

Reference	Respondent	Objects/support	Description	Proposed Action
RSM1	Mr R Marsden	Non given	What are the plans for Seaburn Leisure Centre, which doesn't seem to be on plans	<p><b>RESPONSE</b> - It is acknowledged that the Seaburn Centre provides facilities to the local community; However its scale and central position means that retaining the building could potentially compromise the longer-term comprehensive regeneration plans for the area. In addition the building is considered to have very little architectural merit, adding little aesthetic value to the wider seafront.</p> <p>The Masterplan is a 10-15 year plan and therefore acknowledges that as development proposals for Seaburn come forward, the building in its current form <b>could</b> well disappear.</p> <p>However, it is acknowledged that facilities (such as the wellness centre) are valued by the local community, and the council would therefore welcome and encourage any new developments on the site to include such a facility within future developments</p>
RSM2	Delny Fenis	Supports	More leisure facilities without signing expensive monthly contract.	<p><b>RESPONSE</b> - Currently the council run leisure facilities within the Seaburn Centre and at the Aquatics Centre which offer the ability for residents to pay per visit (and at a discounted rate for those with a Sunderland Life Card). The objective of the Seaburn Masterplan and Design Code (MDC) is to facilitate private sector led redevelopment and as such whilst the council desires to ensure that facilities are inclusive to all, pricing strategies of privately operated facilities would be outside of the council's control.</p>
			A local swimming pool would generate massive interest to all ages.	<p><b>RESPONSE</b> - The specified use is compatible with the acceptable land uses identified within the MDC (Use Class D2). Should a private developer propose to bring forward such a facility, proposals would need to be considered in the context of principles and parameters set out in the MDC as well as other relevant planning policy and guidance.</p>
RSM3	R Franklin	Object	No reasons given	<p><b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted</p>
RSM4	Mr Mrs Parkinson	Non given	More male and female toilets.	<p><b>RESPONSE</b> - An assessment of toilet provision on the seafront has recently been undertaken by the council. The outcomes of this assessment resulted in a recognised need for toilets to be of a higher quality, open all year round and for increased provision of accessible toilets.</p> <p>As a consequence a number of measures are/have been undertaken to improve toilet provision on the seafront.</p> <p>The majority of toilets are now open all year round including winter months.</p> <p>Funding of £120,000 has also been secured for the proposed redevelopment of the toilets at Cat &amp; Dog steps.</p> <p>Furthermore, the redeveloped Seaburn Shelter site will incorporate new accessible public toilets facilities.</p> <p>In addition as leisure proposals come forward customer toilets will be provided. Temporary toilets are also provided on key events days such as the Air Show to accommodate high level of visitors.</p>
			Bigger and more bins.	<p><b>RESPONSE</b> - Seaburn promenade is currently the subject of public realm improvements including high quality litter bins. In addition the Seaburn MDC identifies that as further development comes forward a Litter Management Plan covering both events and daily requirements will be needed.</p>
			Leisure Centre – more seating/tables, a place for drinks when weather is bad. Where old fun fair located, convert to shrubs/flowers able to sit and have snacks/toilets.	<p><b>RESPONSE</b> - The MDC recognises the importance of wet weather facilities i.e. cafes/restaurants particularly in the leisure and entertainment core (site of the existing vacant fairground). These are considered important in providing animation at the seafront.</p> <p>Whilst the MDC identifies the fairground site for redevelopment, in the short to medium term the council are looking for temporary uses for the site to maximise its potential. The masterplan promotes high quality public realm throughout Seaburn recognising its value in contributing to regeneration.</p>

RSM5	V Sharp	Supports	More car parking for residents on seafront – elderly like to drive to seafront for stroll but find parking difficult, maybe residents passes to show in windscreen.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Chapter 9.8 Access and Servicing - the existing public car park located to the west of the site at the rear of the Seaburn Centre is to be relocated closer to the seafront (to the south of the proposed leisure and entertainment core). However, the council seeks to encourage visitors to the seafront and as a consequence at the present time does not propose to introduce parking charges.
RSM6	Mr G Young	Supports	Any development would be a great improvement to the seafront area, i.e. South Shields.  More police to deter young boy racing drivers needed.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted  <b>RESPONSE</b> - In order to calm traffic within the MDC area, a more pedestrian friendly environment will be created including the narrowing of carriageways along Whitburn Road, a shared surface plaza linking the Promenade with the leisure and entertainment core. This will require a new/widened vehicular route along the alignment of Lowry Road.  The council has also introduced vehicle activated signs along Whitburn Road and Roker Terrace to raise speed awareness.
RSM7	Mr & Mrs J E Stewart	Supports	Seafront must be upgraded so at least on par with South Shields.  The derelict fair land should be compulsory purchased and developed to provide a water world activity area to complement the Aquatics Centre.  The skate park (if it stays) should be supervised and fenced in and locked after 9pm.  Litter must be a priority. Wheelie bins should be banned from front of properties as look awful.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted <b>RESPONSE</b> - The council is actively seeking opportunities for temporary uses for the fairground site to maximise its potential as a prime seafront location. The MDC identifies the fairground site for a range of leisure-led uses. A water based activity centre may be compatible with these principles. However it is not the role of the MDC to prescribe specific uses for the site; but instead to provide broad parameters and principles to guide developers when preparing their proposals. Ultimately it is for developers to determine the exact nature of facilities to be provided. <b>RESPONSE</b> - The skate park will be retained as an important facility for younger people and it is anticipated that new residential dwellings within close proximity will provide a greater level of natural surveillance. <b>RESPONSE</b> - The council recognises the need for carefully planned refuse areas at both residential and commercial properties as part of the design process. The MDC requires servicing of commercial properties to be to the rear of developments, in the interests of minimising visual impacts. As part of applications for major development, applicants are required to submit refuse disposal details.
RSM8	Mr & Mrs A Peverley	Supports	How about indoor bowls at Seaburn Centre.  How about using the empty fairground site for a cycle and skateboard area for the kids.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - With regards to the Seaburn Centre see response to RSM1. Indoor bowls may be considered a compatible leisure use. However it is not the role of the MDC to prescribe specific facilities for the site; but to provide parameters and principles to guide developers when preparing their proposals for the site. Ultimately it is for developers to determine the exact nature of facilities to be provided. <b>RESPONSE</b> - Whilst the council considers that the current provision of BMX/skateboard facilities is suitable for the areas needs, should a developer come forward with a cycle/skateboard proposal this would be considered on its individual merits and in the context of planning policy.
RSM9	Mr T Sheerin	Supports	Would welcome any improvements.  Look at South Shields seafront – coloured paving, floral displays, performance area etc.  The airshow is a chance to showcase the area and it has been wasted year on year.  Seaburn Centre is embarrassment, shell with very little purpose.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted <b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted, the inclusion of high quality public realm is a high priority in the MDC. <b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted <b>RESPONSE</b> - With regards to the Seaburn Centre see main body of Cabinet Report.
RSM10	Alison Dorrian	Supports	Remove the amusement arcades and do something with the land where the fair is.  Bring back the illuminations.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - The amusement arcades are in private ownership and provide a tourism based attraction. Consequently, the council will seek to work with arcade owners in seeking clarification on their longer term aspirations. Nevertheless, the MDC establishes a vision for a family friendly resort therefore the development of future arcades will need to be carefully considered. <b>RESPONSE</b> - Lighting and events are important to the regeneration of the seafront and this was recognised within the Seafront Regeneration Strategy. As part of the Sea Change funding received from CABC new high quality lighting is being installed along Marine Walk.
RSM11	Watson	Supports	Disagrees with letter. Council have known for 20 years what this seafront needs. Why is it going to take another 15 years to get the seafront sorted? We need action now. Have a look at Hexham leisure facilities.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Much of the development of Seaburn is private sector dependent whereby market conditions have an important influence. A timescale of 10 to 15 years is considered to be realistic given the complexities of the site and the need for high quality development

				capable of driving forward sustainable regeneration. This timeframe involves a phasing process where certain developments i.e. Seaburn Promenade improvements (currently on site) may be developed prior to larger schemes. Nevertheless this does not restrict the opportunity for development proposals to come forward before then. For example Seaburn and Roker public realm works are currently on site and work towards the re-development of Seaburn Shelter is well advanced.
RSM12	Joy Dagless	Supports	Supports but maintenance important. Continue to care for revamped environment around seafront including litter collectors in skate park.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - The council believes that proper maintenance of public realm is essential to ensure sustainability. Materials will therefore need to be durable particularly given local weather conditions. Proposals to develop management plans for a number of issues including litter will be developed.
RSM13	L Hetherington	Non given	10 years behind the times. Indoor children's play zone, crazy golf, boating lake, miniature railway, promenade, tractor train, landscaped park, open topped tram car Seaburn to Roker, ice rink, a large covered tea shop, would all go along way to attract visitors.	<p><b>RESPONSE</b> - The council's vision for Seaburn is for a family friendly resort and therefore uses which support vision are likely to be looked upon favourably provided they comply with planning policy. A number of the uses suggested may be considered compatible but ultimately it is for developers to bring forward proposals for specific uses.</p> <p>Provision for snow/ice facility was set out within the Stadium Village Development Framework as part of a sports led development. Stadium Village is also considered a more sustainable location for such a facility by reason of its access to the city centre and close proximity to Tyne and Wear Metro system.</p> <p>The council recognises that local weather conditions enhance the need for indoor all year round attractions to ensure the MDC's success.</p> <p>Within chapter 9.9 of the MDC (Landscape and Public Realm) provision is made within the Linear Park for high quality durable play area with equipment for people of all ages including adults.</p>
RSM14	Mrs Mitchell	Objects	Concerned about parking. Street already experiences high volume of traffic and parking issues, especially at weekends. No details on proposals about parking provision for new facilities.	<p><b>RESPONSE</b> - Car parking is a recognised constraint in the area and has influenced the MDC's design considerations. Chapter 9.8 (Access and Servicing) sets specific design standards to guide developers and decision makers in bringing forward development proposals.</p> <p>The council will seek to ensure suitable parking is provided both during and after the delivery of the MDC either through retaining existing parking in the short term, or the constructing replacement public parking in the long term.</p> <p>All new commercial developments at Seaburn will need to provide sufficient on-site parking to meet demands.</p> <p>The MDC requires additional parking associated with new commercial uses, to be accessible and in close proximity of the seafront. The MDC also identifies parking will be in locations that are not detrimental to the area's visual character.</p> <p>In reducing congestion, the council proposes to improve the Lowry Road link with Whitburn Road, through improving the access to Morrison's and taking out tight bends and widening roads to increase capacity reducing demand along Whitburn Road. Through remodelling of Whitburn Road a more pedestrian friendly environment will be created.</p> <p>The council consistently aims to promote higher levels of sustainability i.e. public transport which is integral to the MDC. Consequently both primary and secondary routes will have the ability to be adopted as bus routes.</p> <p>Whilst the provision of additional bus services is dependent upon independent operators, the MDC seeks to improve public transport by securing contributions from developers towards infrastructure such as bus stops and a seasonal shuttle bus service between Seaburn and the City Centre to supplement existing public transport.</p>
RSM15	Sonia Spence	Not sure	Unsure of whether supports proposals, as very different to what have previously seen.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted
RSM16	Margaret Miller	Supports	Appears a vast improvement on current development and amenities.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted

			Action and development is required. A fifteen year timescale is far too long. Seaburn needs development now.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted see response to RSM11.
RSM17	Ms C Fletcher	Objects	Object to the building housing on car parks. Hoped for increase in parking as improvement seafront facilities would require. Housing will not attract visitors. The "upgraded green spaces" is only land that would have been suggested for more housing if not flood risk. Strongly object to housing.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - See main body of Cabinet report for information on housing.
RSM18	No name given	Objects	Ridiculous a no go area for the elderly.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - The intention of the MDC is to develop Seaburn as an area providing leisure uses for people of all ages including the elderly. Consequently natural surveillance through providing active frontages along all routes is a key principle. Lighting is also vital in deterring anti-social behaviour and stimulating an evening economy.
RSM19	Fitzsimmons	Objects	More housing is not the solution.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - See main body of Cabinet report for information on housing. Whilst it is accepted that Seaburn extends beyond the northern boundary of the masterplan the area contained within the boundaries of the framework is considered to be the focus for regeneration with the areas to the north primarily consisting of existing high quality residential housing and large areas of open space.
			Seaburn does not stop at Morrisons.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Whilst it is accepted that Seaburn extends beyond the northern boundary of the masterplan the area contained within the boundaries of the framework is considered to be the focus for regeneration with the areas to the north primarily consisting of existing high quality residential housing and large areas of open space.
			The leisure centre is totally under used no need for more.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - See main body of Cabinet Report in relation to Seaburn Centre.
RSM20	Mr D M Caslan	Supports	Hopefully architecture of 'public space improvements'/ street furniture traditional not trendy chrome abstract features i.e. Sunnyside. Follow South Tyneside's example in this regard.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Section 9.9 of the MDC identifies street furniture/hard and soft landscaping as important to creating a sense of place throughout Seaburn. This must conform to quality expected from the rest of the MDC paying due regard to contextual setting.
			For future consider sea front to St Peter's Metro station, a tram system (like Blackpool's) linked to South Shields.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - The provision of public transport facilities and therefore improving access to the seafront from other parts of the city is a primary objective of the masterplan. Indeed provision is made for the encouragement of increased bus service provision. However, the provision of a tram system would require resources unavailable to the council at the present time.
RSM21	Mr N Thursby	Supports	Put traffic lights at one entrance to South Bents estate.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - The South Bents estate is outside the boundaries of the MDC. Traffic flows/safety will be monitored with appropriate measures taken where necessary.
RSM22	Mr Marshall	Supports	No reasons given.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Noted
RSM23	Martin Ronson	Objects	The plans only outline new housing as a definite proposal. Every other plan is a refurb or unknown. An unknown plan without details.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - The MDC guides the proper planning of Seaburn through providing broad development parameters which reflect constraints and opportunities. The MDC's success requires private sector investment. In order to provide conditions which encourage growth the MDC is not overly prescriptive, enabling flexibility of nature/location of proposed uses.
RSM24	Ian Ellis	Supports	Integrated approach to park, promenade and seafront is essential. Natural asset to city, future development should be sustainable.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted
			Will it all stall in the current financial climate?	<b>RESPONSE</b> - With regards to timescales see response to RSM11.
RSM25	Mrs J Pratt	Supports	Excellent, but needed urgently. Shelter is not very pleasant, but is only shelter.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - For timeframe/market conditions see RSM11. For indoor facilities see RSM13.
RSM26	Occupier of 53 North Guards, Whitburn, Sunderland.	Letter - Supports	What about handicapped and wheelbound people. In 2/3 mile stretch, 5 disabled parking spaces (South Shields 3x no. disabled spaces).	<b>AMEND</b> - Disabled access is critical to MDC. The need to ensure that footpaths and areas of public realm are suitable for those with limited mobility has been included in section 9.9. Parking standards will ensure that sufficient disabled parking spaces will be provided at the planning application stages.
RSM27	Ron Middleton	Support	Supports proposals. Would like covered promenade i.e. South Shields, create all weather facility. If cash not available, should be considered when economy upturns.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted  Public realm works will be continued through the delivery of the MDC with financial contributions sought from major developments. Scale of development will impact on contributions made in turn impact on nature of public realm improvements. A covered promenade has not been considered at present.
RSM28	William Nesbitt	Supports	(i)There are a few assets needed at Seaburn. Ice rink, roller skate, skate board park.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - The MDC will support proposals which contribute to the vision for Seaburn as a family friendly resort. However, the facilities suggested need to be considered in relation to planning policy particularly impacts on the vitality of the city centre. Furthermore, Stadium Village has been identified as regeneration area focused on sport/leisure, which may be more suitable for the suggested facilities. Ultimately it is for the developer to

				propose specific uses.
			(ii)Artificial palm trees along sea front.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Species need to be appropriate to context/climate.
			(iii)A large bad weather shelter.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Wet weather facilities important to MDC success see RSM13.
			(iv)A permanent fairground.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Should a developer come forward with proposals for such a scheme this would be considered on its merits.
			(v)A large restaurant.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Refreshment facilities are important. Seaburn Shelter site/leisure & entertainment core identifies café/restaurant as suitable use.
			(vii)Coloured seats along the prom, windmill or coloured light globe on top of the roundabout.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Public realm is important to MDC. However, features need careful consideration, easily maintainable and are able contribute to wider regeneration of seafront.
RSM29	The Occupier	Supports	Workmanship must be good quality.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – The council will ensure materials/construction is high quality and sustainable this will be set out further as design proposals brought forward.
RSM30	Valerie Hughes	Supports	What about toilets.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – With main body of Cabinet Report for information on toilets.
			What about indoor playing area for children.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – See response to RSM13 for information on indoor facilities.
RSM31	Mr & Mrs N Moxey	Supports	There is a need for the actual seafront to be improved seating, floral beds.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Please see response to RSM20 info on public realm.
			Good toilets	<b>RESPONSE</b> – With regards to toilet provision see main body of Cabinet Report.
			Refreshment bars.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – See response to RSM 28 for information on refreshments.
			The empty fairground needs to be put to good use.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – See RSM4 for information on fairground.
RSM32	Mrs M Ashcroft	Supports	Support proposals would have preferred more specific plans.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Comment Noted
			At previous consultation stage was informed that research had identified need for 'higher end' housing so hope this will be implemented i.e. would not support apartments/flats or developers trying to cram in as many units as possible with consequent car parking/traffic issues.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – See main body of Cabinet report for information on housing.
			Good quality restaurant on shelter site good. High quality frontage important along coastal route.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Comment Noted
RSM33	Mr C Lee	Supports	Seats face out to sea on promenade opposite Seaburn hotel, look to South Shields.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Seaburn public realm improvements phase 1 incorporates granite steps along lower promenade enabling people sit down looking out to sea. Additional seats being installed facing sea on upper promenade. Recognised that seating along the sea wall faces away from the sea. However, physically unachievable for these seats to face the sea due to the location of the promenade in relation to the sea defences.
RSM34	No name supplied	Objects	Need facilities to attract people back to Seaburn i.e. fairground, toilet facilities, stalls, kiosks selling fish & chips, toys, candy floss etc. Public realm waste of money.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – The vision of the MDC is to strengthen Seaburn's role as a family friendly resort and as such facilities which support this are likely to be compatible. Ultimately it is not the role of the MDC to propose specific uses (rather the role of private developers). See main body of Cabinet Report for information on toilet provision.
			Make more use of the Seaburn Centre.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – See main body of Cabinet Report for info on Seaburn Centre.
RSM35	Hazel Shoulin	Supports	No reasons given.	<b>RESPONSE</b> –Noted
RSM36	David Shoulin	Supports	No reasons given	<b>RESPONSE</b> –Noted
RSM37	George Armbruster	Objects	View of participants during initial consultation for more attractions i.e. South Shields. Against more housing.	<b>RESPONSE</b> –See main body of Cabinet Report for information on housing.
RSM38	No name given	Supports	Palm trees/better weather.	<b>RESPONSE</b> –Comment Noted
RSM39	Ron Mcquillan	Objects	Millions wasted on the cross town intercept sewer, the beach is still polluted. Enhanced riverside could be inexpensively achieved with free rocks, boulders and bricks to form a barrage to high tide level, thereby reinstating the natural level of the river bed obviating river bank erosion and silt.	<b>RESPONSE</b> –It is important to note that the River Wear falls outside of the boundaries of the MDC and as such does not form part of any proposals. The beach is regularly monitored for pollution by Environmental Health. The purpose of the MDC is to set out guidance relating to planning and design and not to assess pollution within the sea.
RSM40	Ian Richardson	Letter- Supports	Commend safe approach to development. Lack of flagship development is a worry, as area will offer very little that is different to the current seafront. Forward thinking approach introduce focal point, set the area apart from its local competitors. Please make the most of our natural resources and develop something that can harness it.	<b>RESPONSE</b> –The vision for Seaburn is as a family friendly resort offering high quality all year round facilities. It is not considered that Seaburn would support a seafront related regional attraction, given the presence of established facilities including the already successful South Shields resort, Wet & Wild at Royal Quays and Blue Reef Aquarium in Whitley Bay. Leisure operators for larger scale developments in Sunderland are primarily

				considering sites closer to city centre. Demand exists for local scale facilities, which would can draw sufficient trade from visitors/residents.
			Leisure/entertainment core – Hopefully mixed use bars, restaurants, hotels, cafes and shops. What guarantee of custom?	<b>RESPONSE</b> –Custom can never be guaranteed, but seafront attracts large number of visitors throughout the year. Genuine interest has also been shown from a number of developers for commercial development in and around Seaburn. The council recognises the need to preserve/enhance range of existing businesses and services on offer, and ensure longevity of businesses. As new developments come forward will need to provide flexible floorplates/shopfronts to reduce vacancy levels.
			Will transport links be improved?	<b>RESPONSE</b> –With regards to transport see response to RSM14.
			Will there be a spread of entertainment to cover multiple age ranges? Will the development provide a high level of cover from the elements to allow for a pleasant experience?	<b>RESPONSE</b> –The central vision for Seaburn objective of developing Seaburn is to provide a family focused resort catering for people of all ages throughout the year with indoor and outdoor attractions.
			Residential park – Will there be affordable housing/first time buyer properties? Will the park be open and well lit – safety, will allow for a cohesive blend linking areas 1,2,3.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – The masterplan document sets out that all new developments of over 15 dwellings will be required to deliver 10% affordable housing. It is likely that this would be delivered offsite, however, with a tenure split of 75% social rented and 25% intermediate.
			Modern play area – Herrington Park good model – area designed specifically for younger kids but also BMX/skate for teens.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – As part of the MDC, modern play facilities are proposed at the southern end of the Linear Park adjacent to Roker Burn. The council aims to provide facilities through developer agreements or planning obligations from other developments throughout Seaburn. Facilities will be expected to meet national Play Pathfinder Standards.
RSM41	Vincent T Wright	Supports	Comprehensive, far reaching and ambitious plan should significantly improve important sea front area, provide area be proud of, and one that will benefit the local and wider community and also visitors.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Comment Noted
RSM42	Dorothy Davison	Not given	Disappointed about inclusion of more housing.	<b>RESPONSE</b> –See main body of Cabinet Report for information on housing.
			Problems with litter, huge clean up needed. Playing fields littered with bottles and rubbish. Hope upgrading Dene will include clean up/ improvement of path. On the stop fines should be used, similar to dog fouling.	<b>RESPONSE</b> –With regards to litter please see response to RSM4.
			Do not spoil the seafront through cheap amusements, quality needed, somewhere for young families when poor weather.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – The objective of the MDC is to provide a family focused resort incorporating high quality all year round indoor and outdoor facilities. Careful consideration will be given to uses and their ability to contribute to regeneration.
RSM43	Mr H Smithson	Supports	Agree with proposal don't pull down Seaburn Centre.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – See main body of Cabinet Report for information on Seaburn Centre.
			Use open space for bands etc to bring people into area.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – The Central Gateway at the end of the proposed boulevard linking the leisure and entertainment core with the seafront will act as a focus for smaller scale events including music.
			Provide better toilets.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – See main body of Cabinet Report for information on toilet provision.
			Upgrade shelters along prom.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Comment Noted.
			A much better area for children similar to park in South Shields.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Comment Noted
			More sales units along prom area.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Provision is made for ancillary retail facilities as part of the redevelopment of the Seaburn Shelter.
RSM44	Mr P Durham	Supports	The draft Seaburn masterplan looks fine in its current proposal.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Comment Noted
			Leisure & entertainment core, total resistance to late licences, including special hours certificates or night club licences.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – In complying with planning policy evening uses will need to respect residential amenity of nearby residents. If a use is considered likely to cause excess noise & disturbance to residents it would not be looked upon favourably.
			More attention also for daytime activities for children aged between 3 and 7 years.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – A key objective for Seaburn is the creation of a family focused resort, which includes children of all ages.
RSM45	Ann Blakelock	Non given	We need a small bathing pool at Seaburn for under 5's to learn about swimming with their parents.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – A small bathing pool may be considered compatible. However it is not the role of the MDC to prescribe specific facilities for the site; but to provide parameters and principles to guide developers when preparing their proposals for the site.
RSM46	Forster	Non given	About time	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Comment Noted

**Appendix 3 - Schedule of representations received from members of the public**

RSM47	Nicky Aslam	Non given	Sunderland needs a big change for a better future. More shops.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Comment Noted
RSM48	J Rochester	Non given	Build small leisure centre for young people to use wet weather.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – With regards to wet weather facilities see response to RSM13
RSM49	K M Conlon	Non given	Need to keep people in Seaburn all year round.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Comment Noted
RSM50	Non given	Non given	About time	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Comment Noted
RSM51	Maureen Cummings	Non given	There's more things to do on computer and it's all helpful.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Comment Noted
RSM52	JH	Non given	All the benches should be facing the beach not the traffic.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – With regards to seats facing the sea see response to RSM33.
			Money spent on pier gates should have been spent elsewhere, gates only keep people out as far as pier concerned.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – The pier gates are not located within the boundaries of Seaburn MDC, please see Seafront Regeneration Strategy for further information.
RSM53	Brian Barry	Supports	Roker and Seaburn make a very attractive seafront and walk. Need to take note of South Shields. Everything from Dykelands Road to the north (excl Morrisons) should be demolished and sensible shops and cafes built.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Comment Noted
			Need fairground for kids.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – With regards to providing a fairground see response to RSM28 (iv).
RSM54	Non given	Supports	Illuminations back, events weekends – fairgrounds, music, military displays, markets, car boot.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – With regards to lighting and events please see response to RSM10.
RSM55	J Watts	Objects	Sunderland Council could spend £1bn on project and make a mess of it.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Comment Noted
RSM56	Lyn Chapman	Non given	Display in library had no key or arrows to link visuals to map.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Comment Noted
RSM57	Les Crago	Objects	Waste of money. Real investment on seafront please.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Comment Noted
RSM58	Visitor to Sunderland	Non given	Nothing at sea front. Airshow same every year. Nothing to do, no bucket & spade shops, we need something.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Vision of MDC to build on Seaburn's unique natural environment and rich heritage through the creation of a family focused resort. It is recognised all year round amenities and facilities are needed which attract people of all ages. Leisure and entertainment uses of a suitable scale are promoted in the MDC.
RSM59	Non given	Non given	Give us back our seafront of 1950-1965.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Seaburn is recognised as having a rich cultural heritage and whilst the MDC seeks to preserve and enhance this, the council's vision is to return the area to a level of vibrancy previously enjoyed through the provision of modern facilities and amenities fit for 21 <sup>st</sup> century.
RSM60	Mr J Jameson	Non given	Seats face wrong way. Put seats back along prom near lost children's post, they looked out to sea. Older people cannot be expected to sit on tiered concrete steps.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – With regards to seating facing the sea please see response to RSM33.
			Sheltered parts needed to protect from wind and rain, sudden showers.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – With regards to all weather facilities please see response to RSM13.
RSM61	Non given	Non given	A complete waste of money and resources.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Comment Noted
RSM62	E Annowl	Supports	Essential if Sunderland not to be shamed by South Shields.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Comment Noted
RSM63	M Cooke	Non given	No mention of improving Roker.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – The regeneration of Roker is set out in the Marine Walk Masterplan adopted in 2009. The purpose of the Seaburn MDC is to focus on Seaburn specifically.
			Too many properties have been allowed to be converted into multi-flats for students.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – New proposals for houses in multi-occupation (Use Class C4) are considered to be inappropriate within the MDC area and will be resisted.
RSM64	A Dawns	Supports	About time Seaburn improved beautiful coast but nothing to do. Don't let the residents pull the plug on it.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Comment Noted
RSM65	Julie Foskett	Supports	Focus of seafront should be for 'relaxed leisure and sport.' Lots of green areas with new child park facilities at marina, seafront and Seaburn areas.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – The vision for Seaburn is to provide a family focused resort with high quality indoor and outdoor attractions which may include a range in provision of sports and leisure facilities. This also includes areas of open space for recreation. This is considered important in promoting a healthy environment amongst local residents.
			New toilets.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – See main body of Cabinet Report for information on toilet provision.
			Some paved areas with family restaurants, good lighting, security.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Food and drink uses form an important part in the providing facilities required by the MDC. The leisure and entertainment core will form the heart of the wider MDC and will be the focus for many of these facilities. At the centre of this core will be an open plaza with high quality public realm including lighting, street furniture, surface materials and planting wherever possible.
			Do not want late night bars and clubs.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – See response to RSM44.
RSM66	Angela Barr	Supports	What's new? Why can't we have a scaled model to see what the development will actually look like. Suspect these have already been given the go-ahead.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – The purpose of the public consultation of the draft MDC is to generate input and response from the public and statutory consultees in order that they are able to influence the outcome of the final document including suggesting changes where

				necessary and relevant.
RSM67	Non given	Non given	Do something with the Vaux site. Stop wasting money on spin, £5mn spent on this what a waste. Holmeside Triangle – what a laugh. Arc another waste.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – All sites mentioned lie outside of the boundaries of the MDC and will be/have been covered under other regeneration documents.
RSM68	T Todd	Non given	Sunderland needs an iconic leisure amenity/concert venue for live events and music. It will attract thousands of people to Sunderland.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – The Stadium of Light has successfully held a number of pop concerts for major bands i.e. Take That. However, should a private developer come forward with such proposals at the seafront this would need to be considered on its merits in relation to relevant planning policy particularly impacts on the vitality of the city centre.
RSM69	Non given	Non given	Good idea, but will Seafields estate like having houses so near them.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – See main body of Cabinet Report for information on housing.
RSM70	J Walton	Non given	It looks as though you are getting rid of the kiosk near Seaburn Camp on the prom so everybody along that end will have to get refreshments in Little Italy.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Refreshment facilities are considered important in attracting people to the seafront particularly along the promenade, resulting in a development brief being prepared for Seaburn Shelter for a café/restaurant. Food and drink uses are also appropriate within the leisure and entertainment core.
RSM71	Non given	Non given	Look to South Shields/Cornwall. Families need wet weather facilities.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Comment Noted
RSM72	B Duncan	Non given	Is there no limit to the amount of cash that can be spent (wasted).	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Comment Noted
RSM73	Oswald & Dorothy Mussa	Non given	New seats along promenade facing the sea – senior citizens would appreciate seats facing the sea close to beach.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – With regards to seats facing the sea please see response to RSM33.
RSM74	Brain Robson	Objects	Whilst glad the council is getting round to this at last, the draft proposals really are about managing decline – reducing the amount of space available now in future for leisure use, and introducing more housing. What’s required is bigger thinking, this isn’t it.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – The MDC has been prepared as a ambitious yet realistic and deliverable document with the objective of providing a family focused resort offering high quality indoor and outdoor attractions.
			Think creatively about traffic re-route along Lowry Way to create pedestrianised use between Dykelands Road and Morrisons.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Traffic is an important consideration in the MDC. As part of the proposals, the council intends that whilst Whitburn Road will remain the primary coastal route, works will be undertaken to reduce the dominance of vehicles and improve pedestrian flow through a reduction in width of the carriageway. Furthermore, a new route will be created through the middle of the development site following the alignment of Lowry Road dividing the leisure and entertainment core to the east and residential park to the west.
RSM75	John McCaig	Objects	Nothing more than income generation for the council.	<b>RESPONSE</b> –Comment Noted
			Where are the facilities on offer at the Seaburn Centre going? Used by local residents needs updating and expanding.	<b>RESPONSE</b> –See main body of Cabinet Report for information on Seaburn Centre.
RSM76	Kevin Robson	Supports	Non given	<b>RESPONSE</b> –Noted
RSM77	Bobby Saftoe	Non given	Bring back the little train and the fun fair.	<b>RESPONSE</b> –The council will support uses that contribute to the vision of Seaburn as a family focused resort. The use suggested may be compatible with these principles. However, it is for the private developer to propose specific uses.
RSM78	Non given	Non given	Hardly South Shields or Blackpool. It’s a drop in the ocean.	<b>RESPONSE</b> –Comment Noted
RSM79	V Stirling	Supports	Non given	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Noted
RSM80	D Winter	Non given	I care nothing for any proposals unless the first priority is complete update of toilet facilities which are dreadful.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – See main body of Cabinet Report for information on toilet provision.
			Try looking at South Shields and follow their example.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Comment Noted
RSM81	Mrs O Acklam	Non given	Parking should be readily available and not curtailed.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – See main body of Cabinet Report for information on parking.
			Extra housing of good quality ok not scattered haphazardly around existing car parks.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – See main body of Cabinet Report for information on housing.
			Reasonable entertainment should be available i.e. boating pool/children’s train. Changing facilities needed for surfers. How about a helter skelter etc to draw peoples attention.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Entertainment facilities are important to the success of the MDC in fulfilling the council’s objective for Seaburn as a family focused resort. Should a private developer bring forward such proposals they will be considered on their own merits.
			More toilet facilities.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – See main body of Cabinet Report for information on toilet provision.
			Wider/varied uses for Seaburn Centre and regular catering for events/groups.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – See main body of Cabinet Report for information on Seaburn Centre.
			More events – e.g. Remembrance Day	<b>RESPONSE</b> – As part of the council’s commitment to improving the profile of the seafront, it is actively seeking to build upon Seaburn’s success as an events destination by expanding the events calendar for the area.
RSM82	R J Hutchinson	Supports	Great plan start now or funding will disappear if it hasn’t already.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Comment Noted



RSM83	George Maw	Supports	Before further development commences:  1. Replace fencing around recreation park with steel to avoid regular damage by kids who will not use gates provided.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – The recreation park is outside of the boundaries of the MDC. Improvements to Recreation Park are addressed within the Seafront Regeneration Strategy.
			2. Fence to be extended around grassed area west of Martino's to prevent ingress of so called travellers and horses – numbers increasing yearly.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – The council has enforcement powers to control the unauthorised pitching of gypsy and traveller camps.
			3. Reintroduce park wardens to parks such as Roker to allow for safe access for families. Ensure finance for regular policing, extended seasons, beach cleaners, full time litter and fouling wardens for seafront. Scale back licensing for tables and chairs on public footpaths – think about disabled!	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Whilst Roker Park is outside of the remit of the MDC, a management plan is proposed to ensure that all aspects of maintenance of the wider seafront are taken into due consideration. Matters such as litter and events will also be covered in relevant management plans.
			4. Quality of granite seating – what about protection against skateboard damage.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Granite seating has been chosen as a hard wearing yet high quality material that is durable in form and can withstand impact.
RSM84	Mr & Mrs T R Hughes	Non given	Take amusements away from seafront as they attract undesirables at night. Look to South Shields. Not have many hot days and if people come here there is not much to do and it is not all parents that want to take their children to amusement arcades.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – With regards to amusement arcades please see response to RSM10.
RSM85	J A Wright	Supports	Facilities on beach i.e. climbing frames	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Comment noted
			More parking areas or better transport, stop off street parking, consider residents.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – See main body of Cabinet Report for information on parking/transport.
			A decent fair, swimming pool.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – See response to RSM2 in relation to a swimming pool.
RSM86	A Sheriff	Supports	Better cycle access over Roker ravine bridge possible cycle bridge.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Roker Ravine bridge falls outside of the boundaries of the MDC and is addressed in the Marine Walk Masterplan.
RSM87	J M Lennox	Supports	Better parking facilities	<b>RESPONSE</b> – See main body of Cabinet Report for information on parking.
			Cleaner toilet facilities	<b>RESPONSE</b> – See main body of Cabinet Report for information on toilet provision.
			An all year leisure complex for the people of the city to attract families and tourists alike. Complex would be inclusive to all - amateur theatre, sports facility, families.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Providing all year round leisure facilities is key to the MDC's success. The uses suggested may be compatible. However, it is the role of the developer to detail specific uses for proposed schemes.
RSM88	Mr Robert H Robson	Non given	Need leisure activity centre including swimming pool/leisure pool for those rainy days also sauna, solarium, massage in Seaburn Centre.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – For swimming pool provision see response to RSM2. See main body of Cabinet Report for information on the Seaburn Centre.
			Fairground could be covered over used for indoor activities e.g. golf.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – See response to RSM4 in relation to the fairground site.
RSM89	Jill Lambley	Supports	Extend Seaburn Centre - pool/ice rink for all year and weather uses.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – See main body of Cabinet Report for information on Seaburn Centre.
			More & upgraded toilet facilities	<b>RESPONSE</b> – See main body of Cabinet Report for information on toilet provision.
			Ice cream parlour with seated area	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Refreshment facilities are considered important in attracting people to the seafront particularly along the promenade, resulting in a development brief being prepared for Seaburn Shelter for a café/restaurant. Food and drink uses are also appropriate within the leisure and entertainment core.
			More floral beds on the seafront.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – See response to RSM20 in relation to public realm.
RSM90	Mr & Mrs I Ainsley	Objects	As we understand numbers 1, 3, 4 and 5 on leaflet are fine and needed.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Comment Noted
			Number 2 residential park is absolutely awful.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – See main body of Cabinet Report for information on housing.
			It will infringe on our green belt, an area for walking and enjoying the wildlife. A lot of dog walking takes place there it just needs tidying properly.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Soft landscaping is crucial to the success of the MDC, resulting in proposals for a linear park which will act as a primary open space providing a coherent green link and an ecological corridor allowing for the expansion of existing habitats/creation new habitats. Cut Throat Dene is recognised as an important ecological resource and as such will be preserved enhanced as an urban meadow.
RSM91	Kamla Pannu	Supports	Facilities for all age groups.	<b>RESPONSE</b> –Comment Noted
			Elderly need somewhere to relax with over a cup of tea.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – For refreshment provision see response to RSM89.
			Direct buses from Washington to Seaburn, currently not visit as requires 2 buses or bus/metro.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – With regards to public transport provision please see response to RSM85.
RSM92	C Spence	Supports	More parking would attract visitors as currently limited.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – See main body of Cabinet Report for information on parking.
			Hope current access to Morrison's will be retained.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – The existing access to Morrison's will be retained.
RSM93	No name given	Objects	Look after existing assets before building new schemes. Repair roads; clean pavements in the town rather constantly replacing them. Stop the spending spree.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – As referenced within the council's Seafront Regeneration Strategy, an attractive seafront with a variety of leisure opportunities within close proximity is a unique selling point to Sunderland and will assist the delivery of major projects within the city through providing a high quality of life pulling in new residents and businesses. The value of coastal tourism is estimated to be worth £400-450m to the north east (over 20% of the

				value of tourism to the region as a whole). Consequently the importance of the seafront to the city's economy should not be underestimated and forms a crucial element of providing a sustainable future for Sunderland. Furthermore, the majority of development within Seaburn is expected to be private sector led with financial contributions being sought towards improving and maintaining local infrastructure.
RSM94	No name given	Supports	Hopefully the skateboarding park will be demolished as I cannot imagine anyone wanting to buy a home next to a litter ridden, gang attraction where fences are vandalised, and people feel intimidated (an utter eyesore).	<b>RESPONSE</b> – The skate park provides an important recreational facility within the city and as such there are no plans for its demolition. However, it is recognised that residential layouts will need careful consideration in relation to the siting of the existing skate park. The presence of nearby residential properties may reduce levels of antisocial behaviour through improved natural surveillance.
RSM95	Andrew Mould	Supports	I am looking at starting my own business in the Seaburn area and think Seaburn needs a big revamp to bring it to life. Interested in unit on the seafront as a surf school, Sunderland needs one.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Comment Noted – no contact details provided
RSM96	Graeme Howe	Non given	What leisure entertainments to feature in core? Need covered in facilities to include swimming pool, bowling greens to attract elderly, interactive state of the art areas, cafes.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Appropriate uses for the leisure and entertainment core include food and drink (A3 and A4), leisure (D2), non-residential institutions i.e. museums/galleries (D1), hotels (C1), ancillary retail (A1) and with justification residential (C3) and extra care housing.
			Additional facilities - promenade to support use of best asset sea and beach (toilets, changing facilities, beach guard huts) introduce & encourage extensive use of seaside activities.	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Retaining important seaside infrastructure i.e. toilets, changing facilities and provision for lifeguards is important to the MDC's success.
RSM97	John Tumman and M Gray	Supports	Broadly supportive of redeveloping Seaburn's leisure core.  See letter for detail on key points set out below:  <b>Boundary of masterplan (p9)</b> Why playing fields/Seaburn Camp not included? Could provide integrated development with better circulation patterns and landscaping, integrated uses (ancillary facilities for playing fields within envelope of development).	<b>RESPONSE</b> – Comment Noted  <b>RESPONSE</b> The focus of the Seaburn Masterplan is to set out regeneration plans for Seaburn, with the aim of providing a family friendly visitor destination with both indoor and outdoor facilities. Certain areas of open space have been included within the Masterplan area as improvements to these spaces are considered to have a direct role in delivering the objectives of the plan. For example the creation of a park area on the former boating lake and improvements to Cut Throat dene would improve pedestrian movement within and outside the area and could have a significant role to play in improving biodiversity in the area.  Other areas of open space to the west of the masterplan area are in particular need of regeneration as they are underused and in some cases suffer associated issues such as anti-social behaviour. The restructuring of these areas in a manner would also assist in delivering the regeneration objective of the Masterplan and regeneration Strategy for the area..  Seaburn camp is a significant area of open space to the north of Ocean Park and is allocated in its current form by the Unitary development Plan as playing fields and open space. As the Masterplan document establishes on Page 8, work as part of the emerging LDF into the identification of new housing sites is ongoing. Seaburn Camp has been identified as a potential site for consideration. It is not within the remit of the Masterplan as SPD to change the use of land. Therefore proposals for this area in future would need to be considered as part of the preparation of the LDF rather than through the Masterplan.
			<b>Viability/Feasibility</b> No reference to scale (floorspace). Soft mkt testing concludes limited demand other than residential. Seems speculative without evidence, possibly over ambitious, particularly when taking into account competition from South Shields. May need pre-conditions to promote developer interest. Demolition of existing facilities i.e. Seaburn centre result in further cost impacting upon economic viability.	<b>RESPONSE</b> The timescale as set out within the MDC is for development to take place over a 10 to 15 year period. It is also important to be aware that the masterplan is indicative. From an urban design perspective whilst there is flexibility over layout and floorspace, provided proposals comply with planning policy such as PPS4, it is considered necessary to set out design principles such as storey heights. The MDC has been prepared as a realistic yet ambitious vision based upon what is considered to be deliverable taking into account private sector interest already received and which are currently ongoing.
			<b>Green space/housing</b> Loss of green space link to housing development – ref made to potential loss to residential devt between commercial uses and Seafields. Study justification that of	<b>RESPONSE</b> The council is currently in the process of reviewing its open spaces. Nevertheless it is considered that a loss of open space to residential can be justified in this instance as the

		<p>poorer quality referring to “carefully composed comprehensive development which would provide regeneration solution.” In practice a housing devt on both sides of a very linear open link. No discussion acknowledging importance of link in present form and potential to upgrade open space ensuring better use. Proposals likely to attract strong opposition until alternative option conclusively considered of retaining existing open space in present form and upgrading. Detailed concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Loss open space between cut Throat Dene/Seaburn Camp</li> <li>(ii) Whether loss can be justified paras 16,17,18 PPG17</li> <li>(iii) Linear Park would be incidental to residential, linear suburban form, similar to other housing estates rather than recreation asset</li> <li>(iv) What mkt for expensive housing adj Morrison’s carpark. Residential should be in form of apartments overlooking seafront with upper floors facing boulevard. May help to provide massing shown in indicative scheme.</li> </ul>	<p>area of open space is considered to be under-used in its current form and generally of low amenity value due to problems with antisocial behaviour and a lack of surveillance. The potential for a green link through the site which benefits from greater natural surveillance therefore improving security is considered to outweigh the negative impacts of a loss of part of the open space.</p> <p>For information on housing see main body of Cabinet Report.</p>
		<p><b>Seaburn Centre</b> Significance as indoor multi-purpose resource is barely touched upon. Any work to evaluate economic contribution as events/exhibition centre. Scheme does not appear to make provision for building of footprint which replacement for centre would require. Is centre near end of life, if not is there financial adv in demolition and replacement. Close scrutiny required to see if inclusion within scheme viable.</p>	<p><b>RESPONSE</b> The Seaburn Centre is currently a significantly under-used facility, and although it is recognised to be a valuable facility to the local community it is sited at a very important location at the heart of the MDC area and as such is nit currently fulfilling its potential. As identified within the MDC any specific facilities should be relocated and further work is currently being undertaken in this regard. For further information please see response to Cabinet Report.</p>
		<p><b>Design Issues</b></p> <p><b>Block principles</b> devt. conceived as an entity but may be implemented incrementally need to secure high degree of co-ordination esp around boulevard and Whitburn Rd to give unity i.e. window proportions, storey heights, massing, materials. Will council have powers to enforce design standards?</p> <p><b>Leisure use east of Whitburn Rd</b> No ref in MDC to scale of activity. Could represent sizeable and intensive devt given prominent location. No info how will be serviced, nor where staff parking located. Given all four elevations of block visually prominent, most obvious service point from Whitburn Road, vitally important consideration should be addressed in MDC.</p> <p><b>Car Parking</b> Concern over potential loss of parking, whether adequate to meet normal demands. If not residents quality of life may suffer due to parking on residential streets.</p> <p><b>Circulation</b> Major element MDC enhance Lowry Road whilst downgrade Whitburn Road. Appreciate principles but two main concerns. (i) Intended route less direct, therefore people unlikely to use voluntarily. Enforcement would require stretch of Whitburn Road to have limited access, is this the intention? (ii) Can proposed primary route be fit for purpose – number of accesses required, alignment. More congestion may result. May be more appropriate introduce physical features in carriageway, selective road narrowing.</p> <p><b>Implementation Land Assembly</b> What is unexpired term of leases referred to? Are leaseholders/private landowners willing to work with council? How can proposals be delivered whilst not disrupting existing business.</p> <p><b>Phasing</b> Alteranative method of phasing leisure entertainment core, may be more appropriate to develop as an entity to provide uniformity, co-ordination landscaping, facilitate symmetry design at corners leading to Boulevard.</p>	<p><b>RESPONSE</b> It is important to note that as stated on p32 of the MDC the council will take a regeneration and design-led approach to development whereby the council will release sites for development and developers will be selected based on criteria that ensure the regeneration and design ambitions of the MDC are delivered. The council agrees that co-ordination is required. However, it is the purpose of the MDC to set out broad design parameters and principles. Development Briefs will be prepared for each site providing more detailed design guidance.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE</b> A detailed development brief has been set out for the Seaburn Shelter, whereby bidders have been invited to prepare their own solutions to servicing and parking. All proposals will need to satisfy the council’s transportation team in ensuring that they do not compromise highway safety or lead to unreasonable levels of congestion without implementing means of mitigation.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE</b> Please note that the masterplan is indicative showing preferred arrangements, for further information please see main body of Cabinet Report.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE</b> Work has been undertaken with highways to come up with an innovative proposal appropriate to reducing traffic levels along Whitburn Road. Lowry Road will be an easier route to navigate which will provide suitable access to many of Seaburn’s primary facilities. However, it is important to note that it is not the intention of the MDC to divert all traffic away from Whitburn Road.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE</b> Extensive work has been undertaken with landowners and leaseholders which is still in progress. The importance of ensuring minimum disruption to existing businesses is recognised and is an important consideration in taking proposals forward.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE</b> Comments noted. The masterplan is an indicative plan of the preferred location for uses, this will be looked at in more detail as development brief are prepared for each site.</p>
		<p><b>2.2 Objectives</b> Difficult to see how council can influence affordability of activities (obj 4), MDC plan for</p>	<p><b>RESPONSE</b> Intellectually accessible is referred to as meaning accessible to all in terms of being able to</p>

		built development not management. What is meant by intellectually accessible (obj 6).	be understood by everyone. The respondee is correct in stating that the council does not have the ability to influence pricing for private schemes. Nevertheless it remain an aspiration that all activities both private and public will be affordable to all.
		<p><b>3.6 SWOT analysis</b> Strengths – open space second strength “large areas of green open space suitable for events.” Land refers to Seaburn Camp – not in MDC area. Seaburn Camp should be included or ref to strength deleted.</p> <p>Strengths – commercial demand, strength 6, what basis has strong commercial demand been identified – weakness poor commercial mix suggest not. Sough after location – presume refers to Seaburn as residential area, amend “...and sought after residential location”</p> <p>Threat – Neighbouring Resort – major threat South Shields. Work may need to be done to establish what is deliverable scale of commercial investment at Seaburn.</p> <p>Threats – Impact on existing residents – increasing events and commercial offer and reducing parking will exacerbate parking/access problems for residents. Duplication of point as last threat refers to impacts on existing and future residents.</p> <p>Threat – events space – threat posed by emerging events space elsewhere city could be threat. May need to be resolved by developing strategy for provision of events space.</p> <p>Threats – current economic climate – little/no devt short to medium term likely. Could be opportunity to make sure scale of devt proposed is right in relation to potential demand.</p>	<p><b>AMEND</b> <b>Strength 2 to read</b> “large areas of green open space in and around the study area suitable ...”</p> <p><b>AMEND</b> <b>Strength 6 to read</b> “...and sought after residential location”</p> <p><b>RESPONSE</b> The council recognises that the market today may not support attempts to replicate the Seaburn of old and that demand for large-scale attractions are lessened by the proximity of competing major attractions such as South Shields. As a consequence the council does not intend to replicate South Shields’ offer but to provide facilities on a more modest, local scale able to draw visitors to the beach but also support from local residents.</p> <p><b>AMEND</b> <b>Remove threat 8.</b> With regards to parking please see main body of Cabinet Report.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE</b> As part of development of the MDC close work will be undertaken with the council’s events team to ensure that appropriate events are held in Seaburn to promote its tourism potential.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE</b> Comment Noted</p>
		<p><b>4.0 Policy Review</b> UDP – pg 24 Policy NA40 is omitted although referred to on map of policies on pg 25.</p>	<p><b>RESPONSE</b> Policy NA40 on is referred to in Appendix A..</p>
		<p><b>5.0 Feasibility Appraisal</b> 5.4 Scale of Development – nowhere ref made to actual scale i.e. floorspace. Illustrations show substantial scale but not made reference to in text. Para 5.1 “following section informs development of masterplan having regard to city council strategic objectives, relevant planning considerations and the economic and land ownership realities of the area.” Does not do this in practice, reader left with no indication of scale of devt, basis upon which established or economic viability.</p> <p>5.5 Development Types – How soft was mkt testing, what extent scale of devt can be justified. Recognised in MDC scale of uses is limited, unlikely scale of devt required. Viability of scheme on scale proposed is unproven.</p>	<p><b>AMEND HEADING</b> Replace Scale of development with Extent of development The masterplan is intended to be indicative. The scale of development is not precise and whilst it is possible to restrict building heights in order to protect amenity as a design consideration, it is not possible to make accurate speculations over the exact scale of development as this is dependent upon the private sector.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE</b> It is important to note that the MDC is intended to be developed over a phased 10-15 year period and as such whilst it is acknowledged that at the present time demand for the scale of facilities on the masterplan may not be present, as Seaburn develops over time it is likely to benefit from increased demand, with larger facilities being constructed within the latter phases.</p>
		<p><b>6.0 Evolution of Masterplan</b> 6.1 Masterplan Evolution- Para does not make sense “would it be best to redevelop....”Rerwording required.</p> <p>6.2 Masterplan Workshop &amp; Consultation – 3 development options mentioned, no previous mentions of options.</p>	<p><b>RESPONSE</b> <b>In the context of an amended section it is considered this section now makes sense</b></p> <p><b>AMEND</b> <b>Further details have now been included.</b></p>
		<p><b>9.0 Design Code</b> Indicative Masterplan – Unclear what building is proposed in front of F. If replacement</p>	<p><b>RESPONSE</b> These matters will be considered further at the detailed design stage.</p>

			<p>for water pump station then require careful design if not to detract from devt to west. If doesn't require precise location could be incorporated within block F.</p> <p><b>9.1 Urban structure and character areas</b></p> <p>Pg 46 Leisure &amp; Entertainment Core –Given potential Seaburn Centre demolition council should make every effort to provide new facilities of at least same standard/accessibility, would show acknowledgement of the importance of such uses at the seafront – all weather facilities. Such uses D1/D2 should be essential.</p> <p>Pg 47 Residential park – not opposed overall principle but concerns over extent/form currently proposed.</p> <p>P49 Existing businesses – Error of fact in para. Martino's stated to be existing business to remain but identified as part of redeveloped Leisure &amp; Entertainment Core on plan on p45. Needs clarification.</p> <p><b>9.4 Building Heights &amp; Densities</b></p> <p>Last bullet point any buildings over 6 storeys not permitted, is this really the case should iconic building proposal over 6 storey be submitted. Not conservation area, no listed buildings nearby.</p> <p><b>Para 9.5 Northern Gateway</b></p> <p>By what means scale of Morrisons increased? How is review of orientation of supermarket to be achieved? How practical given main entrance is from car park and secondary entrance onto Whitburn Road at south east corner. Have Morrisons been approached regarding issues?</p>	<p><b>RESPONSE</b> - The council fully intends to ensure that the majority of uses considered important within the Seaburn Centre are relocated elsewhere.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted</p> <p><b>AMEND</b> - Remove Martino's from retained businesses on p49.</p> <p><b>AMEND</b> see response to Homes and Communities Agency comments to para 9.4</p> <p><b>RESPONSE</b></p> <p>Morrison's were consulted as part of the proposals and the guidance has been prepared as advice should Morrison's decide to refurbish their store in the future.</p>
			<p>Urban Design Principles (p38) &amp; Street Hierarchy (p69) Conflict between diagrams. UD map shows Lowry Road as primary road with Whitburn Road stretch secondary. Street hierarchy diagram shows Whitburn Rd as 'primary coast road' and Lowry Rd as 'secondary road.'</p>	<p><b>AMEND</b></p> <p>Amend Urban Design Principles map (p38) to show Whitburn Road as primary throughout.</p>
			<p>Multi-user boulevard (p74) could become focus for anti-social behaviour. No clear idea of ground floor uses. Should be well-lit, free from landscape features recesses, preferably have uses on upper floors which provide natural surveillance.</p>	<p><b>RESPONSE</b></p> <p>Comment Noted</p>
			<p>Private parking &amp; servicing (p77 &amp; 78) – Second bullet p78 where visitor parking for shops restaurants is it with public parking south of boulevard therefore no obvious problems, other than whether can all be accommodated. If visitor parking to be made in private parking areas issues arise with adequacy to meet potential demand and accessibility from rear. Further compounded by duplication of para relating to parking requirements being shared with other non residential uses in both public and private parking sections. Lack of clarity of roles of both parking areas.</p>	<p><b>RESPONSE</b></p> <p>With regards to parking see main body of Cabinet Report.</p>
			<p>Seaburn Public Realm – presentation unfortunate takes no account of development proposals including kiosk on seafront.</p>	<p><b>RESPONSE</b></p> <p>Public realm works have already started on site as a separate project covering the wider seafront. The Seaburn Shelter development brief requires public realm works on the promenade to the front of the existing shelter as part of redevelopment.</p>
RSM98	S M Alder	Objects	<p>5 star hotel with balcony/sea view, together with upmarket wet/wild Crowtree Leisure type of facility which everyone can use all year round regardless of this weather.</p>	<p><b>RESPONSE</b> - With regards to all year round attractions please see response to RSM13.</p> <p>In the medium/longer term may be scope for hotel as part of mixed-use leisure development. Scope may also exist for upgrading of guest houses to cater for the boutique hotel market.</p>
RSM99	Ian Taylor	Supports	<p>Time to build indoor cycling Velodrome in the area as everyone has to go to Manchester, it would get used all the time by North East cyclists and schools.</p>	<p><b>RESPONSE</b> - A veldorome would be considered more appropriate as part of the Stadium Village redevelopment, please refer to the Stadium Village Development Framework for info.</p>
RSM100	M Heine	Supports	<p>Character should reflect a) what is unique to Sunderland, b) what will add to the reputation of the city nationwide c) be attractive to the public nationwide. Avoid burger bars, fruit machines fairground rides.</p>	<p><b>RESPONSE</b> - The council's vision for Seaburn is for an attractive high quality family focused resort that is building upon its unique natural environment.</p>
			<p>Developers opt for "limited investment/high returns" projects should be required to contribute to cultural elements in the development. EC could be approached for</p>	<p><b>RESPONSE</b> - Contributions will be sought for a range of improvements including public realm, open space, transport infrastructure and affordable housing. Details of financial</p>

21

			additional financial support. Suggestions for features within the development: Assuming funding available. Major community centre to replace Seaburn Centre supporting wide range of social and commercial functions incorporating meeting rooms, tiered auditorium/hall. A unique and attractive business and conference centre, exhibition space, theatre and dance school productions, indoor sports hall and dance hall for public. Café/bar on first floor overlooking the sea front would be a clinching attractant and money spinner for whole complex.	contributions will be finalised at the planning stage. <b>RESPONSE</b> - At present no funding is available for such facilities and it is considered that a conference centre/exhibition hall would be more sustainable being located within close proximity of the city centre. Furthermore any proposals would need to comply with relevant national planning policy in relation to economic development including PPS4.
			Tramway running shuttle trams from northern boundary of city to lighthouse could be major and very profitable tourist attraction. If battery or fly-wheel powered no need for visually intrusive and expensive overhead wires. Novel and example of 'green' engineering.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - For tram provision please see response to RSM20.
			Make more of Lowry connection with Seaburn i.e. emblematic stick figures in walkway areas and perhaps with the overall development so named.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Cultural identity is important to the success of the MDC. However, these matters will be addressed in more detail later in the design stages.
			Could there be a pedestrian crossing outside the Waterfront Café/Paradise Garden. Currently only 1 light controlled crossing. At many times of day trying to cross road from restaurant to bus stop and beach opposite highly dangerous. Increased development lead to increased tourist activity so even more hazardous.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - The council proposes to narrow the carriageways along Whitburn Road reducing traffic speeds therefore creating a more pedestrian friendly environment.
RSM101	R Bell	Non given	Seems like a comprehensive plan. Seaburn Centre extensively used and will be greatly missed. Seaburn always suffered from absence of bad weather provision.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - See main body of Cabinet Report for information on Seaburn Centre. <b>RESPONSE</b> - In relation to all year round attractions see RSM13.
RSM102	Martin Wilkes	Support and Object	Overall – frustrating Great opportunity let down by desire to force housing into an area that does not require it. Forget housing develop leisure facilities to attract the volume of visitors the area deserves.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted <b>RESPONSE</b> - See main body of Cabinet Report for information on housing.
RSM103	Mrs S M Thompson	Supports	Need plenty of toilets. Play areas for children, open weekends and holidays.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - See main body of Cabinet Report for information on toilet provision. <b>RESPONSE</b> - In relation to play facilities see RSM40.
			Undercover shelter for wet days.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Whilst the council recognises that proposals to develop Seaburn Shelter will result in the loss of a facility as a shelter, it is considered that the site does not fulfil its potential and a range of wet weather facilities will be provided as the MDC progresses. Please see RSM13 for further information.
			No buildings on cliffs blocking the views.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Panoramic sea views are key to Seaburn. All developments must preserve/enhance sea views.
			Too much housing. Reduce height of house fencing around Roker.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - See main body of Cabinet Report for information on housing. <b>RESPONSE</b> - Roker falls outside of the boundaries of the MDC.
RSM104	Miss J Reed	Supports	Make Seaburn brilliant, have a fantastic city and seafront everything done right revenue could be going into economy.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted
RSM105	Miss D Regan	Supports	Support proposals for revitalisation of Sunderland's sea front but would like consideration of an ice rink.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - With regards to an ice rink see RSM13.
RSM106	R Hughes	Object	Too much of area 1 is close to the road, an area of open space in front of 1 will give a better perspective & not overwhelm the aspect to the sea. Wide pavement/promenade on west side of road with seating, trees, concession huts (high quality). Residential devt. is a concern in a leisure area. Why necessary and will developers have a disproportionate influence on the proposals as with Morrisons & Seaburn Centre. Concern at lack of detail Seaburn Camp and playing fields.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - The MDC intends to reduce vehicular dominance along Whitburn Road through narrowed carriageways, the provision of a new widened route for vehicles along the alignment of Lowry Road thereby reducing traffic flows along Whitburn Road and more priority for pedestrians. <b>RESPONSE</b> - All residential development will be subject to strict criteria set out in the MDC and subsequent development briefs ensuring high quality design. See main body of Cabinet Report for information on housing. <b>RESPONSE</b> - With regards to Seaburn Camp please see RSM97.
RSM107	David Cutts	Supports	Care needs to be taken that no rash decisions taken as consequences long lasting and permanent. Seafront key city asset/income generation. Housing attracts investment but limits potential for tourism avoid. Larger soft play area, secure paddling pool with adjacent picnic area for young children. Upgrade pirates play area. Lambton Worm area could be put out to private tender for one of the above or a themed crazy golf.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted <b>RESPONSE</b> - See main body of Cabinet Report for information on housing. <b>RESPONSE</b> - The uses suggested may be compatible with the MDC's vision. However, such facilities require funding being obtained or development contributions.

21

			Fairground needs developing fairground or amenities for teenagers.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - See response to RSM4 in relation to the fairground site.
			BMX feature good idea but situated badly littered/utilised for antisocial behaviour. Better sited adj Dykelands Road illuminated at night.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - With regards to surveillance and the skate park please see response to RSM94.
			Seafront needs pub, either on own or as part of restaurant. Proposed devt.of promenade good as long as public conveniences attached, friends and family visitors always surprised by lack of bars, more so now Bay Hotel demolished.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Seaburn Shelter dev currently undergoing tendering process has provision for café/restaurant or bar. However, whilst this is the only site deemed suitable for development on the e. side of Whitburn Road, it is anticipated that leisure & entertainment core support range of evening uses. Public toilets are a requirement for developers bringing forward Seaburn Shelter site.
			Escalator built at Roker for access to prom.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted
RSM108	Alvin White	Supports	Great idea, get started straight away. At the moment place is a dump.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted
RSM109	B Clark	Objects	Need leisure pool not swimming pool. No to Seaburn Shelter leave it alone.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - See RSM2 in relation to swimming pool. <b>RESPONSE</b> - The Seaburn Shelter represents a significant development opportunity to create a landmark building framing the Central Gateway of Seaburn connecting leisure and entertainment core with the promenade and is a crucial to early phases regeneration of Seaburn.
RSM110	Philip Dixon	Supports	Looks good. Cannot see any reason to object.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted
			What about renewable technologies such as wind turbines. Would make Sunderland more energy independent. Would be ideal location. The windspires are very attractive and would help support local authority energy demands at Seaburn.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - All new developments within Seaburn MDC area required to meet Target Emission Reduction levels prescribed by Building Regulations. Developments are also required to supply minimum of 10% of the site's energy consumption from renewable sources located on site unless it is demonstrated that this unfeasible. Exact nature of renewable energy progressed in further detail at the planning application stage.
RSM111	Keith Baharie	Supports	Re-brand Sunderland to include ref to coastal location draw people to the city highlight that Sunderland only place in the north east with such close accessibility between sand, beaches, city centre.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - The Sunderland Image Strategy sets out the city's key brand values and recognises the importance of the seafront as a key asset in maximising the quality of life for local residents and a cultural and tourism attraction.
			The use of hardy exotic plants such as phormium, yucca spp, would be a cost-effective way of updating the landscaping. Maybe replicate the landscaping found on the A1231 roundabouts all along the Seaburn/Roker areas? Striking plants with all year round foliage.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - In areas of public realm, open space and other appropriate locations new planting should be indigenous to encourage habitat diversification and encourage biodiversity. Appropriate species will be identified as the MDC develops.
RSM112	Mrs A Maw	Supports	Area described as vacant land (2) is green space used by dog walkers/children. Concern at the supervision of new play/public area, do not want a repeat of problems skateboard park brought.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - The presence of large areas of green space offers some value to the local population. However, the quality of open space is poor and under-used. Furthermore, there are limited amounts of natural surveillance resulting in anti-social behaviour. Consequently whilst residential development would lead to some loss in quantity of open space, the quality of open space will be enhanced through providing a Linear Park and enhancing biodiversity within Cut Throat Dene.
RSM113	Paul Hepple	Non given	Will the proposed redevelopments include five-a-side football facilities?	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Facilities such as five-a-side football pitches may be better located elsewhere within the city such as at Stadium Village where a planning framework has been adopted promoting sports-led redevelopment.
RSM114	Mr G Petrie	Objects	Plan is an excuse to build houses on leisure land. Where is provision for parking car park shown is inadequate.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - See main body of Cabinet Report for information on housing. <b>RESPONSE</b> - See main body of Cabinet Report for information on parking.
			The plan will force even more people to South Shields.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted.
RSM115	J Owen	Objects	Concern over lack of parking as visitors already park on cycle path/yellow line/pavement during summer months. Concern over policing of parking/yellow lines/dog fouling/anti-social behaviour will there be any.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - See main body of Cabinet Report for information on parking. <b>RESPONSE</b> - The council in partnership with Northumbria Police continuously aims to improve the management of parking/anti-social behaviour and this will continue as the development of the MDC progresses.
RSM116	Wayne Kemp	Supports	Aspiration for outdoor exercise equipment e.g. as seen in LA/San Diego Along designated route (2-3miles) several workstations that people can stop at and complete exercises e.g. pull ups, press ups, dips, See <a href="http://www.fresh-airfitness.co.uk/p_all.htm">www.fresh-airfitness.co.uk/p_all.htm</a>	<b>RESPONSE</b> - The council will consider future opportunities for new leisure facilities to support the delivery of this objective.
RSM117	E and D Blakie	Supports	Removal of car park incr. existing problems, p.transport will not help.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - See main body of Cabinet Report for information on parking.
			Traffic calming – greater problem removing bottle necks. Some traffic calming measures dangerous i.e. lane narrowing. Whitburn traffic lights are biggest bottleneck particularly match days/sunny days problems for both residents and visitors.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - In relation to traffic calming see RSM6.

			Skate park in wrong place, noise & rubbish disgusting. Like S. Shields build proper skate park in full view of seafront not hidden away.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - With regards to the skate park please see response to RSM94.
			Need for decent anti vandalism i.e. surveillance cameras or more police on beat.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Natural surveillance is important to the MDC and includes environmental design i.e. building orientation, overlooking of open space/footpaths and use of appropriate boundary treatments and lighting as less oppressive form of reducing crime and fear of crime in comparison to measures such as CCTV. Whilst some CCTV/policing required where high crime risk, should not be over dominant. Where these measures required most effective in combination with natural surveillance.
RSM118	Peter Walton	Objects	Need traffic calming measures in my street until now council have resisted such measures. Proposals bound to increase traffic flow.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - The responsees address is located outside of the MDC area. With regards to traffic calming see RSM6.
RSM119	Frank Hunter	Objects	When moved to Seafields 1993 believed housing would never be overlooked, since then in correspondence from council regarding path through Mere Knolls Cemetery (alongside Seafields), and also construction of skateboard park, assurances have been given land is reserved for leisure use. Why have council abandoned this policy.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - After carefully considering the need for regeneration within Seaburn in balance with amenities of nearby residents, small quantity of res. development required to ensure long term sustainability. MDC sets strict design criteria to ensure existing residents not harmed by future development. For further information see Cabinet Report.
RSM120	Peter Ramsey	Supports	Move amusement arcades away from seafront.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - For amusement arcades see RSM10.
			Extend Seaburn Centre with swimming pool in place of old showground.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - For information on Seaburn Centre see main body of Cabinet Report.
			New res. devt single storey to give views over green belt.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Building heights of residential properties required to be in context with surroundings (between 1.5 and 2.5 storeys) and at lowest adj Seafields. Private views however, are ultimately not a planning consideration.
			Develop more flower beds along seafront and grassed area south of South Bents, currently not properly maintained.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted
			Good to hear green belt including university fields is being retained.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted
RSM121	Adam Lyons	Unsure	Don't build speed humps, loads at S Shields, more boy racers there than Seaburn, already have speed camera so no need.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted
			Better lighting on prom near Little Italy.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Improved lighting along promenade is important consideration of MDC in attracting people to the seafront in evening whilst maintaining high level of natural surveillance and is included in public realm proposals.
			Rebuild Seaburn fountain, was focal point.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted
			Build something where old funfair was e.g. Seaburn Centre extension.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - In relation to fairground site see RSM4.
			Make better feature of Seaburn Dene i.e. park.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted
RSM122	Leigh Green	Support	Bring back illuminations would attract more people/trade.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - In relation to illuminations see RSM10.
RSM123	Barbara Clark	Supports	Object to the Seaburn Shelter being turned into café.	With regards to the Shelter site see response to RSM109.
			Would benefit from leisure pool.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - See response to swimming pool provision see RSM2.
RSM124	Katie O'Brien	Supports	Long overdue. Anything encourages visitors particularly families, is encouraging. More upmarket coffee bars, restaurants and gift shops. Anything that capitalises on the fantastic views is great idea. Anything to remove image and build positivity fantastic.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comments Noted
RSM125	Councillor Kay	Supports	Good balance in light of the economic times between council leadership and private opportunity. Seaside venues can be subject to dramatic rapid declines in fortunes if strategies not in place.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comments Noted
RSM126	Ash Griffiths	Supports	No reasons given	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Noted
RSM127	Dianne Snowdon	Supports	No reasons given	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Noted
RSM128	Andy Corbett	Supports	The timescale (of up to 15 years) seems a long. Could MDC take greater advantage of current economic climate?	<b>RESPONSE</b> - With regards to timescales please see response to RSM11.
RSM129	Patricia Robinson	Objects	No concrete plans for entertainment for families visiting Roker and Seaburn, facilities such as Fun Fare, indoor bowling, small scale golf site, miniature railway, under cover facilities for live entertainment.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - The central vision of the MDC is to strengthen Seaburn's role as a family focused resort. Such facilities as those suggested may be compatible with this vision however it is the purpose of the MDC to set out broad development parameters rather than list specific uses.
RSM130	Mary Chadburn	Supports	Bring funfair back, punch and judy, donkey rides, little kiosks, crazy golf and fun fair and boating pool. Nice to see family attractions.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Seaside attractions such as those suggested are appropriate for the location. However, it is not the purpose of the MDC to prescribe specific uses rather instead to set out broad planning and design parameters. Ultimately developers will need to bring forward proposals for specific leisure uses.



21

RSM131	N Davison	Objects	I have no objection to the principle of the plan. Concerns loss of green site to housing - residential park proposal, do not recall any mention in original display within leisure centre. Pods - failed to see use when saw initial proposal can find no mention of them in the latest plan have these been discarded? What facilities for leisure & entertainment core - swimming pool? Ice Rink? Not more slot machines enough already. What will be in modern play area will local children be invited for ideas.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted <b>RESPONSE</b> - With regards to housing see main body of Cabinet Report. <b>RESPONSE</b> - The proposals for the Pods are progressing as part of the Sea Change funding. However, these will be located near Marine Walk and therefore ref made in Marine Walk Masterplan. <b>RESPONSE</b> - With regards to appropriate uses for the leisure and entertainment core please see response to RSM96. <b>RESPONSE</b> - See RSM40 for play area facilities.
RSM132	Mr. R.D.Dunn	Objects	Where visitors parking after car parks adj Morrison's sacrificed. Proposing to build over good parking area. Proved inadequate at events i.e. Air Show, to further reduce will result in fewer visitors not more. How long before we lose what was Seaburn Camp and the fields west of there? More seats on prom facing the sea. More toilets not less, toilets closed down at the junction of Dykelands Road and Queens Parade, toilets south of the bus shelter opp. Recreation Park, both underground therefore not eyesore.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - With regards to parking see main body of Cabinet Report. <b>RESPONSE</b> - In relation to Seaburn Camp see RSM97. <b>RESPONSE</b> - With regards to seats facing the sea please see response to RSM33. With regards to toilets see main body of Cabinet Report.
RSM133	Jessica Clark-Barkess	Supports	Upgrade promenade, seating areas opp Marriott Hotel poor image as in bad condition.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Public realm works are currently being undertaken within Seaburn including the Promenade. These works are part of phase 1 for the public realm and it is expected that this will continue throughout the lifetime of the MDC.
RSM134	Anne Twine	Supports	Make promenade footpaths user-friendly for summer time bathers. Free standing showers (or fresh water taps) near the beach, these would not cost too much to implement in both Roker and Seaburn.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Upgrading the footpaths along the Promenade forms part of the long term ambitions for public realm improvements to be carried out over the lifetime of the MDC. <b>RESPONSE</b> - The Seafront Regeneration Strategy recognises that initial seafront consultations identified a number of requests for a foot shower as such the council will seek to deliver facilities and will look favourably upon proposals incorporating such amenities.
RSM135	P Minto	Supports	No reasons given	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Noted
RSM136	Angela Wilkinson	Supports	Appreciate overall objective would like to see Seaburn for young families and older generation. Indoor activities tea rooms, children's activities, (not bandits and gambling). Visitor walk leading through various attractions. Many resorts abroad well organised. People want to take in the air, have a walk, and sit to have a drink, ice-cream or a snack (not just chips). Modern indoor leisure centre. Bulldoze Seaburn Centre and start again - indoor bowling alley, bowling green or adventure park. Think big, and compete with South Shields. Must keep some free parking otherwise visitors will park local streets. Cannot allow to happen year round as caused accidents, inconvenience and access problems for residents, our visitors and emergency services. Nice to see new housing in the area. Good to have events plan to use fields more often i.e cars/bike shows, food fairs, fashion shows and music events.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - The vision for Seaburn is as a family focused resort for people of all ages throughout the year. With regards to refreshments please see response to RSM70. <b>RESPONSE</b> - Proposals exist to develop an advisory/interpretive signage scheme encouraging responsible recreation and guide people to use less sensitive areas of the seafront. <b>RESPONSE</b> - With regards to the Seaburn Centre see main body of Cabinet Report. <b>RESPONSE</b> - With regards to parking see main body of Cabinet Report. <b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted <b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted
RSM137	Edward Flood	Supports	Pleased leisure/residential mix. Concerned loss of 2 large car parks on sea front adj Morrisons. Where will visitors park? May lead to two problems people use Morrisons car parks but conflicting chaos between shoppers/visitors or visitors will use residential streets unless permits implemented. Safety concerns.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted <b>RESPONSE</b> - With regards to parking please see main body of Cabinet Report.
RSM138	Terry Sandison	Objects	Against residential development. Building height should be restricted & properties not "affordable Gentoos" type. Playing fields & Seaburn Camp better sense to improve.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - With regards to housing see main body of Cabinet Report. <b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted
RSM139	Ross Hall	Supports	Encourage private sector investment i.e. indoor water park/aquarium of national scale attraction similar to theme parks like Alton Towers family friendly. Would increase need for accommodation in area/city centre. If attractions too small/local scale will not succeed only attract local people.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Much of development within the MDC area will be private sector led although on certain sites the council may seek to enter into partnership with developers in order to stimulate development and secure a high quality of development. <b>RESPONSE</b> - The introduction of an artificial reef for tourism purposes was given consideration by the project team early on. However it was considered that resources should initially be focused on the improvement of the onshore elements of the seafront. Therefore

21

				whilst such a proposal would be compatible with the aspirations of the overall Seafront Regeneration Strategy for Sunderland, it would be necessary for the private sector Artificial reef encourage scuba diving/underwater wildlife to the area e.g. sink old ship off coast suitable to shipbuilding heritage/incr tourism/additional business. Needs private sector investment to deliver an attraction of this kind.
RSM140	W Watson	Objects	1. Neither consultation findings nor regen strategy identified residential use as priority. Some residential may be required (for financial reasons) but 40% of footprint excessive and against stated aim of the masterplan leisure and associated uses.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Development parameters set out in the Masterplan and Design Code have been prepared in the context of existing views to and from the seafront and countryside. The scales proposed are not significantly greater than that of existing buildings currently on the site and it is considered that the site could accommodate a greater density of development than is there currently - the current development appearing fragmented and lacking continuity. In developing Seaburn as a 'destination' for both visitors and residents it is considered that future proposals at Ocean Park should provide a greater arrival experience and more unified 'street scene', whilst not detracting from the context of the area. With regards to housing see main body of Cabinet Report.
			2. The residential use at the northern nexus bus turnaround is considered a major mistake, this will remove approximately 1/3 of the available view across the camp field from the coast road. The SWOT analysis identified the enhancing of existing views and provision of visual links with surrounding areas of open green space as an opportunity, this small residential addition goes against this opportunity. Similarly the Constraints Plan has failed to identify this very important view across the open countryside.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - In terms of the bus turning head, longer distance views across the site to the west will largely still be visible. In addition due to the angle of the road, when adjacent to the turning head and approaching from the the south, views to the west from Whitburn Road are partially obscured by existing houses. In approaching from the north views to the south west from the Coast Road will be partially lost, although these are not as long-distance and are obscured already by existing Morrisons and Seafields developments. Currently the turning head does not represent a particularly attractive foreground to the views to the west. It is anticipated that a high quality new development in accordance with the design criteria set out in the Masterplan and Design Code could better benefit the views across the countryside.
			3. The building height of 4 to 5 stories and density at the coast road is considered too great in relation to the seafront and open countryside into which the development sits, in effect visually 'too much' development.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - The Masterplan seeks to balance the regeneration and development aspirations for the Seaburn area with the natural qualities of the local area. It is considered that this can largely be achieved even where certain elements of development are of a greater scale and density than current buildings. In some cases there will be elements where existing views may be lost. However in taking a comprehensive approach to developing the masterplan, it is considered that the net outcome will be greater for views across the site and the open countryside which lies beyond the Masterplan study area and improved framing of key views into and out of the site through the development of high quality buildings. Where development takes place, any loss of open space is to be offset by provision of replacement green space of improved quality than that which precedes it.
			4. This consultation should perhaps have included an additional option - 'object in part' as the strategy proposal of developing the seafront is to be welcomed.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted
			5. Why not include the other two seafront shelters in any facelift so that there is continuity along the seafront.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - The Seaburn Shelter, is the only site deemed appropriate for redevelopment within the lifetime of the MDC. Whilst minor changes may be made to the other shelters it is not considered relevant to include such details.
			6. The master plan has not included any proposals / suggestions etc. as too what leisure or associated uses the development will seek to fulfill, this would appear to be a starting point for then deciding the extent and size of the buildings required.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - The purpose of the MDC is to set out broad planning and design parameters, it is not the role of the MDC to identify specific uses, as this would be overly restrictive to potential developers. Consequently it is the responsibility of the developer to bring forward proposals for detailed uses which the council will then assess upon their own merits.
RSM141	A Siggins	Objects	Seaburn is residential area. Concerned area will become more dog unfriendly, antisocial behaviour, litter. Noise at weekends, due to activities on the seafront and in Roker Park, are not reasonable for residents.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Whilst Seaburn is considered to be a key asset to Sunderland's tourist economy, the council will pay due regard to noise considerations in determining planning applications for leisure uses, including the need for methods of mitigation. For further information on housing see main body of Cabinet Report.
RSM142	Brian Davison	Supports	Glad new park area being considered as Roker Park unconnected to sea front. Hopefully park's visibility will be similar in appearance to South Shields' park.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted
			Links to seafront from town centre/outlying districts some distance, unlike South Shields logistics. Public transport access little awareness, buses head along sea front to S. Shields as final destination. Needs prominent, identifiable and readily accessible bus service around Wearside.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - The council will prepare a travel plan to maximise public transport opportunities throughout Seaburn. The council will also seek developer contributions towards bus stop improvements, and during the latter phases of development through the provision of a shuttle service linking the seafront with the city centre.
			Keen to see cycle ways improved.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted
			Amusements arcades eyesore, limit to travelling shows and during high season only.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Careful consideration will need to be given to prevent an over-proliferation of licensed premises detracting from the resort's family focus.
			Aim to avoid cheap drinking joints.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - With regards to amusement arcades please see response to RSM10.

RSM143	Ken Spencer	Objects	Car parking facilities are by far the worst for seafront in GB. Seaburn shelter good idea. Housing will do nothing.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - With regards to parking please see main body of Cabinet Report. <b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted. <b>RESPONSE</b> - With regards to housing please see main body of Cabinet Report.
			Modern facilities for in-line roller skating, skate boarding, biking, ice skating, are missing from the city as a whole.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Whilst the leisure facilities suggested may be compatible with the vision of the MDC as a family focused leisure resort, it is the purpose of the document to set out broad planning and design parameters not specific uses.
			Only more celebration and a pride displayed for the great traditions and enormous national contribution of Sunderland will bring tourism i.e. ships, engineering, mining.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted
RSM144	William Harrison	Supports	Need more attraction to the walkway on the front ideal business opportunity for market huts and traders.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Refreshment facilities are considered important in attracting people to the seafront particularly along the promenade, resulting in a development brief being prepared for Seaburn Shelter for a café/restaurant. Food and drink uses are also appropriate within the leisure and entertainment core.
			Pay and display parking i.e. South Shields - revenue. Rear of Pullman already introduced Pay and Display, permit scheme for residents in surrounding streets help with air show: model like Durham CC, reduced need for waiting restrictions which upset residents.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - As new parking provision is provided, charging may be considered. However, such proposals are considered overly prescriptive for the MDC which has been prepared to set out broad planning and design parameters.
RSM145	T MacDonald	Supports	Action required. Don't compare to S Shields, better it. Need volunteers to help clean area.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted
RSM146	S Wright	Supports	What's going to attract visitors, only weekend busy is air show. Families need to be attracted i.e. Sea Life centre, model railway, boating lake, more things for families to do.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - The council recognises that Seaburn does not currently fulfil its potential. Consequently the MDC has been prepared to regenerate the area. The council envisages the MDC will increase developer confidence/interest through promoting leisure and entertainment uses.
			Don't like the units on the front. The improvement to the seating and promenade is long over due.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted
			Public toilets are massive issue for visitors, toilet opp Marriott not been open this year.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - With regards to toilet provision see main body of Cabinet Report.
RSM147	Eric Glasper	Supports	Welcome improvement but please do something about it soon. We have had too much waste of time & taxpayers money talking about Sunderland's future and not enough action.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - With regards to timescales please see response to RSM11.
RSM148	Dr Myra McDonald	Supports	Support regeneration of seafront. Plan underestimates need for public transport to underpin planned developments. Public transport currently deplorable, especially evenings/summer period when busy. Metro could be more widely used as for people from further afield if onward bus transport links were available (need to improve signposting from Metro stations to Sunderland attractions). Shuttle service linking Stadium of Light/St Peter's Metro/Roker/Seaburn and Seaburn Metro would encourage visitors from Sunderland/further afield and greatly improve general accessibility to a variety of Sunderland attractions.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted <b>RESPONSE</b> - Planning applications for development will be assessed against accessibility particularly in relation to public transport. Mechanisms are also available i.e. planning obligations will be explored with prospective developers to enhance the provision of public transport to, from and through the masterplan area. In addition whilst the council cannot guarantee increased bus service/frequency, the council is keen to participate in discussion with Nexus and developers to ensure adequate provision is maintained, and where appropriate, expanded.
			Cafes and restaurants are to be welcomed.	Developer contributions will be sought from the latter phases of development towards a seasonal shuttle bus service between Seaburn/city centre to supplement existing provision. <b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted
			Housing developments should ensure affordable housing and not be aimed solely at affluent.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - With regards to housing see main body of Cabinet Report.
			Outdoor/indoor play areas need to be incorporated.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - In relation to indoor play facilities see response to RSM13.
			Green areas preserved/improved need sufficient priority relative to commercial development interests).	<b>RESPONSE</b> - With regards to open space provision please see response to RSM90.
			Litter management extremely important if area to be maintained/ improved.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - See RSM4 in relation to litter management.
			Flood defences need careful assessment if developments are to be sustainable.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - The council has recently prepared (2010) a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment which identifies measures to ensure flood risk is minimised. All development is required to link in with the future flood risk management strategy for coastal defences and land around Cut Throat Dene will be retained as open space.  In relation to surface water flooding all development should maximise opportunities to improve surface water drainage, through incorporating storage or reducing conveyance.
RSM149	G Nixon	Objects	How can converting public shelter to private restaurant promote tourism in Seaburn.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - The Seaburn Shelter is the only site deemed appropriate for development on the east side of Whitburn Road and is vital to the regeneration of the area. Part of this

				redevelopment will also include the incorporation of new public toilets and a Changing Places facility for disabled people (the first on the seafront). The redevelopment of the Seaburn Shelter is intended to provide activity throughout the year where people are able to enjoy refreshments whilst taking in sea views.
			Scheme revolves around building of houses on publicly owned land.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - With regards to housing please see main body of the Cabinet Report.
RSM150	E R Ambrose	Objects	Potential previously wasted, every effort must be made for residents to enjoy facilities/attract visitors. Will bring much needed revenue.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted
			No provision visitor for car/coach parking. Current parking should remain.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - With regards to parking see main body of the Cabinet Report.
			No further residential building on Whitburn Road. Residential development only allowed adjacent to Seafields.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - With regards to housing main body of the Cabinet Report.
			Toilet facilities are required along the sea front not just on air show weekend.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - With regards to toilet provision see main body of Cabinet Report.
RSM151	Mr Smith	Objects	Loss of free, convenient, car park adj. Morrisons serious flaw. Need free car parking will still exist and just be transformed to existing residential streets.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - With regards to parking please see main body of Cabinet Report.
			New residential development means loss of valuable public amenity space.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - With regards to housing see main body of Cabinet Report.
RSM152	Freda & Dave Leeming	Supports	Plan would improve area.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted
			Lacks major vision, primarily designed to bring revenue in to the council through sale of land for housing (and Council Tax) provision of large commercial units which bring a financial return to both occupiers and council. Missed opportunity.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - The MDC has been prepared as an ambitious but deliverable plan. Consequently uses have been identified in order for regeneration to be viable, it is not considered that there is a sufficient gap in the market for large scale seaside related leisure attractions. For further information on housing see main body of Cabinet Report.
			Car Parking – existing mostly under-used but loss of all other than Morrison’s increase visitor on-street congestion parking, other than when controlled.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - With regards to parking please see main body of Cabinet Report.
			Devt. will modernise/smarten area, visitors more to do, nothing suggested unique/grand enough attract extra visitors from wider area than at present. Plans concentrate on small area of Seaburn seafront rather than whole seafront.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - The Seafront Regeneration Strategy acts as the overarching document in the regeneration of the seafront for both Roker and Seaburn. The MDC concentrates specifically on the Seaburn area in supporting the delivery of objectives set out for the Seaburn character area within the SRS. The scale of facilities need to be of an appropriate to prevent harm the vitality of the city centre.
			Sunderland coast lot of positives. Council must build on strengths. Proposals seem to fall way short of this.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted
RSM153	George Jackson	Non given	Why sell WC’s for private development so no more public toilets.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - For toilet provision see main body of Cabinet Report.
			To rely on private enterprise funds is folly, more careful thought and research needs to be put in.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - At the present time the council has limited funding for investment. Market testing has identified genuine private sector interest. The MDC has been prepared to be phased over 10-15 years allowing for changes in the economy.
RSM154	Mark James Holland	Support and Objects	P30-31 Object to ‘catchment and demand has increased.’	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted
			Theme park would be huge benefit to area. Outdoor swimming pool with bar interesting prospect i.e. Stanhope.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - For swimming pool provision see response to RSM2. For info relating to large scale attractions see RSM40.
RSM155	L Nixon	Support and Object	Worried about small businesses on Queens Parade – is there enough business support all re mixed use ‘C&D’ in the new development.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - The council will work closely with existing businesses and landowners to ensure their needs are represented. All existing businesses will be retained including those along Queens Parade. The intention of the MDC is to preserve and enhance the range of existing businesses and services currently on offer along the seafront and to ensure the longevity of these businesses.
RSM156	Daisy Campbell	Non given	Beach safety important.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Beach safety is of paramount importance for the council.
RSM157	K Brown	Supports	Build tall landmark can be seen when Great North Run cameras at South Shields.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - The MDC sets out principles in relation to building heights. Buildings of up to 6 storeys may be acceptable further away from dwellings. However, additional storeys are unlikely to be acceptable unless it can be demonstrated that they would not cause harm to the residential and visual amenity of the area or the wider environment.
RSM158	T Shevlin	Objects	Used Seaburn Centre since opened as have lots of friends.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - For Seaburn Centre see main body of Cabinet Report.
RSM159	J McDermott	Objects	Any proposals should include sports and recreation facilities.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - For Seaburn Centre see main body of Cabinet Report.
RSM160	Mr G Meek	Objects	Keep Seaburn Centre used by lots of people.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - For Seaburn Centre see main body of Cabinet Report.
RSM161	Mr G Meek	Objects	Keep Seaburn Centre.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - For Seaburn Centre see main body of Cabinet Report.
RSM162	Mrs J Meek	Objects	Keep Seaburn Centre.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - For Seaburn Centre see main body of Cabinet Report.
RSM163	S Lamb	Objects	Strongly object to proposed closure of Seaburn Centre.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - For Seaburn Centre see main body of Cabinet Report.
RSM164	Mr M Furness	Objects	Seaburn Centre fills recreational need.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - For Seaburn Centre see main body of Cabinet Report.
RSM165	Dwane Pipe	Supports	Very good.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted

RSM166	Thomas Guespie	Supports	Looks amazing can't wait.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted
RSM167	Glen Hargrave		Extend Fulwell skatepark before anything.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - The Seaburn skate park lies outside of the boundaries of the MDC and as such is under the remit of other LDF documents.
RSM168	Chelsey Robins	Supports	Staff very kind and welcoming.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted
RSM169	J Chattenton	Supports	Swimming pool would be appreciated by day trippers when weather bad. Not everyone knows where Aqua Centre is.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - For swimming pool provision see RSM2.
RSM170	Anomynous	Objects	Keep Seaburn Centre. Boxing Day dip? Airshow? Sunderland football club winning a trophy?	<b>RESPONSE</b> - For Seaburn Centre see main body of Cabinet Report. Comment Noted
RSM171	A England	Objects	Hope will not cause increase in noise or traffic especially late at night.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Balancing the needs of local residents whilst promoting Seaburn's growth as a resort is vital to the success of the MDC. Consequently in considering the design and location of developments noise will be of utmost importance minimising impacts on residents. With regards to traffic please see response to RSM74.
RSM172	Sophie Douthwaite	Supports	Like beach activities, like dips in sea, surfing.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted
RSM173	Lynn Carrington	Supports	Swimming pool would be draw for bad weather.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - For swimming pool provision see RSM2.
RSM174	W Browning	Objects to some	Retain Seaburn Centre. Council lose revenue from cancelled gym memberships. Supposed to be encouraging healthy lifestyle.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - For Seaburn Centre see main body of Cabinet Report.
RSM175	Anomynous	Supports	Need more shops at seafront	<b>RESPONSE</b> - The MDC recognises that there has been little retail development due to the presence of Morrisons and nearby Sea Road local centre. Limited retail development in the form of specialist retailers catering for the foreshore location and leisure orientated character of the area may be acceptable.
RSM176	Anomynous	Non given	These plans will never happen.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted
RSM177	Doreen Whitwell	Objects	Shouldn't extend buildings to sea side of road. Enough clutter on other side. Leave grass and view undisturbed.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - The only site acceptable for development on the eastern side of Whitburn Road is the Seaburn Shelter. Retaining views is key to redevelopment of site.
RSM178	William Burdon	Supports	S. Shields received £20m European grant recently. Sunderland lagged behind in completing upgrade Roker/Seaburn most certainly a priority.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted
RSM179	John Lloyd	Non given	Keep Seaburn Centre used for many years	<b>RESPONSE</b> - For Seaburn Centre see main body of Cabinet Report.
RSM180	Mrs M Todner	Objects	Why centre of plan huge chunk of parking. Another eyesore? Park machines underground and leave space for people to use. Is the only thing we're good at/good for another car park.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - The MDC will take a carefully managed approach to location and design of new car parks ensuring suitable provision for visitors. Underground car parks may be considered as part of a development proposal. However, these often require significant investment which can harm the viability of development.
RSM181	W Craddock	Supports	Million just start, investments i.e. Bridlington excellent family resort. A good start, toilets up to standard.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted. For toilet provision see main body of Cabinet Report.
			Black/sponsored seats facing sea.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - For seats facing sea see RSM33.
RSM182	L Hughes	Supports	More control of parking on main road.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - As part of the MDC a new approach to parking will be undertaken, ensuring greater pedestrian priority on Whitburn Road and less dominance of motorised vehicles.
RSM183	Anomynous	Neither (plans inadequate)	Where are the public toilets?	<b>RESPONSE</b> - For toilet provision please see main body of Cabinet Report.
RSM184	H Schell	Objects	Looks awful. Sunderland council/officials so badly informed about city developments. Much better as it is.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted
RSM185	Ron McQuillan	Objects	Seaburn expenditure low priority. First priority for 90% plus of population 1) New river road crossing to utilise existing roads. 2) Conserve industrial land from Q. Alexandra Bridge to Groves site for industrial use. 3) Develop leisure potential of Wear by constructing a barrage e.g. Tees.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - The Seaburn MDC focuses on the regeneration of Seaburn as a family focused resort. The areas identified by the respondees are outside of the boundaries of the MDC and are therefore not included within the document and are covered elsewhere within the LDF.
RSM186	Marilyn Fairs	Supports	Good plan long awaited improvements. Train and paddling pool would be excellent.	<b>RESPONSE</b> - Comment Noted. The facilities suggested may be compatible with vision for Seaburn as family focused resort. However, MDC's purpose set out broad planning and design parameters not detail specific uses.