

**Subject:** Fw: PLANNING APPLICATIONS 11/0198/FUL and 11/020/76/FUL

**Subject:** PLANNING APPLICATIONS 11/0198/FUL and 11/020/76/FUL

Dear Ms. V. Rising,

With reference to the above applications I wish to express my concerns that the democratic position of residents within Springwell Village have been compromised by the lack of appropriate, detailed consultation on the most important issues relevant to these applications.

Within your Department Report to Committee dated 13 Dec 2011, I raise the following points of concern.

POINT1 As Council Tax payers to City of Sunderland we have not been adequately consulted,( the proposal is on Gateshead land but planning consent is to given by Cof SC....an anomaly in its self!!).

POINT 2. I refer to your Document 13/12/2011,.....PAGE 2.....The report indicates `that representations made have been considered.` The Appendix refers to 4 letters of objection and 1 petition of some 307 signatures!!

Does Committee seriously consider that this is a fair and reasonable number of objections to a scheme of this magnitude? Would more have been expected?

I can assure Committee that HAD CONSULTATION BEEN WIDE REACHING THE COUNCIL WOULD HAVE BEEN INUNDATED.

I suggest that the Council has failed to consult fully on both planning applications now at Committee stage. Council has a problem , officers have NOT carried out their responsibilities fully. The letter of the law may well have been fulfilled, \officers may well have complied with the Council`s policy on public consultation( Report page 13) but they have failed to reach the target audience. In particular, the officers failed to reach the local population within Springwell Village. On the basis of such findings , the MOTION must be ` TO DEFER.`

POINT 3 Traffic Movements ...Page12/13...Indicates the inclusion of route 5 via Springwell Village....had consultation been adequate then many letters of objection would have been dispatched to the Council Officers on this issue. As consultation was inadequate Council received no letters !!

POINT 4 DEMOCRACY and REPRESENTATION...(Report page 13)...states 8 Public Notices were displayed within the Gateshead area, 98 notification letters were sent to `neighbours` of the site (again within Gateshead). It is very kind of Sunderland council to raise notices in Gateshead but why did they fail to do so in Springwell Village? Futher the local shop in Springwell Village fails to stock the Sunderland Echo. Whilst I accept

`that the LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY cannot cater for everyones individual preference in relation to their preferred publication`, this is hardly DEMOCRATIC if

the local newsagent fails to meet the requirement of the Council and stock a specific publication. The Sunderland Echo is not a stocked item at the local newsagent!

POINT 5 Therefore I must refer to paragraph 3 (report page 14) and simply state ``you cannot be serious``. I would state that the Council has failed to ascertain the `true feeling` of residents within Springwell Village. There is a difference of approach to the same question. Clearly the Council Officers can `hide the `true level of objection` if it fails to undertake targeted methodology in the first place.

POINT 6 (Report page 16 paragraph 4) refers to a public meeting and the reason why such a request was declined, perhaps the Head of Planning and Environment would welcome the opportunity to reconsider in the light of the points raised in this letter?

It is with regret that residents of Springwell Village have NOT had the democratic opportunity to make democratic representation to Council on this most important matter.

Please defer until Council is certain it has fulfilled its moral as well as legal duty to keep its own Council Tax payers informed of such developments.

yours

elsie jones.