Respondent	Satisfied or Not Satisfied with Proposed Changes	Suggested Changes (if any) and Comments Made	Recommended Council's Response
1.Mr B.Bell	Satisfied	None	Noted
2. Ms H. Evans, CTC	-	No comments to make.	Noted.
3. L. White, County Archaeology Service	Not Satisfied	Add Scheduled Ancient Monument to list in Proposed Change 5.	No change. The sensitivity factors listed are examples; not meant to be exhaustive.
4. D. Whitfield	Satisfied (all changes)	None.	Noted.
5. J. Wilson, Appletons	Satisfied	None, but commented that continuing along these lines will stop all development in Darlington.	No change. The proposed changes are designed so that the community engagement expected is proportionate to the nature and scale of the application and the sensitivity of the location. Furthermore, similar thresholds are proposed by other neighbouring local planning authorities.
6. P. Medcalf, Bellway Homes	Satisfied with Proposed Change 12 Not satisfied with Proposed Change 5 – not clear enough.	Use 60 dwellings as the criteria for major residential developments – ref: para. 8 PPG 3.	No change. The thresholds for residential development, like those for other forms of development, are taken from the definitions of major development set out in the GPDO and the ODPM's PS2 Return, which are well established and widely understood. To set higher thresholds for the housing element only may give the impression that the Council considers pre-application consultations less important for this form of development, which is not the case.
7. A. Kent	Satisfied	None.	Noted.
8. The Gypsy Council	-	None, but seek indication of where gypsy sites are in all our future plans.	Noted for development plan document production.
9. North of England Civic Trust	Satisfied	Suggests that comments made to developer should be copied to Council to reduce the risk of developers 'massaging' the response.	No change. Fostering good partnerships with potential developers relies on some element of trust.
10. Drivers Jonas	Not Satisfied with Proposed Change 7.	Concerned about potential waste of resources arising from developer consultations. Suggest that text be added to indicate that Planning Officers will provide a list of addresses of suggested contacts during pre-application discussions.	No change. The Proposed Changes are intended to ensure that consultations are not excessive in relation to the proposed development. Sensible. Make change as requested.
11. K. Cheadle		Points to omission of the following issues: • Guidelines must apply to the Council too;	• They do. The document is explicit that the guidelines cover both public and private sector development. *No change proposed*.

		• Results of community engagement and consultation responses must be open to the public. • Would there be scope for Ombudsman's complaint if developers did not carry out consultations when they were meant to ? • Concern that developer involvement in community engagement is privatising democracy and is therefore a flawed approach; • Suggests developers should incur penalties for 'persuasive tactics' towards potential objectors. • Suggests that the sanctions that are proposed if developers do not comply are insufficient, and that speed is the wrong motivation for determining planning applications. • Publicity: clarify what orally means. Will the Council accept comments on its own consultations orally ? • Pt. 17: define recently, e.g. within 6 months.	• They will be, in summary form, in the developers submission. This can be viewed on the planning application file at the Town Hall. *No change proposed* • IN the council's opinion, no, though this is a matter for the Ombudsman. The Council can only encourage developers to undertake pre-application consultations. There is no requirement in law. *No change proposed.* • Consultations and publicity once a planning application is submitted will still be carried out by the Council. There is no threat to democracy arising from developer dialogue with the local community before this. *No change proposed.* • Because there is no requirement in law for a developer to undertake pre-application community engagement, the Council is not in a position to impose penalties or sanctions. *No change proposed.* • Agree this is unclear. *Propose change to replace with 'Material comments made in writing or at a minuted meeting should be accepted'.* In its own consultations, the Council generally requires consultation responses to be made in writing, but on request, will assist anybody who has difficulty communicating in this way. *Propose Change to Guiding Principle 2 to include assistance to people who have difficulty communicating in writing.* • The relevance of any existing Planning/Development Brief depends on whether there has been any changes, e.g. to national guidance or local circumstances, that affect how up to date it is. *No change proposed.*
12. Mr J. Wheeler	Not Satisfied	None.	Noted.
13. Mr J. Marshall, Tees Forest	Satisfied	None.	Noted.
14. Mrs R. Eldridge	Satisfied	Concerned that the process may prolong negotiations or deter developers from following the guidelines. It is unfortunate that the Council has to reply on goodwill of developers to comply.	No change proposed. The proposed change to the guidelines have been made to help ensure that the consultations required are not disproportionate to the development proposed.
15. Durham Constabulary Architectural Liaison Officer	Satisfied	None.	Noted.
16. Darlington Civic Trust	Satisfied	None.	Noted.

17. Arriva North East	Satisfied	None.	Noted.
18. Sport England	Standard response to all SCI consultations	Letter sets out the detail about consultations with Sport England that it expects the SCI to contain in respect of both planning applications and local development document preparation.	No change. Whilst supportive of Sport England's involvement in the planning process, it would be difficult to go to the level of detail requested by Sport England for all consultees without the document becoming over long and unwieldy.
19. Cllr. V. Copeland	Satisfied.	None.	Noted.
20. Durham Assn. Of Parish & Town Councils		Proposed changes appear to go some way towards meeting possible concerns from others and are welcomed by the Durham Association.	Noted.
21. English Nature	Not satisfied with proposed changes 4 and 5.	Nature conservation interests* should be included in examples of 'significant developments'.	The list of examples of sensitive developments given in the SC1 is not meant to be exhaustive. No change proposed.
22. CPRE	Satisfied.	None	Noted
23. English Heritage	Satisfied.	None	Noted

*eg SSSIs and protected species