

| Reference | Respondent | Relevant Masterplan, SA, AA Paragraph | Comment | Proposed Action |
|-----------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| | Nexus | Page 19 | Respondent strongly disagrees with the statement that public transport is infrequent in the Seaburn area and identifies the fact that the area benefits from between 6-9 buses an hour depending on the time of day. | ACTION – Omit bullet point from SWOT referring to infrequent public transport on page 19 |
| | | Page 28 | The site ownership plan on page 28 does not identify land owned by Nexus, which will influence the delivery of the site. | ACTION – Update land ownership plan to include land owned and controlled by Nexus on page 28 |
| | | Page 38 | <p>Following on from the above, urban design principles plan shows residential development on Nexus owned land. This should be discussed with a Nexus Property Manager.</p> <p>The urban design principles plan shows 'what appears to be' the diversion of the coast road inland. Nexus would like to emphasize the importance of the main South Shields – Sunderland bus route remaining on the direct route along the coast.</p> | <p>RESPONSE – The council has met with representatives from Nexus from both their planning and property teams. They have confirmed with us that the turning head which is currently located at Seaburn is no longer in use and that alternative uses for the site are likely to be sought.</p> <p>As the site is currently allocated as 'White Land' within the UDP and is not controlled under any site specific planning policies, the council thought it to be prudent to identify the site as appropriate for residential purposes. This decision has been taken following an assessment of surrounding land uses and identification of appropriate land uses for the site. Nexus has stated that it supports this approach.</p> <p>RESPONSE – The masterplan includes a proposal to narrow the current Whitburn Road to lessen its dominance on the surrounding area. This is identified on the 'urban design principles plan' through showing this section of street as a 'Secondary Street'. This is misleading. Whilst being narrowed, the proposed road width will still be sufficient to accommodate a bus route and free flowing traffic, albeit calmed through a range of design features. Whilst the proposed masterplan will include the realignment and widening of Lowry Road, this will not be at the cost of down grading Whitburn Road and instead is intended as an alternative route. This is fully explained in the later stages of the masterplan and design code.</p> <p>ACTION – Review the urban design principles plan on page 38 to make clearer the council's aspirations for Whitburn Road.</p> |
| | | Page 39 | The urban design principles for the masterplan do not include any reference to the need to provide access or enable public transport provision. | ACTION – Update the 'Access' section on page 39 to include reference to the role and use of public transport within the masterplan. |
| | | Page 77 | Supports the need for additional bus stops to be provided within the scheme but feel one should be provided closer to the existing Morrisons Foodstore. | <p>RESPONSE – This is an issue which has arisen following the public consultation, with a number of attendees highlighting this issue. This was looked at as an option but there were concerns with regard to the impact a bus stop in this location will have on the traffic capacity of this road bend – a location which historically has an issue with congestion.</p> <p>ACTION – Explore appropriate opportunities to locate a new bus stop in an appropriate location as close as possible to the existing Morrison Foodstore and change masterplan accordingly. Need to discuss with colleagues in the council's highways team.</p> |
| | Homes and Communities Agency | Section 2.2 Page 7 | The objectives behind the SPD are supported, but they do not include reference to the role of energy efficiency and promoting sustainable development. | ACTION – Amend/add to objectives on page 7 to include reference to the need to deliver sustainable developments through the masterplan. |

| | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| | <p>Section 3.2 Page 8</p> | <p>There is a concern that as the adjacent Seaburn Camp Site is likely to be allocated for residential uses in the forthcoming Core Strategy and so is not to be included within the current masterplan, that the masterplan is therefore premature and should be drawn up in tandem to the Core Strategy and Site Allocations Development Plan Document</p> | <p>RESPONSE – The Seaburn Seafront is subject to a high level of developer interest and the council is keen to postpone development until a comprehensive masterplan for the site can be adopted to ensure individual sites are developed according to a single approach.</p> <p>Currently the adjacent Seaburn Camp Site is allocated as protected open space within the UDP, and to identify this site as appropriate for residential uses within the masterplan would therefore represent a departure from planning policy. This is unlikely to change until the publication of the Site Allocations DPD which is likely to reallocate the land for residential uses, a document which is not due to be adopted for a number of years.</p> <p>The council are therefore concerned that to wait for the adoption of the Site Allocations DPD before bringing forward a masterplan of the site would unduly delay the redevelopment of the Seaburn Site. This would have the potential of turn away development and investment and have a detrimental impact of the development potential of the wider seafront.</p> <p>The council has therefore adopted a masterplan boundary which excludes the Seaburn Camp Site. This has a number of benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provides infrastructure to the adjacent Seaburn Camp Site to enable any future development if/when the site is allocated for development in the future ▪ Does not require release of the Site Allocations DPD to be released prior to the masterplan being adopted ▪ Satisfies current developer interest without imposing undue delay and allowing the site to be developed sooner. |
| | <p>Section 3.4 Page 14</p> | <p>There is concern that in this section discussing the failures of the existing site, including the lack of maintenance of areas of open space, there is no mention of the important role maintenance will play in the future redevelopment of the site.</p> | <p>RESPONSE – The section is a factual assessment of the existing site and is not the appropriate time to make recommendations and/or proposals. The important role of maintenance is discussed in the later stages of the document, in terms of design in section 9.9: Landscape of the design code, and section 10 Implementation.</p> |
| | <p>Section 3.4 Page 15</p> | <p>The section 3.4 on Built Form on page 15, there is a discussion of 3 sub-areas of varying built form which are not identified on the land use plan which follows on page 16. The respondent feels it would be useful for the land use plan to correspond to the preceding text.</p> | <p>ACTION – Amend land use plan on page 16 to better relate to the text on Built form in section 3,4</p> |
| | <p>Section 3.5 Page 17</p> | <p>This section discusses the findings that the Seaburn area has a higher than average affluent and elderly population. The respondent feels this should be borne in mind in ensuring suitable facilities are provided for the community (incl. seating, shelters, toilets)</p> <p>The respondent states that the site has value for amenity and as a landscape resource, suggesting that an assessment of the sites assets be made and retained in order to mitigate</p> | <p>RESPONSE – The demographic makeup of the surrounding community has been a key influencing factor guiding the masterplan. Whilst included within the masterplan site, a separate project is currently underway to redevelopment the Seaburn Promenade in providing new seating, shelters and toilet facilities along the sea front. The masterplan also encourages such facilities within the wider masterplan, specifically in section 9.9 which discusses landscaping.</p> <p>In terms of being more prescriptive with regard to built facilities throughout the masterplan, the council are keen to ensure the masterplan has freedom to allow for flexibility and creativity on behalf of potential applicants. However, this is in line with a number of criteria and codes as highlighted in the design code which must be satisfied by the applicant, and ensures the needs of the surrounding community are adequately met.</p> <p>RESPONSE – A comprehensive Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Appropriate Assessment (AA) have been published and supplement the masterplan and design</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | <p>the impacts development has on local amenity, ecology and biodiversity. They also make recommendations that an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) be drafted at a project level to identify the possible impacts the masterplan may have on surrounding sites of importance</p> | <p>code document. Both documents identify key assets and constraints associated with the site and offers recommendations on how they can be approached to deliver a scheme which has the most beneficial impact on the surrounding environment.</p> <p>Where concerns exist with regard to any detrimental impacts the masterplan may have on its surroundings, a list of recommendations on possible mitigation measures have also been provided and incorporated into the masterplan where possible.</p> <p>As a consequence of these documents, which have benefitted from the involvement of the Environment Agency and Natural England, the council are confident the proposed masterplan adequately mitigates any potential detrimental impacts which threaten the success of the masterplan.</p> <p>The council are also of a view that at this stage of the planning process, it would be inappropriate to initiate an EIA. To date, the masterplan represents an indication of how the council wishes the masterplan area to be developed. The purely indicative nature of the masterplan means that no scale or quantum of development is guaranteed, and consequently would bring the meaningfulness of any EIA into question. Notwithstanding the above, the council clearly states its expectations that all prospective developer should submit an EIA screening opinion for any major development on the site, a process which will be undertaken at the application stages of the scheme.</p> |
| | | <p>Section 3.6 Page 21</p> | <p>The respondent welcomes the inclusion of the SWOT analysis and the constraints plan, but whilst the document states these are not exhaustive, the respondent questions if there are other constraints which should be included (services, sewers, nature/heritage constraints)</p> | <p>RESPONSE – The council sees the purpose of the SWOT analysis and constraints plan to highlight design considerations and constraints which otherwise may be overlooked if the masterplan document did not exist. It draws attention to the key issues the council would like to see addressed as well as assets the council would encourage be harnessed.</p> <p>As other features such as planning designations and planning constraints are addressed later in the document, and features such as services are a common and compulsory consideration as part of a standard planning application, the council does not see any value in adding yet more detail and possible confusion to the current constraints plan.</p> |
| | | <p>Section 4.1 Page 24</p> | <p>This section refers to the Sunderland DMP, an acronym which needs to be fully explained.</p> | <p>ACTION – This is an error on the council's behalf and should read EMP (Economic Masterplan). Amend paragraph and replace “DMP” with “Economic Masterplan”</p> |
| | | <p>Section 4.1 Page 25</p> | <p>The respondent is of the view that the UDP site specific allocation plan should include all planning policies which influence development on the site. The current approach adopted by the council shows policies which only effect part of the site, and refers the reader to proceeding text highlighting all policies (incl. general or city wide policies) which may also effect development on the site.</p> | <p>RESPONSE – It is the view of the council that it would be inappropriate to include all site specific and city wide planning policies on a single plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It could encourage the reader to depend solely on the contents of the map without referring to the written text which accompanies the plan. In clearly stating that the reader needs to refer to the accompanying text as well as looking at the plan, the reader is more likely to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the sites policy constraints than they would by simply looking at a plan. ▪ There are a total of 18 UPD policies which influence development on this site, of which only 7 are site specific and effecting part of the site. To include all 18 policies on the plan would likely make it illegible to read and is likely to impede the plans usefulness. |

| | | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------------|---|---|
| | | Section 5 Page 28 | The respondent is of the view that the land ownership plan is not clear. The current approach of the council is to identify all land which is not owned by the council and thus is subject to leases/covenants. Any remaining land which is not allocated on the plan is therefore owned by the council. | RESPONSE – The council is of the view that there is no benefit to identifying council owned land on the plan, when the plan clearly states that all land on the plan is council own unless otherwise stated. Adopting this approach is again likely to increase confusion and be detrimental to the legibility of the plan. ACTION – amend text on plan key to read: “ Remaining land within the redline boundary not allocated under the above is council owned and therefore not subject to lease/covenants” |
| | | Section 5.4 Page 27 | This section re-discusses the benefits of having a masterplan for the site, and the respondent questions if this is the write location for such a discussion | ACTION – Omit para. 3 of section 5.4 on page 27. |
| | | Section 5.5 Pages 30-33 | Concern over the style of writing which differs from earlier elements of the document | RESPONSE – This section will be reviewed as part of wider consideration of all aspects of the draft document and changes made where it is felt necessary (including matters relating to style). |
| | | Section 6.1 Page 34 | Para. 2 of section 6.1 on page 34 is confusing and uses a mixture of tenses. The respondent feels the section could be strengthened with a discussion on the various masterplan options explored and reasoning behind the final approach which was adopted. | RESPONSE – The approach discussed by the respondent was the approach originally adopted by the council, but this information was omitted from the consultation document so not to confuse the reader of what was actually being consulted on. It was always the intention of the council to reintroduce this section in the final document. ACTION – To review section 6.1 on page 34 and discuss the masterplan option discussed, their relevant strengths and weaknesses, and reason for rejection. |
| | | Section 7.0 Page 37 | This chapter only contains a single section (7.1 Masterplan principles) and yet it is given a sub-heading number. Respondent recommends the sub-heading title be removed. | ACTION – Omit sub-heading title “7.1 Masterplan principle” |
| | | Section 7.1 Page 37 | Uses – Respondent asks if there are there any local facilities for surrounding residents such as schools, post offices, hairdressers etc? Will there be any tourist type shops for example for souvenirs and leisure clothing. Layout – Respondent suggests reference should be made that uses fronting onto the coast needing to be “active uses” to make the most of windows and internal spaces promoting new life (although it is acknowledged this topic is discussed later in the document) Access – Respondent suggests reference should be made to the need to promote green and sustainable forms of transport. Landscape - Respondent suggests reference should be made with regard to maintenance and the choice of appropriate species | RESPONSE – The masterplan document offers a clear indication into the type of uses appropriate for the masterplan site, as well as recognising the type of uses which the council deem inappropriate. Due to the scale and quantum of the development, it is unlikely the scheme will be of the threshold appropriate for delivering larger facilities such as schools. With regard to smaller uses, such as a specific type of shop, the council are of the view that this would be inappropriate for a planning document, the remit of which will only cover uses classes as included within the Use Class Order 2010. The masterplan document will therefore be unable to dictate the type of business on the site beyond that of the Use Class Order. RESPONSE – As the respondent has recognised, this issue has been dealt with through the later stages of the document, and consequently the council does not see the benefit of highlighting this point at this stage of the document. RESPONSE – This is an over site of the council and agrees with the recommendation of the respondent. See Nexus comments. ACTION – Update the ‘Access’ section on page 39 to include reference to the role and use of public transport within the masterplan. RESPONSE – As the respondent has recognised, this issue has been dealt with through the later stages of the document, and consequently the council does not see the benefit of highlighting this point at this stage of the document. |

| | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|
| | | Section 8.0 Page 40 | The indicative masterplan shows a number of residential units. However, the respondent is unclear to the numbers and tenures of the suggested dwellings which would be acceptable and whether the council consider the provision of house as mandatory or acceptable. | RESPONSE – The illustrative masterplan in indication of how the masterplan area can be developed in line with the criteria included within the design code. The masterplan in the document is therefore an interpretation of how the site could be developed. The masterplan has also been designed to be flexible. With a life span of between 10-15 years, the council feel it would be inappropriate to prescribe the specific numbers and tenures of dwelling on the site as this will not accommodate the likely future changes in the regional and national economy. The council has therefore taken the approach to allow dwelling numbers and tenures to be guided by the relevant planning policies of the time, and instead use the masterplan and design code document as a control on quality instead. |
| | | Section 9.1 Page 47 | Para. 4 currently reads “levels of activity are to be significantly reduced in the park to complement the areas more intimate residential character” The respondent suggests that activity should be promoted in the park to ensure the area is safe, vibrant, and does not become isolated. | RESPONSE – This statement is meant to be interpreted as less activity than its surrounding areas but the council appreciates this can be misleading. The council will not discourage activity in the residential park area of the masterplan, but will expect activity to be significantly less than that of the commercial and entertainment core. ACTION – To replace para. 4 of page 47 “Levels of activity within this area are to be significantly lower than that of the entertainment and leisure core to complement the areas more intimate residential character” |
| | | Section 9.4 Page 57 | Bullet point 7 currently states that no building in the masterplan area will be allowed to exceed 6 storeys or 18m in height. The respondent is of the opinion that such stringent height limits should not be applied as a taller structure may be able to provide and attractive focal point to the area. | RESPONSE – The council accepts this opinion. ACTION – Add an additional bullet point to page 57 stating “ No building heights will be permitted to exceed the maximum build heights stated unless in exceptional circumstances where it can be demonstrated the building is of an exemplar quality and is in the public interests of the masterplan and wider area” |
| | | Section 9.4 Page 58 | The respondent is of the view that some additional 3 storey elements for corner and feature buildings within the residential area could be considered appropriate. This is currently not shown on the building heights plan. | RESPONSE – As will all plans within the document, the building height plan is illustrative only. This point is made in bullet point 5 on page 57. ACTION – Amend bullet point 5 to correct grammatical error. |
| | | Section 9.9 Page 85 | The respondent is of the opinion that para. 2 of page 85 implies that standard catalogue street furniture is acceptable whereas bespoke design is not. | RESPONSE – The council is of the opinion that the paragraphs reference to “reputable supplier” is appropriate enough to include catalogue mass produce furniture as well as bespoke design from a range of companies. The council is of the view that quality is of primary importance with regard to furniture design. |
| | DPTAC | General Comment | Asked to be removed from the councils Consultation Database as their remit does not cover regeneration masterplans. Otherwise, no comments specific to the document was made. | ACTION – Remove DPTAC from Planning Consultation database |
| | English Heritage | General Comment | The respondent has no objection to make with the masterplan as they recognise it does not affect the setting or impact upon any designated heritage assets. That said, the respondent acknowledges that the project team should work with the councils conservation team to identify and locally significant heritage assets which may be included within the councils forthcoming Local Heritage Designations SPD | RESPONSE – The project team has undertaken a significant amount of consultation with the councils conservation team to identify any local heritage assets which may be affected as a consequence of the proposed masterplan. No such assets to date have been identified. Notwithstanding the above, the conservation team remain an important consultee within the masterplan project, and will be involved in all future phases of the masterplan |

| | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | and will be consulted in the event of any planning applications which come forward as a consequence of the masterplan. |
| | Theatres Trust | General Comment | The respondent supports the objectives of the masterplan, specifically with regard to making Seaburn a 'focal point for investment towards the development of cultural and tourism attractions'. They also suggest that this objective is supported through use of Block E (the Seaburn Shelter) as an outdoor amphitheatre which extends out to the sea. | RESPONSE – It is the councils aspiration (as previously stated) to encourage cultural activities and events along the city's seafront. This is evident in the works which are currently underway at Roker Promenade which will see Holey Rock Corner redeveloped to form a natural amphitheatre and major public event space. Whilst it will be the councils intention to focus major events toward Holey Rock Corner, the council will explore other opportunities to provide additional secondary events spaces in other locations along the seafront where ever possible. This may include areas along the Seaburn Promenade. |
| | Coal Authority | General Comment | No comments to make | Comment noted |
| | Ministry of Defence | General Comment | The respondent supports the document and its content, although reemphasises the need for due consideration of the fact that the masterplan site sits within the Ministry of Defence Statutory Height Safeguard Zone. Consequently the respondent requests they be consulted on any future phases of the masterplan or any resulting major planning application to ensure they accord with the requirements of the safeguard zone. | RESPONSE – The council is aware of the ministry's safeguard zone and is committed to ensuring its database is up to date with their latest requirements. Notwithstanding the above, the ministry is included within the councils consultation database and the council welcomes their future involvement in the future phases of the masterplan. |
| | Civil Aviation Authority | General Comment | The respondent states they do not wish to comment on the masterplan and have no objections to make. However, their response does go on to identify the criteria development has to address to accord with the CAA regulations. | RESPONSE – The criteria offered by the CAA has been duly noted and has (following previous consultations) been accommodated within the councils planning policy and planning application consultation process. The council therefore welcomes any future involvement the CAA may wish to have in the later stages of the masterplan and with any subsequent planning applications. |
| | Highways Agency | General Comment | The respondent is of the opinion that the masterplan proposed is unlikely to have any significant impact on the safe and efficient operation so the Strategic Road Network(SRN), which in the Sunderland Area include the A19 and the A1(M) and A193(M), and largely support the masterplan document. | Comment noted |
| | | Page 19 | The respondent feels the document does however lack specific reference to how the local road network will accommodate the increased traffic flows associated with the development, especially with regard to the potential from commuters using the residential element of the scheme, especially when considering the document states the area suffers from 'infrequent public transport' | RESPONSE – The reference to 'infrequent public transport' is an error on the council's part and will be omitted. In addition to this, the document will also be amended to reflect the council's commitment to encourage a modal shift towards sustainable modes of transport and to reduce the dependency on the use of private cars. |
| | Environment Agency | 5.4.10 | Sustainability Appraisal Incorrect wording, suggested alternative Seaburn is located above Magnesian Limestone rock (not Magnesium) which is classed as a principal aquifer. It represents an important source of drinking water within the region. Although it is not currently used in the Seaburn area it is an important resource and it needs to be protected against the risk of pollution occurring. | ACTION – amend paragraph 5.4.10 to read: Seaburn is located above Magnesian Limestone rock which is classed as a principal aquifer. It represents an important source of drinking water within the region. Although it is not currently used in the Seaburn area it is an important resource and it needs to be protected against the risk of pollution occurring. |
| | | 7.5.5 | Fluvial Flood risk Para 7.5.5 suggests no fluvial flood risk, which contradicts paragraph 7.4.7. There is fluvial flood risk at Cut Throat Dene and the potential for this to increase with climate change in | ACTION - Document amended accordingly |

| | | | | |
|--|--|----------------------------|--|--|
| | | | future. Existing tidal risk to the area (currently limited) is also likely to increase with climate change. | |
| | | Section 4.0 P.23 | <p>Masterplan and Design Code</p> <p>Supplement to PPS25, development and Coastal Change is relevant to the masterplan and should be included as part of the policy review.</p> | <p>ACTION - Insert text page 23 to read: PPS25 Supplement: Development and Coastal Change identifies the need for impacts of coastal change to be taken into account at the planning stages. It should be ensured that new development at Seaburn be prevented from being put at risk from coastal change. Areas identified for coastal change (Coastal Change management Areas) should be identified through an evidence base. Applications for development within these areas need to be accompanied by an assessment of the vulnerability of the proposed development to coastal change</p> <p>The North East Shoreline Management Plan (SMP2) provides an evidence base identifying risks associated with coastal evolution and a policy framework to address these risks. In the case of Seaburn (Coastal management area MA06) improved management of coastal defences is recommended with no further construction of defences, allowing the cliffs to erode naturally ('Hold the Line'). The control of land use within the Seaburn Coastal management Area will therefore need to be carefully considered.</p> |
| | | | PPS23 Planning and pollution Control should be reviewed. Seaburn lies above a principal aquifer (Magnesian Limestone rock) which is an important resource which needs to be protected against the risk of flooding | <p>ACTION - Insert text page 23 to read: PPS23 clarifies that the impact upon the quality of land, air or water arising from development is capable of being a material planning issue. Consideration will therefore be given to whether development is an acceptable use of the land given the impacts of that use. The potential for contamination must be considered in relation to the existing use and circumstances of the land, the proposed new use and the possibility of encountering contamination during development. The potential for contamination and any risks arising must be properly assessed and any necessary remediation and management measures incorporated. Advice must be taken from the Environment Agency and other relevant bodies such as Drainage Boards, and water and sewerage undertakers who will be responsible for the control of processes or emissions.</p> |
| | | P.26 | EA are pleased to note that the SFRA has been used to identify specific flooding issues. It should be clarified that any land within Flood Zone 3b is not suitable for any development other than water compatible land uses in line with PPS25. Strong support for the plan to leave the area around Cut Throat Dene as open space. | <p>ACTION - amend paragraph on SSFRA to read: '...This indicates that the areas of undeveloped land to the south of the masterplan area are at higher risk of flooding and no existing undeveloped land will be offered for development'.</p> |
| | | Section 5.0 P.29 | Support for the proposal to create and enhance biodiversity in the area particularly within Cut Throat Dene area and recognition of the benefits this may bring | Comment noted |
| | | Section 7.0 Page 37 | Support the consideration of landscaping and measures to reduce floodrisk (in line with PPS1 and PPS9) | Comment noted |
| | | Section 8.0 Page 40 | The need for information on the Sequential Test for development in Flood Zones 2 and 3 is highlighted. | <p>ACTION - insert text on Floodrisk (P.89 3rd paragraph) Any proposed new uses located within Flood Zones 2 and 3 will require the application of a Sequential Test in line with Planning Policy Statement 25 (PPS25). More information on the Sequential Test can be found in the Practice guide to PPS25 and at www.environment-agency.gov.uk/planning</p> |
| | | | Concern with the development proposal at Block F in relation to flood risk. This appears to | RESPONSE - The Seaburn Masterplan is not a blueprint for development. It sets out a |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | be partially in flood zones including Flood Zone 3B. In line with PPS25 The Environment Agency would not support development within Flood Zone 3B unless it was water compatible. The sequential test would first need to be undertaken and feasibility of the development measured through an appropriate Flood Risk Assessment. | comprehensive framework to guide future development and reflect the City Council's regeneration and design ambition for Seaburn. To this end the development block F forms part of an indicative masterplan of leisure led mixed-use development at Seaburn. Nevertheless in assessing development proposals consideration will also be given to extent to which schemes reduce the overall risk of flooding in the area. In all cases, it is recognised that in order to mitigate against any future flood risk careful design work, combined with incorporation of measures such as sustainable urban drainage systems will be paramount. |
| | | Section 9.0 Page 49 | Strongly support the aim of the document to preserve and enhance natural assets in the area and avoid development within the floodplain. | Comment noted |
| | | Page 81 | Recommend use of a variety of SUDs methods throughout the Masterplan area where appropriate | ACTION - amend 3rd bullet page 80 to read: Due to the sensitivity of the Seaburn area as a coast location and a partial flood zone, landscape design and materials must be suitable for their context. All areas of public realm and landscaping must be designed to mitigate the risk of flooding through appropriate sustainable drainage techniques where feasible. Permeable paving should be utilised for all large areas of hard surfacing. New developments should incorporate green roofs to increase green infrastructure. The impacts of coastal flooding also need to be taken into account. Add bullet Page 85 (Street furniture, materials and public art) to read: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All areas of hard surfacing should utilise permeable paving in order to mitigate flood risk. |
| | | Section 10 Page 86 | Reiterate the need for SUDS and the enhancement of biodiversity throughout the masterplan area. This should be phased in with each new development to ensure that flood risk and green infrastructure is managed throughout the phases of development rather than left to the end. | RESPONSE - The need for green infrastructure and sustainable drainage across the site is now made using the amendments above. Improvements to green infrastructure and SUDS will be integrated across all phases of development. As clarified in the masterplan and Design Code, improved green infrastructure and landscaping is a key component of the vision for regenerating the Seaburn area (e.g. residential park) and therefore will not be considered as an afterthought to development. |
| | | Page 88 | Support the requirement for an Environmental Impact Assessment and Flood risk assessment. Encourage applicants to submit a preliminary risk assessment to ensure that land contamination is taken into account and any necessary remediation identified to reduce pollution to groundwaters. | ACTION - amend P.89 to include new section to read: Preliminary Risk Assessment For all new development a preliminary risk assessment will be required regardless of the site history, contaminated or otherwise. This must consider the potential for contamination to be present in relation to the existing use and circumstances of the land, the proposed new use and the possibility of encountering contamination during development and any necessary remediation and subsequent management measures to deal with unacceptable risks. |
| | | | Encourage flood risk to be considered on all planning applications given the issues in the area. | ACTION - amend P.89 1st paragraph (Floodrisk section) to read: A Flood risk assessment and Drainage impact assessment for all proposed development sites within the masterplan area will be required. The Floodrisk assessment will identify the potential sources of flooding, from tidal, fluvial, groundwater and on-site drainage sources, review flooding history, obtain critical water levels and determine the influences on river hydraulics. The FRA will consider flooding both individually and in combination. The assessment also covers a number of other factors such as loss of floodplain storage and surface water drainage issues The Drainage Impact assessment shall provide a preliminary review of the potential options |

| | | | | |
|--|---|----------------|--|---|
| | | | | for drainage designs that may be developed in avoidance or mitigation of flood risks and will consider the physical changes the proposed drainage measures may cause to the development and to the area drainage efficiency beyond the proposed development. DIA will invariably offer an outline design for an appropriate sustainable drainage system that will consider betterment compared with the existing flood protection measures |
| | | | Any proposal to remove concrete from watercourses and create more natural riparian areas, or remove culverts and obstructions will be supported. These works may require land drainage consent under the Land drainage Act 1991. | Comment noted |
| | | | Recommend that developer contributions could be used towards mechanisms for maintenance and adoption of SUDS or the implementation of future flood alleviation schemes. | ACTION - amend P91 additional paragraph (Developer Contributions) to read: SUDS maintenance and adoption The implementation of SUDS across the site will require ongoing maintenance. Should this require adoption by the City Council, developers will be expected to contribute towards the adoption and ongoing maintenance. http://www.ciria.org.uk/suds/model_agreements.htm |
| | | | Depending on the recommendations of the Shoreline Management Plan for the area it may also be relevant to require contributions towards sea defences particularly in areas where the policy is to hold the line. | RESPONSE - The issue of sea defences is to be explored and contributions sought where required. |
| | | | Support the proposal to obtain contributions for biodiversity and open space | Comment noted |
| | Disability Alliance Sunderland (DAS) | General | The inclusion of a changing Places facility (not just disabled toilet facilities). It is important to have one at Roker too. | RESPONSE - The re-development of the Seaburn shelter for a café/restaurant use will include a changing places facility. This is a key project requirement in the development brief to which developers must adhere. The project is now progressing with a target date for completion of summer 2013. The Council will seek to find opportunities for Changing Places toilets at Roker subject to the availability of funding. |
| | | | Youth work provision could be very helpful with regard to reducing vandalism Include voluntary groups to provide services at the seafront | ACTION - add new section Targeted Recruitment and Training , page 91 The purpose of the Masterplan and Design Code is to provide design and planning advice on the development of the Seaburn masterplan area. It is not within the remit of the document to prescribe Youth work/ Voluntary work projects at Seaburn. Consultation with voluntary groups has taken place and the Council will seek to work with these existing groups (such as SNCBC and KICKZ) where opportunities arise during the delivery of this project. However the Council will seek to provide initiatives to help link local people to jobs over the course of the project: Targeted recruitment and Training The City Council will seek to secure agreements for the targeted recruitment and training of contractors working on the construction phases at Seaburn. These Agreements may take the form of targeted recruitment of a local construction workforce or investment into additional training for any locally based construction workers employed on the site. This targeted approach to training and recruitment is designed to assist the local economy and reduce worklessness and social deprivation. For further information, contact Employment and Training Manager (0191 561 1339) |
| | | | Seating and wheelchair friendly surfaces – consideration for those with disabilities | ACTION - add bullet page 85 (street furniture materials and public art) to read: |

| | | | | |
|--|------------------------|--------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | Footpaths and areas of hard surfacing should be designed to be suitable for people with limited mobility, including wheelchair users to ensure that the seafront is accessible to all. Consideration should be given to design and layout as well as materials. |
| | | | Disabled parking needs to be considered when parking facilities are being re-designed. | RESPONSE - Disabled Parking will be given consideration. In all cases where new areas of parking are proposed, the City Council will seek a proportion of disabled parking in line with the car parking standards set out in the Development Control Supplementary Planning Guidance Document. |
| | Natural England | Section 6.2 Page 40 | Habitats Regulations Assessment Will the proposed Dog Prohibition Zone for Parson's Rocks and Whitburn Steel be a seasonal arrangement? Given the non-breeding bird interest, a seasonal buffer zone will only be required over the winter months – September to April | ACTION - The matter of dog control orders and other relevant byelaws across the City (including the foreshore area) is currently under discussion including details such as the timescale of any restrictions. Due to the significance of the two sites at Seaburn, before these are taken forward for approval by Cabinet, Natural England will be consulted further and their views considered. In advance of an agreed approach, the masterplan and HRA shall be amended to read: Measures to control dogs in the areas around Parson's rocks and Whitburn Steel shall be implemented and enforced by the City Council. |
| | | | There will need to be some dialogue with South Tyneside to ensure the 'Dog Prohibition Zone' does not move dog walkers further north along the beach to other parts of the SSSI and SPA. | RESPONSE - The City Council will look to cooperate with South Tyneside Council in the development of dog control orders for the foreshore location. |
| | | | The HRA acknowledges that the finding of 'No significant effect' is not possible until the results of the seafront bird study become available in March 2011. This may result in further necessary changes to the masterplan. Therefore adoption must be postponed until such a time that the test of significant effect can be determined. | RESPONSE - The outcome of the bird study will be considered and its recommendations taken into account prior to adoption of the masterplan. |
| | | | Masterplan and Design Code River basin Management Plan for Northumbria suggests that this river has moderate ecological status therefore welcome proposals for improvements and returning the watercourse back to its natural channel. Given proximity to SPA consideration should be given to water quality. Environment Agency may have comments. | RESPONSE - See above for Environment agency comments and responses. Consideration has been given to the impact on water quality both through the Masterplan and design Code and sustainability Appraisal. The Sustainability appraisal concludes that the potential increase in visitor numbers and of development may increase scope for pollution; however is satisfied that measures proposed in the document such as SUDs and the necessary investment into waste water infrastructure in the longer term will mitigate this risk. Notwithstanding the above, water quality in the area is constantly monitored by the City Council's Environmental Health team. Future work into the Seafront Management Plan will oversee measures in relation to management of visitors and litter control, which could also have a bearing on water quality. |
| | | | Light pollution on the intertidal area of the coast should be managed and reduced through this plan. Public realm improvements should be considered against this plan. | ACTION - insert new section p.85 (Street furniture, materials and public art) to read: All new developments will be expected to incorporate a lighting scheme to frame and enhance the appearance of developments at night particularly at the key gateways and routes identified in this plan. A thorough approach to lighting may also assist in crating a sense of community safety and way finding. Due to the sensitive habitat in the area, considerable care must also be taken to minimize the impact of light pollution particularly on the inter tidal area. Consideration |

| | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | must also be given to minimizing energy consumption. |
| | ONE North East | General | ONE endorses the draft SPD's vision and objectives for this important area of the seafront | Comment noted |
| | | | ONE endorses the identification of the need to develop facilities to ensure that Seaburn becomes a 'year round' destination which is not left empty on days outside of events | Comment noted |
| | | | Work undertaken as part of the study of future hotel growth including within Sunderland may provide evidence/justification for provision | Comment noted |
| | | | ONE Highlights the Coastal Framework Study ('Tourism Vision, Framework and Action Plan for One North East Coastal Zone, 2006') which provides a high level action plan to guide tourism development along the North East Coast. | Comment noted |
| | | | One North east welcomes the document's emphasis on the need to improve public realm and achieve high standards of design within the draft SPD area. The need for a development brief for each site is also welcomed particularly in the context of ensuring energy and resource efficiency in development. | Comment noted |
| | | | Given the 10-15 year lifespan of the SPD, charging places for electric vehicles should be encouraged. ONE is leading the development of infrastructure through the 'Plugged in Places Initiative' | ACTION - insert new section p.79 to read: Electric Vehicle charging infrastructure New development proposals must identify opportunities for the installation of electronic vehicle charging infrastructure. The North east of England has successfully bid for funding under the 'Plugged in Places' Programme. This programme will provide match-funding to local consortia of businesses and other public sector partners, to help provide electric vehicle recharging infrastructure in a range of different locations. Up to 1,300 charging points are expected to be installed from 2011. |
| | | | It may be useful for the document to identify the feed-in tariff. The Tariff guarantees a price for a fixed period for electricity generated using small scale low carbon technologies. It may also be useful to refer to the renewable heat incentive. One North East can provide guidance on what technologies are appropriate and provide additional support in this area. | ACTION - insert new section p.90 to read: Incentives for low carbon technologies Developers will be encouraged to take advantage of schemes such as the feed-in tariff and Renewable Heat Incentive schemes. The feed-in tariff is designed to encourage the take-up of renewable energy sources by guaranteeing producers the purchase of their electricity using small scale low carbon technologies. A premium price is paid for a fixed period. Renewable Heat Incentive is to be launched in June 2011 and is designed to provide financial support that encourages individuals, communities and businesses to switch from using fossil fuel for heating to renewables. Those who replace existing fossil fuel heating systems with an eligible renewable technology could get paid a set amount each year as an incentive to reduce CO ₂ emissions. |
| | Northumbrian Water | General | NWL generally supports the consultation draft version of the Seaburn Masterplan and Design Code. | All comments noted |
| | | Section 4.1 Policy review | NWL supports the recognition of the provisions of the Water and Flood Management Act 2010 especially the encouragement of the uptake of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) by removing the right to connect to sewers and providing for local authorities to adopt SUDS for new developments. | |

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | NWL supports the proposed linear park feature, which will form an important part of the green infrastructure. In particular NWL welcomes the proposed location of the SUDS scheme as illustrated on page 81. The proposed SUDS scheme will be important in achieving and delivering the benefits identifies on P.82 of the SPD. | |
| | | | Reference to the mutually reinforcing benefits of drainage capacity improvements and biodiversity enhancements should be retained in the finalised SPD as well as the proposals for SUDS schemes in the linear park. MWL looks forward to liaison with the City Council and potential development partners at the earliest opportunity in working towards the delivery of these proposals. | |
| | | Section 10 Implementation P.88 | NWL supports the requirement for Floodrisk Assessment and Drainage Impact Assessment. In addition NWL agrees with the requirement that all development should maximise opportunities to improve the current surface water drainage issues. | |
| | | P89 | NWL particularly supports the proposed guidance on water conservation techniques | |
| | | P91 | NWL supports the expectation for developers to contribute financially towards public realm in the materplan area and highlights the potential opportunities for thie funding to deliver the proposed SUDS schemes. | |
| | | General | NWL requests early consultation as proposals within the area become clearer to ensure adequate water and sewerage infrastructure is available to support the scale of new development | |
| | Green Party | General | It is not clear what public transport solutions are being proposed. It is notable that the Metro system is some distance from the seafront. We suggest consideration of light rail, traffic restrictions and or a publicly run bus scheme such as the yellow electric buses operating in Newcastle. | RESPONSE - The Masterplan and Design Code proposes a range of improvements to public transport in the area. Page 91 highlights that contributions will be sought from developers towards bus stop improvements and the development of a seasonal shuttle bus between Seaburn and the City Centre to supplement existing public transport provision. Restrictions such as the narrowing of Whitburn road and rationalisation of Lowry Road (P.70/71) are aimed to ease congestion issues and are complemented by proposals to upgrade public realm, footpaths and cycle routes which will safely link public transport facilities in the area. A dedicated Travel Plan for the area is to be prepared which will inform sustainable transport solutions (P.91). |
| | | | We suggest that any new developments are built with a view to achieving energy self-sufficiency. Developments should be designed to require as little imported energy as possible and produce at least 30% of their own power. We suggest that these goals are achievable with appropriate use of modern insulation methods and renewable energy. | RESPONSE - Page 90 of the Masterplan and Design Code seeks to promote environmentally friendly construction by requiring as a minimum 10% of the site's energy to come from on-site renewable sources. At the detailed planning stages developers will be required to demonstrate what renewable energy sources may be feasible and viable on site and justify their approach to achieving the aspirations. In addition to the provision of renewable energy development will be required to be highly energy efficient (for further details see also P.90). |
| | | | Advocate the deployment of recycling bins | RESPONSE - Recycling bins and other elements of street furniture are to be implemented as schemes are worked up in more detail. |
| | | | It is important that the plan is realistic in its ambition. Suggest that the Council seeks to draw out aspects of natural beauty and draw attention to the areas pre-existing features e.g. we | RESPONSE - The overall approach to the regeneration of Sunderland's Seafront seeks to take advantage of the pre-existing features at both Roker and Seaburn. At Seaburn |

| | | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------|--|---|
| | | | suggest the promotion of wildlife in the area, such as birds and emphasise that it may not be cost effective to focus heavily on the construction of buildings | original infrastructure such as the Seating Shelter and promenade are to be retained and improved. The Masterplan does also recognise and seek to take advantage of the green infrastructure and biodiversity value of the area, through improvements to landscaping and open space, creation of Sustainable Urban Drainage infrastructure and organic management of the land around Cut Throat Dene to support biodiversity in the area. The Plan also promotes additional management measures to protect the nearby European designated sites. |
| | RSPB | General Comments | Masterplan and Design Code Welcome the acknowledgement that the masterplan could potentially disturb the interest features of the Northumbria Coast Special Protection Area (SPA). | Comment noted |
| | | | Commend the Council for the 4 management and mitigation measures that it has identified | Comment noted |
| | | | Support the dog prohibition zone at Parson's Rocks and Whitburn Steel including the 50m buffer zone. Considered an appropriate measure for the European site and as a measure to reduce impact of increased recreational disturbance. | Comment noted |
| | | | However it is unclear whether this would be a voluntary zone or would be achieved formally through a Dog Control Order. The latter option is likely to be more effective but in either event monitoring of the effectiveness of the prohibition zone (and enforcement) will be crucial to its success. New restrictions will require careful liaison with affected communities in order to get people to behave sensitively. Recommended that the Council identify its preferred mechanism for the prohibition zone, how it will be implemented and enforced in the finalised SPD. | RESPONSE - see response to Natural England comments The Masterplan will identify the need for dog control measures at Parsons Rocks and Whitburn Steel, which will be implemented as part of a city-wide review of dog control orders and other relevant byelaws. As noted above the Implementation team will liaise with relevant stakeholders to ensure the most effective means of implementing these will be adopted. However it would be inappropriate for the masterplan to anticipate the most appropriate mechanisms for such management measures until a thorough review has been carried out. |
| | | | HRA Screening Agreed that an adverse effect on the integrity of the SPA cannot be ruled out at this stage. | Comment noted |
| | | | The council is commended for undertaking the winter bird survey work to inform a more detailed assessment. The study will allow for the final HRA to provide additional detail on what the embedded mitigation measures should cover – e.g. the months in which disturbance would be likely to affect significant numbers of water birds. The study will help rule out an adverse effect in integrity. | Comment noted |
| | CB Richard Ellis on behalf of Sunderland University | General Comments | The University is reassured about the City Council's approach to Seaburn which is to take a step by step approach to the masterplanning of the wider area. We are pleased to note that the masterplan shows the potential for future connections into the wider landholdings around the masterplan site boundary. | Comment noted |
| | | | The University wishes to continue dialogue with the City Council. The future of the University's land at Seaburn is an important part of the University's Estate considerations. The University believes that matters are moving forward in a positive direction and wishes to continue these fruitful discussions over the coming months. | Comment noted |
| | Equality and Human Rights | | No Comments | Noted |

| | Commission | | | |
|--|--------------------------|------------------|---|---|
| | Sunderland Civic Society | General Comments | Concerned over the loss of the Seaburn Centre. As a sports venue it is underused but it also plays a role in hosting other events such as fairs. The centre should therefore be enhanced. | <p>RESPONSE - It is acknowledged that the Seaburn centre provides facilities to the local community; However its, scale and central position means that potentially retaining the building could 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 development proposals for Seaburn come forward the building in its current form could 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 any future developments</p> |
| | | | Seaburn funfair site could be transformed into a major attraction. Suggested a Pirate theme Water Fun pool - A unique family attraction that could be linked to the Seaburn centre. | <p>RESPONSE - The vision of the Seaburn Masterplan ascertains that Seaburn will be a family friendly resort offering indoor and outdoor facilities all year round. Accordingly the indicative masterplan and design code identifies suitable land uses and establishes design criteria for the entire site. The suggested attraction could be compatible with the masterplan and design code. However the development of detailed proposals will be private sector-led. It would be inappropriate in this case for the masterplan to stipulate specific proposals and operational details of potential facilities</p> |
| | | | The area of the Burn behind Jet amusements could be a site for a major attraction e.g. Sealife centre – a marine conservation and educational resource rather than a zoo. | <p>RESPONSE - As above. The suggested site for a Sealife centre is also identified as Strategic Floodplain in the Sunderland Strategic Floodrisk Assessment 2010. The site is therefore unsuitable for major development and will be retained as open space in order to mitigate the impact of flooding and climate change.</p> |
| | | | Major attractions are needed | <p>RESPONSE - The masterplan identifies the Council's vision as to how development of leisure-led schemes at Seaburn may best be delivered. Proposals will be considered on their merits and in the context of the Masterplan and Design criteria for the site</p> |
| | | | Seaburn should include an adventure golf | <p>RESPONSE - The suggestion would be compatible with the uses identified in the Masterplan and Design Code. However the development of such attractions will be private sector-led. It would be inappropriate in this case for the masterplan to stipulate detailed proposals and operational details of potential facilities</p> |
| | | | Small street for a couple of small attractions is a dead loss Major attractions are required. There are too many restaurants | <p>RESPONSE - The Masterplan and design Code represents a vision for how the site should come forward. A key element of the Masterplan and design code is the creation of a 'multi-user boulevard through the centre of the Ocean Park site to aid increased movement through the area of both pedestrians and cyclists. This approach would also increase scope for an active frontage for leisure/commercial uses within the area Whilst providing guidance on building heights, scale and massing of new development the masterplan does not stipulate the detailed function and scale of potential proposals to be brought forward by the private sector. The City Council will work with developers and assess their proposals based on the planning and design criteria set out in the masterplan and Design Code</p> |
| | | | Residential Park would result in a loss of valuable parking for visitors (including coaches for match days/visitors to the World heritage site). It would also lose valuable land should a major attraction become available. The loss of the parking would impact upon events such | <p>RESPONSE - To make leisure led development viable, and to ensure any development has a sustainable mix of uses, there is a need to incorporate housing into the scheme. This approach has been supported through market testing and would also address</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | as the air show. | <p>housing need issues in the Seaburn area.</p> <p>In terms of parking, throughout the development of the site, the council will ensure that public car parking is still provided, either through the retention of existing parking in the short term, or the construction of a new public car park in the long term.</p> <p>In addition to this, any proposal for the site will have to demonstrate that plans include sufficient parking to meet the demands of the proposal. The council will resist any new scheme which places any new pressure on existing parking spaces.</p> |
| | | | Loss of the motel would impact upon events | <p>RESPONSE - This masterplan does not compromise any land/business owned/leased on the site. The masterplan represents a vision of how the site should be developed in the future if developers or land owners wish to redevelop any part of the site.</p> <p>The masterplan does not propose the removal of any business on the site and does not preclude any existing business on the site from bringing forward proposals. The council will therefore welcome discussions with any new or existing businesses who wish to develop any part of the site so long as they accord with the policies and principals set out in the masterplan. It should be noted that guest accommodation development is identified as a compatible use within the masterplan.</p> |
| | | | Masterplan should include a caravan park – Sunderland is lagging behind | <p>RESPONSE - It is recognised that a caravan park represents a compatible use with a seafront location generally; however a Caravan park is not identified as a use that would be encouraged within the Masterplan area. A proposal would need to be assessed on its merits in the context of planning policy and the design Code and it is not considered that a site suitable for accommodating a Caravan Park exists within the boundary of the Masterplan study area. The potential for a caravan park on other sites at the Seafront would need to be considered as part of the preparation of the wider Land use allocations Development Plan Document.</p> |
| | | | The Pirate Play Park should be retained and improved Will the Pirates Play park be replaced by a small couple of climbing frames and concrete or something for all to enjoy? The Play Park should be unique and be a worthwhile attraction | <p>RESPONSE - The removal of the pirate play park has been informed by the City Council's Play and Urban Games Strategy, which provides a thorough review of the condition of all existing equipped play facilities across Sunderland. The strategy indicates that the pirate Play Park is of 'low quality'. The Masterplan should not prescribe the exact form of the new play area but identifies an alternative site to the south of the the Masterplan area and stipulates that any new facility should satisfy the National Design Standards for equipped play areas.</p> |
| | | | Promenade should be an area for strolling with the odd area for refreshment and rest with a central area for family entertainment | <p>RESPONSE - The open character of the promenade is to be retained and improved and development restricted to ensure that views across the seafront are preserved. However as part of improvements at the seafront, The Seaburn Shelter has been marketed for re-development as a café/restaurant use. This project is progressing with a target date for completion of 2013. Due to the aspiration to protect views, other forms of development will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances.</p> |
| | | | Events field next to Seaburn Hotel should be retained with a replacement wood fence that has adaptable gating for big events such as the airshow. | <p>RESPONSE -This field is currently outside the redline of the masterplan</p> |
| | | | Access to Seaburn camp should be improved. | <p>Comment noted</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|-------------|---|--|
| | | | <p>Showers should be provided especially at Roker. Views towards the Bents should be maintained and around Whitburn Bents left natural. Natural features retained</p> | <p>RESPONSE - Shower provision forms just part of a scheme of improvements to be delivered as part of the Marine Walk Masterplan. £1.5m funding has been secured to deliver phase 1 of the plan, which includes shower facilities. The Seaburn Masterplan specifically identifies the importance of views towards the Bents from within the study area. However land around the Bents is outside the boundary of and therefore the scope of the masterplan. Natural features within the boundary of the Masterplan are to be retained and enhanced.</p> |
| | Housing Strategy | P.33 | <p>Amend wording re: RSLs and Housing Associations accessing HCA funding to support delivery of extra care facilities.</p> <p>The name RSL has been updated to 'Registered Provider'. We also need to consider that other developers and organisations who deliver 'housing' will be interested in developing accommodation. Housing Provider is a catch-all.</p> <p>Housing Providers will be able to apply for HCA grant for residential development/extra care only if there is an element of social rent/shared ownership within there proposals. Wording is OK however care needs to be taken about putting the word 'residential' next to extra care as it could suggest residential care, which is something we want to avoid. Wording suggested above is much clearer and avoids ambiguity. Avoid reference to extra care as a 'facility'. It is housing.</p> | <p>ACTION - Change wording P.33 to read: Housing Providers may be able to access capital funding from the Homes and Communities Association (HCA) to support delivery of residential development including extra care housing within the Seaburn area.</p> |
| | Community Services | P.84 | <p>Reference to Play Pathfinder standards should be replaced with Play England design for Play Guidance.</p> | <p>ACTION - Amend Text P.84 to read Play equipment should use materials from sustainable sources and must meet national standards for play and urban games. Provision must aim to reach a broad range of age groups and must satisfy the 10 principles of successful Play Spaces contained in Play England's guidance document 'Design for Play – a guide to creating successful Play Spaces.'</p> |
| | | P.27 | <p>Remove reference to Play Pathfinder team and replace with Play and Urban Games Team</p> | <p>ACTION - Amend reference accordingly</p> |
| | | P.26 | <p>Can reference to Lambton Worm as a play feature be deleted?</p> | <p>ACTION - Amend text P 26: The strategy indicates that Pirate Play Park is of 'low quality'. Although not strictly recognised as a play area, the Lambton Worm Garden is also found to be low quality in the Strategy.</p> |
| | | | <p>There may be opportunity to develop a Seafront Activity Trail with Play development at Roker Foreshore through the already refurbished and high quality play area within Roker park and along the seafront through to the Seaburn area, encompassing Adult Wellness Mini golf and Seaburn Centre</p> | <p>RESPONSE - As part of the improvements at Roker, a Heritage Trail is being developed along Marine Walk to Roker Ravine and the entrance to the park. This is to include educational information suitable for young children. The development of an activity trail incorporating play development along the seafront foreshore areas has been given consideration subject to the availability of funding. In terms of Seaburn however, the priority should be the replacement of the well-used Pirate Play Park with an alternative equipped play area. Nevertheless the masterplan will identify the opportunity for such an Activity Trail. The development of a Seafront activity trail incorporating play facilities should be given consideration.</p> |
| | | | <p>Adult Wellness features for adults of all ages. Equipment designed specially to provide gentle exercise for adults and older people should be considered. Capital funding and</p> | <p>RESPONSE - The opportunity for equipment for adults and older people has been identified in the plan</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|----------------|--|--|
| | | | revenue budget would be required. | |
| | | | It would be pleasing to see opportunities for family based activities e.g. a quality crazy/mini golf course. Recent designs are to a high specification. Capital funding would be required and a revenue budget. | RESPONSE - The Seaburn Masterplan seeks to enable a range of family friendly leisure-led developments at Ocean Park. A quality crazy/mini golf facility would be compatible with the direction of the masterplan. However development proposals at Seaburn are to be private sector-led. It would be inappropriate for the masterplan to stipulate detailed proposals and operational details of potential facilities |
| | | P.27 | Seaburn Centre Text should read: The Seaburn Centre continues to operate as a local leisure centre servicing the surrounding residential area. The facilities it provides such as the Wellness Centre are of value to the local community. It should therefore be ensured that appropriate sport and leisure provision is available for existing users as part of the wider redevelopment of the Seaburn masterplan. | Comment noted |
| | Sunderland City Council Transportation Team | Page 19 | The respondent refers to the opportunity to introduce traffic calming as an opportunity. They state that traffic calm should only be considered in appropriate locations. | RESPONSE – The bullet point being referred to states “Introduce traffic calming where appropriate”. It is felt this statement suitably addresses the concerns of the respondents. |
| | | Page 41 | <p>It is the recommendation of the respondent that the redevelopment of the site allows the opportunity to modify the entrance of the existing Morrison Foodstore on the site and also allow for the widening of Lowry Road.</p> <p>The respondent is of the opinion that access road servicing the Morrisons Foodstore should be retained</p> <p>The respondent asks if the reduction in existing car parking provision for the Morrisons Foodstore caters for their projects customer demand?</p> <p>The respondent questions the suitability of block A for residential development and/or an extra care scheme, stating that such a scheme would not be supported by the transportation team on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The loss of public transport infrastructure (a bus turning head) ▪ The interests of road safety with regard to a new scheme being accessed off Whitburn Road | <p>RESPONSE – The current proposals have been drawn up in collaboration with the councils transport team and include the following design features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The realignment of Lowry Road to widen tight bends and increase capacity ▪ The widening of Lowry Road to 7.3m to allow use as bus route and increase capacity ▪ The remodelling of the Morrisons Foodstore entrance to include dedicated entrance/exits points to increase capacity <p>This approach has been agreed by the councils transportation team during the design evolution stages of the masterplan.</p> <p>RESPONSE – We agree with this comment and this is in line with ongoing discussions taking place between the council and Morrisons.</p> <p>ACTION – Amend masterplan to re-instate southern link to Morrison Petrol Station.</p> <p>RESPONSE – The masterplan does not affect any of the existing areas of parking currently owned by Morrisons. There is therefore no reduction in parking provision associated with the Morrison Foodstore.</p> <p>RESPONSE – The masterplan proposes the use of the site in question (currently the site of a disused turning head) for future residential purposes. There is no suggestion this site has ever been proposed for extra care housing largely due to its limited size.</p> <p>The decision has been taken following discussion with Nexus who has clearly stated the turn head is no longer used, and identified their intentions to dispose of the land for redevelopment. The current turning head (when previously in use) provided two points of access off Whitburn Road, this is reduced to one point of access through the design code. Use of the site for residential development is also likely to significantly reduce</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <p>traffic movements to and from the site in comparison to a bus turning head which would be used at regular interval throughout the day.</p> <p>We are therefore of the opinion that the points of concerns raised for this site are invalid and the site remains viable for residential purposes.</p> |
| | | <p>Page 70</p> | <p>The respondent recommends that the Primary Vehicle Route be widened from 7.2m to 7.3m as a maximum to allow for free flowing traffic. It is also their recommendations that design features need to be incorporated into scheme to prevent on street parking, specifically regarding vehicles mounting the pavement (ie the installation of bollards)</p> <p>The cyclist provision along Whitburn Road would require modification, and the provision of a Toucan Crossing may be considered beneficial.</p> <p>The respondent identifies the need to provide limited waiting areas and/or taxi drop off points to service any proposed hotels in the masterplan.</p> | <p>RESPONSE – We agree with this comment</p> <p>ACTION – Amend the masterplan document to increase road widths on pages 70-71 from 7.2m 7.3m as well as including design features such as bollards.</p> <p>RESPONSE – The possible changes in the route of the existing cycle path is acknowledged in the masterplan document and will be an ongoing issue to be finalised during the implementation of the masterplan.</p> <p>ACTION – Amend masterplan document to include reference to possible installation of Toucan Crossing to support cyclists.</p> <p>RESPONSE – The indicative masterplan includes a waiting area and/or taxi drop off point, although this is not explicitly identified within the masterplan document. This will need to be addressed.</p> <p>ACTION – Amend masterplan document to identify the requirement of a dedicated waiting areas/taxi drop off point for any proposed hotels. Update the “Access and Servicing” plan on page 77 to show indicative location of taxi drop off point, and update text on page 78 to include the need to deliver a taxi drop off point within the design code.</p> |
| | | <p>Page 73</p> | <p>The respondent is of the opinion that that's a 4.8m carriageway is only appropriate for a minor road servicing no more than 25 dwellings. Adequate access will be required for servicing and refuse collection arrangements</p> <p>The respondent is of the opinion that a 3.5m carriageway is not recommended and should be increased to 4.1m, and only serve a maximum of 3 residential dwellings.</p> | <p>RESPONSE – The Seaburn Masterplan and Design Code aims to provide high quality spaces and to encourage no standard design solutions. In line with guidance included within Manual for Streets, the impacts of traffic on its surroundings can be mitigated through limiting road widths where ever possible. The indicative road widths within the masterplan are in line with the dimensions suggested in Manual for Streets.</p> <p>We are therefore of the opinion that good design should therefore be encouraged over standard highway solutions.</p> <p>The document should however make suitable reference to the need to provide adequate road capacity for the scheme being proposed, including servicing, access, refuse and passing points.</p> <p>ACTION – Amend text on page 68 to include the following text:</p> <p>“The following street dimensions have been produced using guidance contained within Manual for Streets (Department for Transport). Such dimensions should be adhered to as a matter of priority, although localised departures from these dimensions will be permitted in the interests of catering for suitable refuse, servicing and turning space provision.</p> <p>Any proposals which demonstrate a significant departure from the dimensions shown will be resisted.”</p> <p>RESPONSE – Comment noted, please see above.</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---------------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>Page 74</p> | <p>The respondent is of the view that any defensible strip of land running along the Multi User Boulevard needs to be clear defined to identify between public and private space. They also state the need to accommodate the needs of emergency vehicles.</p> | <p>RESPONSE – Please refer to bullet point 8 on page 74 and bullet point 4 on page 75 to address these concerns. Both issues are discussed here in these points.</p> <p>ACTION – Amend bullet point 4 on page 75 to read “...a minimum 3m strip of clearly defined defensible space ...”</p> |
| | | <p>Pages 76-78</p> | <p>The respondent is concerned that residential properties in block J of the masterplan look out over the adjacent Morrisons Foodstore Car Park which is likely to compromise their residential amenity. They also state that this block does not provide suitable permeability to the above car park</p> <p>Is concerned that block C is not permeable enough, and suggests a links should be provided between the Central Boulevard and the Morrisons Foodstore</p> <p>The respondent is of the view that whilst the provision of a new bus stop is welcomed, the location of the bus stop should relate to the current demand which relates to the need of a bus stop near the current Morrisons Foodstore.</p> | <p>RESPONSE – The dwelling in question all front onto and along the linear park running through the site, and instead back onto the existing Morrisons Car park. No primary frontages are therefore effected by the car park. Any impacts on secondary frontages can also be suitably mitigated through appropriate landscaping buffers. This in turn will enclose the car park and increase security, currently an issue for the current land owner. To increase the security of residents living within block J and that of Morrisons, the decision has been taken not to provide new access points to the Foodstore and instead encourage the use of existing formal access points.</p> <p>This approach is supported by Morrisons Foodstore who has been involved during the evolutionary stages of the masterplan.</p> <p>RESPONSE – the current entrance points to the existing Morrisons Foodstore are along Whitburn Road and to the rear of the store, in close proximity to both ends of the Central Boulevard. There is very little apparent benefits to creating more routes linking the store with the boulevard. Encouraging a desire line to pass through block C will also increase the risk of inhibiting the plots comprehensive development.</p> <p>RESPONSE – <i>please refer to Nexus comments</i></p> |
| | | <p>Page 79</p> | <p>The respondent has identified a number of concerns with regard to the level of public/private park provision to be provided through the masterplan, focussing on the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The loss of the existing car park which provides 200 car parking spaces and 19 coach spaces ▪ The construction of a new car park providing approx. 105 car parking spaces and 6 coach spaces and the consequential loss of parking provision ▪ The location of proposed car park which is felt to be in the wrong place and should be instead located to the end of the Central Boulevard to increase pedestrian flows | <p>RESPONSE – The masterplan being referred to by the respondent is indicative only, and is not to be taken literally with regard to parking numbers and provision. Such numbers will only be determined once the masterplan is implemented.</p> <p>The existing public car park on the site is currently poorly utilised and used, largely due to its remote location. A decision has therefore been taken to replace this car park with a new one close to the seafront. To lessen the dominance of large areas of hardstanding, parking provision has been spread across the site in/adjacent to blocks C, D and F and provide a mixture of public parking, publicly accessible parking and private parking. Initial research suggests up to 350 car parking spaces can be provided across these sites.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, in line with PPG 13, it would be inappropriate for the document to prescribe minimum parking standards, and instead the onus will be on the applicant to demonstrate suitable public/private parking provision will be provided through the sites redevelopment.</p> <p>However, this issue is an ongoing topic which has to take into consideration issues such as developer contributions, phasing, and delivery.</p> <p>ACTION – Amend Access and Service plan on page 77 to re-emphasise the above points.</p> |
| | | <p>Page 91</p> | <p>In the section of the document dealing with developer contributions, specifically with regard to section 278 agreements, the respondent is of the view that there will be a need for</p> | <p>RESPONSE – We agree with this opinion</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | <p>Stopping Up Orders to be lodged which needs to be acknowledged in the document.</p> <p>The respondent is of the view that opportunities to introduce a shuttle bus linking the masterplan area to adjacent metro stations should be explored.</p> <p>The respondent is of the view that a travel plan should be co-ordinated to deal with the masterplan site as a whole instead of simply carrying out travel plans for individual development plots as part of the planning application process.</p> | <p>ACTION – amend section 7 of page 91 to include suitable reference to the need to consider Stopping Up Orders as well as Section 278 agreements when developing the site.</p> <p>RESPONSE – Section 6 of page 91 clearly states the councils expectation that developer contributions should be made to improving the public transport provision servicing the site. Given the indicative nature of the current masterplan, it would be premature to prescribe specific public transport provision requirements prior to gaining greater clarity on what is to be delivered on the masterplan site.</p> <p>RESPONSE – Section 8 of page 91 clearly states the councils intention to co-ordinate an outline travel plan dealing with the masterplan area as a whole.</p> |
|--|--|--|---|--|