 2021/22 monitoring period, was subject to an appeal which was dismissed. This planning application related to landraising (40,000 tonnes of inert material) near Edmondsley.

MW27 Appeals upheld contrary to this policy

Appeals	0
Appeals allowed	0
Target:	None upheld at appeal.
Performance against target:	N/A

10.65. Over the monitoring period, there has been no appeals against applications that have been refused against Policy 60.

Policy 61 Location of New Waste Management Facilities

10.66. The Plan seeks to ensure that suitable provision is made to manage anticipated future waste arising in County Durham whilst ensuring that the environment and the amenity of local communities in County Durham are protected and enhanced and that the health of local communities is not endangered. Policy 61 sets the criteria for assessing proposals for new or enhanced waste management facilities that will assist the efficient collection, recycling and recovery of waste materials.

MW28 Number of approved facilities located on land outside designated and defined areas and upon land given priority by the policy

Performance achieved	100%
Target:	100%
Performance against target:	Target not met

10.67. Two planning applications were approved on land outside designated and defined areas.

MW29 Appeals upheld contrary to this policy

Appeals	0
Appeals allowed	0
Target:	None upheld at appeal.
Performance against target:	N/A

10.68. Over the monitoring period, there has been no appeals against applications that have been refused against Policy 61.