

PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE

AGENDA

**Meeting to be held in the Civic Centre (Committee Room 2) on
Tuesday, 20th December 2011 at 5.30 p.m.**

ITEM	PAGE
1. Receipt of Declarations of Interest (if any)	
2. Apologies for Absence	
3. Minutes of the last meeting of the Committee held on Tuesday 15th November, 2011 (copy attached)	1
4. Reports of the meetings of the Development Control (North Sunderland) Sub Committee held on 2nd November, 2011 and 22nd November, 2011 (copies attached)	5
5. Reports of the meetings of the Development Control (Hetton, Houghton and Washington) Sub Committee held on 4th October, 1st November and 29th November, 2011 (copies attached)	10

**This information can be made available on request in other languages. If you require this, please
Telephone 0191 561 1044**

- | | | |
|----|---|----|
| 6. | Reports of the meetings of the Development Control (South Sunderland) Sub Committee held on 1st November and 29th November, 2011 | 18 |
| | (copies attached) | |
| 7. | Consultation Response to the Environmental Report on the Revocation of the North East of England Plan | 28 |
| | Report of the Deputy Chief Executive (copy attached) | |
| 8. | The Newcastle and Gateshead One Core Strategy: Update on Sunderland City Council's Response to Consultation | 34 |
| | Report of the Deputy Chief Executive (copy attached) | |
| 9. | Sunderland City Council Local Development Framework: Annual Monitoring Report | 38 |
| | Report of the Deputy Chief Executive (copy attached) | |

Elaine Waugh,
Head of Law and Governance,

Civic Centre
SUNDERLAND
12th December, 2011

At a meeting of the PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE held in the CIVIC CENTRE on TUESDAY, 15TH NOVEMBER, 2011 at 5.30 p.m.

Present:-

Councillor Tye in the Chair

Councillors Ball, Curran, Ellis, Essl, M. Forbes, Francis, Gallagher, Howe, Lauchlan, T. Martin, Padgett, D. Richardson, J. Scott, Tate, Thompson and Wood.

Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Charlton, Copeland, Fletcher, T. Foster, E. Gibson, Kay, P. Watson and A. Wright.

Minutes of the Last Meeting of the Committee held on Tuesday, 11th October, 2011

1. RESOLVED that the minutes of the last Committee held on Tuesday, 11th October, 2011 be confirmed and signed as a correct record subject to the inclusion of Councillor Ball's attendance and not Councillor Bell.

Minutes of the Extraordinary Committee held on 27th October, 2011

2. RESOLVED that the minutes of the Extraordinary Committee held on 27th October, 2011 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

Report of the Extraordinary Meeting of the Development Control (South Sunderland) Sub-Committee held on 18th October, 2011

The report of the extraordinary meeting of the Development Control (South Sunderland) Sub-Committee held on 18th October, 2011 (copy circulated) was submitted.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

3. RESOLVED that the report be received and noted.

Proposed Traffic Regulation Order to Prohibit Waiting on Durham Road, Houghton

The Executive Director of City Services submitted a report (copy circulated) to inform the Committee of the objection received to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) prohibiting vehicles waiting on markings between the times of 8.30 am – 9.30 am, 3.00 pm – 4.30 pm, Monday to Friday on Durham Road, Houghton.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

4. RESOLVED that:-

- (i) the objection received during the consultation process to the introduction of the waiting restrictions should not be upheld; and
- (ii) the Executive Director of City Services be recommended to instruct the Head of Law and Governance to make the “No Waiting” Traffic Regulation Order on Durham Road, Houghton.

Consultations from Neighbouring Councils on Planning Applications – Sheddons Hill, Birtley

The Deputy Chief Executive submitted a report (copy circulated) to seek the Committee’s agreement to the response to be made to a consultation from a neighbouring Authority regarding a planning application affecting a site within proximity to the boundary of the City of Sunderland.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

Sunderland City Council had recently been consulted by Gateshead Council on the planning application for the erection of a single wind turbine (79.6m tip height) and associated hard standing, switch room, metering unit and access track at Sheddons Hill, Birtley.

Mike Mattok, Technical Manager, Development Control advised that, for the reasons outlined in the report, it was not considered that the proposal would be likely to have any notable adverse impact on Sunderland or its residents. However, it was considered that the proposal represents an inappropriate development in the Tyne and Wear Green Belt and would have an adverse impact upon the openness of the Green Belt. It was therefore recommended that the Council make that observation to Gateshead Council with regard to the proposal.

5. RESOLVED that the above observation be made to Gateshead Council in relation to Planning Application No. DC/11/01019/FUL.

The Newcastle and Gateshead One Core Strategy and Urban Core Area Action Plan: Sunderland City Council Response to Consultation

The Deputy Chief Executive submitted a report (copy circulated) to inform the Committee that the Council had been jointly consulted by Newcastle City Council and Gateshead Borough Council regarding two emerging planning documents:-

- the Newcastle and Gateshead draft Core Strategy (the One Core Strategy) which covers the whole administrative area of Newcastle and Gateshead, and
- the associated Urban Core Area Action Plan, which covers central shopping and business areas.

The report highlighted specific issues arising from the draft Core Strategy that would be of significance to the future development of Sunderland. The closing date for responses to the consultation was originally 25th November, 2011.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

Neil Cole, Lead Policy Officer for Planning presented the report and referred to the proposals at Leam Lane. Mr. Cole advised that Sunderland City Council's view was that the site would undermine the integrity of the green belt and that as the consultation period had been extended to 4th January, with Members permission, requested this report be submitted as a holding response to allow further consultation to take place with the other Authorities involved.

Councillor T. Martin commented that he knew the area well and it would impose upon the green belt and felt the plans should be resisted.

Councillor Wood agreed with Councillor T. Martin and considered that it was not a sustainable development, therefore had no problem in allowing Officers more time to consult further.

Councillor Ellis commented that the proposal should be resisted as strongly as possible as it was a gross invasion of the green belt.

Councillor Forbes agreed that the proposal should be strongly resisted and was in favour of getting more information on the matter. Councillor Forbes suggested that the housing options could be looked at again once the Regional Spatial Strategy has been rescinded.

Councillor Forbes also referred to paragraph 3.14 of the report and commented that she welcomed the proposal to re-open the Leamside line but as this had been turned down previously due to a lack of a business case, asked if any indication had been given that it would be looked upon more favourably this time.

Mr. Cole advised that the Leamside line has been an issue for some years and may continue to be so. Network Rail was undertaking a feasibility study to justify further work to look at re-opening the line. Mr. Cole advised that he would check and feedback to the Committee on the latest position.

Councillor Tate enquired if the Council's objection would carry any weight.

Mr. Cole advised that as a statutory consultee the Council does have the right to make objections, and the Localism Act would also impose a duty of co-operation between Authorities. The Council can also ultimately make submissions upon the public examination of the plans before an Inspector.

Councillor Howe also commented that the proposal should be resisted as he felt it was a continued attack on the green belt and could set a precedent elsewhere if approved.

Councillor Francis commented that he believed the implementation of the Leamside line was rather a “red herring” as it would involve a great cost to bring it back into use.

Councillor Howe referred to paragraph 3.6 of the report and the Walker Riverside being mentioned as a specialist location for renewable energy and enquired as to the impact this would have on our Port.

Colin Clark, Head of Planning and Property advised that Walker Riverside was an established location for renewable energy and he did not believe it would detract from the Port of Sunderland in any way as the opportunities were so large it was unlikely only one particular location could meet the demands of offshore provision.

Councillor Howe commented that there were other Ports interested and felt Sunderland’s chances could be affected by this.

Mr. Cole advised that the recommendation was to send off Members’ comments and concerns and for Officers to meet with the other two Authorities and discuss why the Leam Lane site has come forward and bring the findings back to the next available Committee.

6. RESOLVED that the Committee:-

- (i) endorsed the comments as detailed within the report, with the addition of the Members’ comments/concerns;
- (ii) agreed that the City Council objects to the current proposals for the Leam Lane Neighbourhood Growth Area on the grounds that it would significantly impact on the Green Belt in this location and also due to its potentially adverse implications for housing regeneration in Sunderland; and
- (iii) authorised Officers to forward a copy of this report to Newcastle City Council and Gateshead Borough Council as constituting the City Council’s formal response to the Newcastle and Gateshead One Core Strategy (pending further discussions).

The Chairman thanked everyone for their attendance and closed the meeting.

(Signed) P. TYE,
Chairman.

**At a meeting of the DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (NORTH SUNDERLAND)
SUB-COMMITTEE held in the CIVIC CENTRE on WEDNESDAY, 2nd NOVEMBER,
2011 at 4.45 p.m.**

Present:-

Councillor Copeland in the Chair

Councillors Curran, Fletcher, T. Foster, Francis and E. Gibson

Declarations of Interest

11/02920/TEX – Installation of a 12m high light weight lattice telecommunications tower supporting 3x Vodafone antennas and 3x O2 antennas (Overall height 15m) with ground based equipment cabinet and ancillary development

Councillor Curran declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the application.

Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Charlton, D. Richardson and L. Walton

Applications made under the Town and Country Planning Acts and Regulations made thereunder

The Deputy Chief Executive submitted a report (copy circulated) relating to the North Sunderland area, copies of which had also been forwarded to each Member of the Council upon applications made thereunder.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

11/01796/FUL – Erection of (70) 2, 3 and 4 bedroom dwellings with associated highways, landscaping and car parking

1. RESOLVED that the decision be delegated to the Deputy Chief Executive to either:-
 - a. Grant permission for the reasons set out in the report and supplement and subject to the 20 conditions set out therein, subject to the completion of a Section 106 agreement in respect of off site play

- provision and improvements to the footpath connecting Maplewood Avenue with the playing fields; or
- b. Refuse permission should the Section 106 agreement not be completed on the grounds that the development does not provide adequate play provision.

11/02775/VAR – Variation of Condition 2 (approved Plans) of previously approved application 10/01995/FUL to install photovoltaic panels to the roof

2. RESOLVED that the application be approved for the reasons set out in the report and subject to the 12 conditions set out therein.

11/02920/TEX – Installation of a 12m high light weight lattice telecommunications tower supporting 3x Vodafone antennas and 3x O2 antennas (overall height 15m) with ground based equipment cabinet and ancillary development

The representative of the Deputy Chief Executive, Mr Mike Mattok, presented the report and advised Members that this application was for prior notification of proposed development and the only aspects the Committee were able to look at were siting and design issues. There had been a number of objections relating to health risks associated with the installation however the Government guidance was that as the applicant had advised that the antennas were compliant with the International Commission on Non-Ionising Radiation Protection guidelines for public exposure the planning authority could not use health risks as a reason for refusing permission to install the antennas. There had been a site considered at the Marriott Hotel however this had been discounted by the applicant due to the high rent demanded by the hotel owners; economic forces such as this were not material planning considerations.

The Chairman welcomed to the Committee Mr Alan Osborne who was in attendance to speak in support of the application on behalf of the applicant. Mr Osborne advised that:-

- The network operators had been seeking a site in this area for the last 2 years; there was the requirement for this installation to improve coverage in the area to meet users needs.
- There had been other sites in the area considered and it was felt that this would be the most appropriate site in terms of increased network coverage and minimal visual impact. The site at the Marriott Hotel was at an advanced stage however the proposal had been withdrawn as the agent wanted rent of 15 percent more than the expected guideline amount Vodafone would normally pay for such a location and the installation would not be commercially viable as a result.
- There would only be 8 houses which would have direct views of the installation and this would be from the rear of the houses so it was not considered that the installation would have any detrimental impact on residential or visual amenity.
- Should this application be refused it was likely that the operators would look for other sites within the T.A. centre as this was felt to be the most appropriate location.

Councillor Francis queried whether tests had been carried out on the signal reception in the area. Mr Osborne advised that the existing coverage had been looked at as had the anticipated future coverage. Currently there was restricted coverage in the area with users experiencing an outdoor signal but limited signal when indoors. As demands on the network increased the level of coverage would decrease if there were no additional base stations installed.

Councillor Francis then stated that the health implications of these masts were still unknown given that it was relatively new technology.

The Chairman then introduced Mr Paul Tullock who would be speaking against the application on behalf of himself and the other local residents.

Mr Tullock advised that he lived on Kingarth Avenue which was the street which would be most affected by the installation. He objected to the size and type of tower proposed as these lattice towers were more commonly seen in industrial estates rather than residential areas where masts were normally hidden or sympathetically designed. The tower would be an eyesore and would disrupt the skyline, an issue compounded by various factors including:-

- The choice of site resulting in a higher pole than usual being required
- The location of the installation within an open area of the TA Centre leaving it unscreened and clearly visible from surrounding properties.

He also advised that there was a petition against this installation which had 300 signatures on it from local residents.

Mr Tullock concluded by stating that the tower would be visually obtrusive and an eyesore and that it would be out of character with the area.

Councillor Fletcher agreed with the concerns raised by the objectors, she felt that this installation was not in an appropriate location or of an appropriate design.

Councillor Francis stated that he supported the views of the objectors; this was not an appropriate site. He also commented that the site was in a hollow and as such it would be difficult for any type of signals to be transmitted from this site.

3. RESOLVED that the application be refused for the reason set out in the supplementary report.

Town and Country Planning Act 1990 – Appeals

The Deputy Chief Executive submitted a report (copy circulated) concerning the appeals received for the period 1st September, 2011 to 30th September, 2011.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

4. RESOLVED that the report be received and noted.

(Signed) R. COPELAND,
Chairman.

At a meeting of the DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (NORTH SUNDERLAND) SUB-COMMITTEE held in the CIVIC CENTRE on TUESDAY, 22ND NOVEMBER, 2011 at 4.45 p.m.

Present:-

Councillor Copeland in the Chair

Councillors Curran, Fletcher, T. Foster, E. Gibson and L. Walton.

Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Charlton, Francis, D. Richardson and Tye.

Applications made under the Town and Country Planning Acts and Regulations made thereunder

The Deputy Chief Executive submitted a report (copy circulated) relating to the North Sunderland area, copies of which had also been forwarded to each Member of the Council upon applications made thereunder.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

11/03065/FUL – Proposed flexible mixed use development consisting of A1 (retail), A3 (restaurant and café), A4 (drinking establishment), A5 (hot food take-away) B1 (Offices) and D1 (Assembly, Arts and Leisure), refurbishment of existing Shelter building capable of providing up to 10 Retail/Leisure. Units at promenade level, ground floor relocation of male and female public toilet facilities, ground floor changing places facility, ground floor RNLI/office (B1), erection of 2 shell only facilities above existing building with level access onto Whitburn Road. Change of Use and Stopping Up of 2 public footpaths stairs to A1, A3, A4, A5, B1, D1 uses and provision of new ambulant public staircase to the centre of development (AMENDED DESCRIPTION 2.11.2011) – Kiosk 14 Whitburn Road, Sunderland, SR6 8AA

Mike Mattok, Technical Manager, Development Control presented the report and was on hand to answer Members queries.

In response to Councillor T. Foster's enquiry, Mr. Mattok advised that the area was too steep for a ramp, rather than stairs. Peter Graham, Technician also advised that this was financially prohibitive to install.

Councillor E. Gibson welcomed the application and commented that facilities to attract tourism to the seafront had been needed for a long time.

Councillor Curran commented that he thought the proposal was a great idea but raised concerns over potential risks of flooding to the building due to it being at sea level.

Mr. Mattok advised that the Environment Agency had been consulted and they were satisfied with the safeguards that were to be put in place to guard against flooding.

In response to Councillor Walton's concerns over potential parking issues, Mr. Mattok advised that Engineers had deemed the parking provision in the area as adequate. Eric Henderson, Engineer advised that the demand for parking would fall within the day to day usage.

Councillor Fletcher commented that her only concern was in relation to the operating times of the public toilets, and believed they should be closed after a certain time to prevent anti-social behaviour and gangs gathering to use them as a shelter.

Mr. Mattok advised that this could be looked at and a suitably worded condition could be considered.

1. RESOLVED that the decision be delegated to the Deputy Chief Executive subject to no further representations being received.

Town and Country Planning Act 1990 – Appeals

There were no appeals submitted or determined during the period of 1 October 2011 to 31 October 2011.

The Chairman thanked everyone for their attendance and closed the meeting.

(Signed) R. COPELAND,
Chairman.

At a meeting of the DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (HETTON, HOUGHTON AND WASHINGTON) SUB-COMMITTEE held in the CIVIC CENTRE on TUESDAY, 4th OCTOBER, 2011 at 5.45 p.m.

Present:-

Councillor Fletcher in the Chair

Councillors Lauchlan, Morrissey, Padgett, D. Richardson, Tate and Thompson

Declarations of Interest

Councillor Tate declared a personal interest in application 11/02288/FUL – The HG Building, Mercantile Road, Rainton Bridge Industrial Estate, Items for Information, 11/02362/OUT – Land at north Road, Hetton-le-Hole, Houghton-le-Spring and Appeals Received 11/00010/REF – Post Office, Front Street, Hetton-le-Hole, Houghton-le-Spring as a Member of Hetton Town Council, which is a consultee in the applications.

Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Charlton, Scaplehorn, Scott, Tye and Wakefield.

Applications made under the Town and Country Planning Acts and Regulations made thereunder

The Deputy Chief Executive submitted a report (copies circulated) a supplementary report and a report for circulation, which related to Hetton, Houghton and Washington areas, copies of which had also been forwarded to each Member of the Cabinet upon applications made under the Town and Country Planning Acts and Regulations made thereunder.

(for copy report – see original minutes)

11/01963/FUL – Erection of 2 semi-detached dwellings (Amended Site Plan received 08.09.2011) at land at Public Car Park, Former Tivoli Cinema, Tivoli Buildings, Houghton-le-spring

The Chairman invited Councillor Hall to speak to the Committee who advised that she spoke on behalf of residents in objection to the application and raised the following points:-

- residents felt that their objections were given little recognition as previous applications had been granted regardless;
- another piecemeal development being undertaken in the area which had in the past left plots of land in an unruly state with nothing being done to it;
- the amenity of the car parking and green area that would be lost as a result of the development;
- boulders had already been placed across the car parking area preventing residents from using the area which showed a lack of respect and consideration;
- potentially there could be an issue on Main Street with traffic problems, especially as there was a garage parking cars on the grass verges/pavement;
- it is felt that it is an inappropriate development and residents felt that Members were fully appreciative of their concerns.

The representative of the Deputy Chief Executive advised that any previous objections to applications would have been considered on planning grounds and any relevant legislation at that time and the impact any development would have.

Councillor Tate supported the objections regarding traffic and parking issues and was advised by the Highways Officer that access to the development and in the area had been checked and there were no significant concerns.

1. RESOLVED that the application be approved for the reasons as given and subject to the nine conditions as set out in the report.

11/02221/FUL – Change of use from permitted health and fitness/retail store to Class A1 non-food retail at land at the Peel Centre, Glover, Washington

The representative of the Deputy Chief Executive presented the application, advising that it had been requested to defer the application pending the submission of further information.

2. RESOLVED that the application be deferred pending the submission of further information.

11/02273/FUL – Retrospective change of use from bus depot to warehousing, distribution, and hire and sale of mobile shower units (Use Classes B2 and B8) at 10 Sedling Road, Wear Industrial Estate, Washington, NE38 9BZ

3. RESOLVED that the application be approved for the reasons as stated in the report and subject to the two conditions as set out in the report.

11/02276/VAR – Removal of condition no. 30 (construction of 5,000 sq. metres of employment floor space before the 50th house has been sold) on consent no. 06/02303/OUT (granted 07.11.2006) Land SW of Teal Farm, Barmston Road and North of Pattinson Road at site of former Cape Insulation, Barmston Road, Washington

4. RESOLVED that the application be given approval for the reasons as set out in the report.

11/02275/FUL – Substitution of house type (new nos. plots 29, 30-54, 66-81 and 107-118 resulting in a reduction of 13 unites subsequent to previously approved application reference 08/03987/REM at the site of former Cape Insulation, Barmston Road, Washington

5. RESOLVED that the application be delegated to the Deputy Chief Executive to either:-

- (i) approve the application subject to the signing of the deed of variation by 19th October, or such other date as might be agreed by the Deputy Chief Executive, and the resolution of the highway engineering issues;
- (ii) refuse the application on grounds related to the unsatisfactory highway layout; or
- (iii) refuse the application because the deed of variation has not been signed by 19th October on grounds related to the unsatisfactory highway layout.

11/02288/FUL – Change of use of building to mixed use comprising B2 (General Industry) and B8 (Storage and Distribution) at the HG Building, Mercantile Road, Rainton Bridge Industrial Estate, Houghton-le-Spring

6. RESOLVED that the application be given approval for the reasons as given and subject to the two conditions as set out in the report.

11/02368/FUL – Change of use to warehouse with ancillary officer accommodation (Use Class B8) at Unit 5, Stratford Road, Pattinson South, Washington, NE38 8QP

7. RESOLVED that the application be given approval for the reasons as given and subject to two conditions as set out in the report.

11/02372/FUL – Excavation of 20 metres-wide breach in existing embankment between pond and River Wear to create saline lagoon, regarding of existing embankment, removal of existing bund and installation of control structure, in-fill of upstream and downstream areas of existing pond and associated works

**at the Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust, Middle Barmston Farm, Pattinson,
Washington, NE38 8LE**

8. RESOLVED that the application be given approval for the reasons given and subject to the four conditions as set out in the supplementary report.

Items for Information

9. RESOLVED that the items for information be received and noted.

Town and Country Planning Act 1990 – Appeals

The Deputy Chief Executive submitted a report (copy circulated) concerning the appeals determined and received for the period 1st August, 2011 to 31th August, 2011.

(for copy report – see original minutes).

10. RESOLVED that the report be received and noted.

(Signed) J. FLETCHER,
Chairman.

At a meeting of the DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (HETTON, HOUGHTON AND WASHINGTON) SUB-COMMITTEE held in the CIVIC CENTRE on TUESDAY, 1st NOVEMBER, 2011 at 5.45 p.m.

Present:-

Councillor Fletcher in the Chair

Councillors Morrissey, Padgett, Scaplehorn, Scott, Tate, Thompson, Tye, Vardy and Wakefield

Declarations of Interest

Councillor Tate declared a personal interest in application 11/02873/FUL – Plot 19C, Hetton Lyons Industrial Estate, Hetton-le-Hole, Houghton-le-Spring and Items for Information, 11/02768/OUT – The Peel Centre, Spire Road, Washington as a Member of Hetton Town Council, which is a consultee in the application.

Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Charlton, Lauchlan and D. Richardson

Applications made under the Town and Country Planning Acts and Regulations made thereunder

The Deputy Chief Executive submitted a report (copies circulated), which related to Hetton, Houghton and Washington areas, copies of which had also been forwarded to each Member of the Cabinet upon applications made under the Town and Country Planning Acts and Regulations made thereunder.

(for copy report – see original minutes)

11/02873/FUL – Change of use from vacant land to inert waste recycling facility comprising external aggregate production stockpile, screened soil product and pre-screened soil and inert waste area, a 3-way split screen, a 360° excavator, 2no. skip/container plant storage areas and associated parking (RETROSPECTIVE) (AMENDED DESCRIPTION 13.07.2011) at land at Hetton Lyons Industrial Estate, Hetton le Hole, Houghton-le-Spring

The representative of the Deputy Chief Executive advised that following discussions with the Chairman around Members concerns and issues raised it was recommended that the application be deferred in order for the applicant to provide information. He advised that if possible they would aim to submit the application to the extraordinary meeting of the Committee scheduled to be held on 13th December, 2011.

1. RESOLVED that the application be deferred pending further information being submitted.

Items for Information

2. RESOLVED that a site visit be undertaken to the following application:-

11/02678/OUT – The Peel Centre, Spire Road, Washington at the request of Councillor Tye.

Town and Country Planning Act 1990 – Appeals

The Deputy Chief Executive submitted a report (copy circulated) concerning the appeals received and determined for the period 1st to 30th September, 2011.

(for copy report – see original minutes).

3. RESOLVED that the report be received and noted.

(Signed) J. FLETCHER,
Chairman.

At a meeting of the DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (HETTON, HOUGHTON AND WASHINGTON) SUB-COMMITTEE held in the CIVIC CENTRE on TUESDAY, 29th NOVEMBER, 2011 at 5.45 p.m.

Present:-

Councillor Fletcher in the Chair

Councillors Lauchlan, Padgett, D. Richardson, Scaplehorn, Scott, Tye and Wakefield

Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest received.

Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Charlton, Morrissey and Thompson

Applications made under the Town and Country Planning Acts and Regulations made thereunder

The Deputy Chief Executive submitted a report (copies circulated), which related to Hetton, Houghton and Washington areas, copies of which had also been forwarded to each Member of the Cabinet upon applications made under the Town and Country Planning Acts and Regulations made thereunder.

(for copy report – see original minutes)

11/02809/FUL – Erection of extension to existing building at Impetus Waste, Wilden Road, Pattinson South, Washington, NE38 8QA

Councillor Scott sought information around the classification of the development and its suitability for siting on an industrial estate. The representative of the Deputy Chief Executive confirmed that B1, B2 or B8 would be acceptable on the site and this development would be either B2 or B8.

Councillor Scott went on to raise concerns over the number of industrial estates in and around the city that now had waste transfer sites either upon them, or planning applications pending for them and asked that this be investigated further. The

representative of the Deputy Chief Executive commented that the service could look into this further and bring information back to Members outside of the meeting.

The Chairman then asked if any Member wished to move an alternative decision and with no Members making any such motion the officer's recommendation to approve the application was put to the Committee and with:

6 Members voting for,
2 Members voting against, and
0 Members abstaining; it was:

1. RESOLVED that the application be approved for the reasons as stated and subject to the three conditions set out within the report.

Items for Information

2. RESOLVED that site visits be undertaken to the following applications:-

- 11/02018/FUL – Land adjacent to 9 Grange View, Newbottle at the request of Councillor Fletcher;
- 11/02873/FUL – Plot 19C, Hetton Lyons Industrial Estate at the request of Councillor Fletcher; and
- 11/03177/EXT1 – Willows Reservoir East of 23 Eddison Road, Washington at the request of Councillor Scaplehorn.

(Signed) J. FLETCHER,
Chairman.

At an Extraordinary Meeting of the DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (SOUTH SUNDERLAND) SUB-COMMITTEE held in the CIVIC CENTRE on TUESDAY, 1st NOVEMBER, 2011 at 4.45 p.m.

Present:-

Councillor E. Gibson in the Chair

Councillors Ball, Copeland, Ellis, Forbes, Gallagher, Kay, Porthouse, Tye, Wood and A. Wright

Declarations of Interest

11/02320/FUL – Waste Transfer Station incorporating waste recycling building, covered ad hoc storage area, gully waste and street sweepings storage bay, office and staff welfare facility and associated access and infrastructure.

Councillors Ball and Mordey declared personal interests in the application as Council appointed Directors of the Raich Carter Sports Centre Management Board.

Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Charlton, T. Martin, D. Richardson, P. Watson and S. Watson

Applications made under the Town and Country Planning Acts and Regulations made thereunder

The Deputy Chief Executive submitted a report, supplementary report and circulatory report (copies circulated) relating to the South Sunderland area, copies of which had been forwarded to each Member of the Council, upon applications made under the Town and Country Planning Acts and Regulations made thereunder.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

11/02320/FUL – Waste Transfer Station incorporating waste recycling building, covered ad hoc storage area, gully waste and street sweepings storage bay, office and staff welfare facility and associated access and infrastructure.

The Representative of the Deputy Chief Executive, Mr Mike Mattok, presented the application and advised the Committee that the site was already used by Sunderland City Council for a similar use and was within an area designated for industry in the

Development Plan. It could be reasonably expected to find a waste transfer station in these industrial areas. The transfer station, if approved, would have the capacity to manage approximately 82,000 tonnes of residual waste per annum and would help to reduce the amount of waste being sent to landfill which would help the authority to meet its requirements under the Landfill Directive.

This site was next to the former paper mill which had recently had outline planning permission granted for a mixed use development comprising 300 houses and 6000 square metres of commercial space. That application had been a departure from the planning policy for the area and the commercial aspect was to be located at the end of the site closest to the proposed waste transfer station.

There had been a number of objections received from residents however a large number of these objections cited the impact on house prices as a ground for objection, this however was not a material planning consideration. Another concern for residents was the potential for heavy vehicles to be travelling through the residential areas; this could be controlled by a condition requiring the vehicles to travel along the A1018 Southern Radial Route rather than through the residential area should planning permission be granted.

Councillor A. Wright referred to the site visit which had been undertaken and advised that the left turn out of the site was quite tight and could cause problems for large vehicles; he queried whether there were any proposals to modify this part of the roundabout.

The Highways Engineer, Eric Henderson, advised that the Highways department were satisfied that the layout of the junction was appropriate and also advised that the submitted transport assessment stated that the vehicles would access the proposed facility from the A1018 Southern Radial Route and this would be covered by a condition.

Councillor A. Wright then queried whether the 7 parking spaces within the site would be sufficient. He was advised by Mr Mattok that it was felt that 7 spaces would be sufficient.

In response to queries from Councillor Wood regarding the quarantine of contaminated waste Mr Mattok advised the Committee of the proposed location for the quarantine area and advised that the contaminants were likely to be things like oil which had been collected by the street sweepers. It was not expected that the contaminants would be highly dangerous substances.

In response to a query from Councillor Ellis Mr Mattok advised that it was proposed that there would be odour sprays to seek to prevent adverse smells from escaping.

Councillor Porthouse queried what was meant by residual waste. Mr Mattok advised that it was domestic waste which had been collected from the local area and this would be a temporary storage facility before the waste was transported to the North East Energy Recovery Centre in Teesside.

Councillor Forbes referred to a letter she had received from Gateshead residents who lived near to an existing waste transfer facility operated by the applicant; the residents had complained about the impact of the site from the failure of the

operators to follow up their promises. She asked whether there would be any monitoring carried out by the authority and also asked why there was not an environmental impact assessment available.

Mr Mattok advised that the environmental statements and supporting documents were considered to be sufficient to address the environmental concerns. The application proposal had been screened for the purpose of the EIA Regulations and a negative screening opinion had been adopted so an EIA was not necessary. This was a Brownfield industrial site and the impact on the residential areas had been assessed through the environmental reports submitted with the application. The site would also be controlled in its operations by the Environment Agency and the conditions of any permit granted for the use of the proposed facility.

Councillor Kay referred to the covered ad hoc storage area and the uncertainty which was implied. He also queried what the operatives would be looking for when looking for contaminants and also what would happen if contaminants slipped through and were sent on to the facility on Teesside. He stated that it would not be possible to look through every item of waste, especially given that some waste would come in bags which would need opening if the contents were to be inspected.

The representative of the applicant SITA, Ms Corrina Scott Roy advised that the ad hoc storage area was intended for items which would come into the facility on an ad hoc basis and the waste would be held there while it was agreed what action would be taken to dispose of it. This could include items such as clinical waste or road kill. Ms Roy then introduced her colleague Mr Hughes who advised of the procedures in place. He stated that any contaminated waste was segregated while the appropriate course of action was agreed. There were discussions ongoing with the Council as to how to deal with any contaminated waste which was sent to the site.

Councillor Copeland expressed concerns over the location of the development given its close proximity to two primary schools and Jack Crawford House; there was the likelihood that these would be affected by smells from the development, especially during hot weather or if the operators cut any corners to save time and leave the doors to the building open all the time.

The Chairman then welcomed Councillor Mordey, Ward Councillor, to the committee who would be speaking against the application on behalf of the local residents. The objections were based around:-

- The impact on the redevelopment of the Edward Thompson Paper Mill site. Housing in this area was welcomed and there was a need to ensure that this development was protected.
- The impact on existing residents from the smells and increase in traffic, especially HGVs in the area. It was felt that the increase in traffic would cause congestion issues on the Southern Radial Route.
- The site was close to two schools and there were concerns that there could be accidents involving children and HGVs.
- There were concerns that given that waste would be stored on the site that vermin would be attracted to the site.
- The impact on the allotments and potential for contamination along with the impact on the Raich Carter Centre and Hendon Beach.

He also stated that there had been millions of pounds spent on improving the local area and he felt that this development could risk all of the hard work that had been done. He also asked for assurances that the vehicles servicing the site would not be allowed to travel through the residential area.

Mr Mattok advised that the application site had always been an industrial site and was identified as such in the planning policies and that this proposed use would fall under industrial use. The engineers were satisfied that the existing highway network could cope with the increase in traffic the development would cause and the environmental concerns could be addressed by appropriate mitigation measures implemented by the operator.

Ms Roy of SITA then spoke in support of the application and advised that:-

- The operations would be monitored by the Environment Agency to ensure that the site was operating correctly and in accordance with its operating permit.
- To control odour emissions there was a 2 door system to be in place which would consist of an external roller shutter which would be open during operating hours and there would be an internal 'fast acting' door which would be a large heavy PVC curtain which can open or close in 10 seconds. This fast acting door would be operated by sensors to ensure that it was only open when vehicles were passing through and there would be no tipping of waste when the door was open.
- The site would result in less waste being sent to landfill with waste being used to create electricity or being recycled.
- The site would create 7 full time jobs in addition to the employment opportunities during the construction phase.

Councillor A. Wright commented that there was a rail line next to this site; he queried whether there were any plans to use this line to transport the waste to Teesside. Ms Roy advised that currently there were no proposals for this however this was a potential option in the future. Mr Hughes advised that the Teesside facility was also next to the railway line.

Councillor Wood commented that it was not just Hendon residents who were concerned; residents from St. Michael's Ward had spoken to him with concerns over the odour that may come from the development. He then expressed concerns with the list of conditions in the report; he felt that there needed to be more specific detail regarding the wording of the proposed conditions. He also asked that a condition be included to require a system of negative air flow around the building to prevent odour emissions and he wanted the condition relating to vehicle routes to be more specific to ensure that large vehicles were not travelling through the residential areas.

Mr Mattok advised that it was not felt that a negative air flow system would be necessary as the fast acting door system and other proposed measures would be sufficient. He also advised that the conditions listed in the circulatory report were the proposed headings and the principles regarding the proposed conditions were set out in the reports. The conditions would be drafted by the planning officer and attached to any consent; Mr Henderson added that page 17 of the supplementary report set out the exact wording of the condition relating to vehicle routes.

Councillor Kay expressed concerns that there appeared to be no detail to condition 16 which covered the action to be taken with contaminated waste. Mr Mattok advised

that the procedures which the applicant had advised of would be included in the wording of the condition which would be attached to any consent granted.

The Chairman then asked the Committee's legal advisor, Mr Jonathan Rowson, to advise of the protocol which needed to be followed where some Members do not agree with the officer's recommendation. Mr Rowson advised of the procedure to be followed. The Chairman, in accordance with the protocol, asked Mr Mattok to inform the Committee of the implications of going against the recommendation.

Mr Mattok advised of the implications of Members going against the officer's recommendation; Members would need to have valid, justifiable reasons for refusing the application. The applicant would have the right of appeal. In his view, there were no valid planning grounds to justify the refusal of planning permission and therefore there would be a risk that the Council could be liable to a costs award on an appeal.

The Chairman then asked if any Member wished to move an alternative decision and with no Members making any such motion the officer's recommendation to approve the application was put to the committee and with:

- 6 Members voting for,
- 0 Members voting against, and
- 5 Members abstaining

The officer's recommendation was carried and as such it was:-

1. RESOLVED that the application be approved for the reasons set out in the report, supplement and circulatory report and subject to the 19 conditions set out within the circulatory report.

11/02436/VAR – Variation of condition 2 of planning permission 11/00410/VAR to install photovoltaic panels on roof of building

2. RESOLVED that the application be approved for the reasons set out in the report and subject to the 22 conditions set out therein.

11/02564/VAR – Variation of condition 2 (Approved Plans) of planning approval 10/03530/FUL to allow the addition of a 1100mm high handrail to roof edge, reconfiguration of fire exit doors and construction of additional first floor storage area and alteration to approved elevational fin detail on front and side elevations.

3. RESOLVED that the application be approved for the reasons set out in the report and subject to the 11 conditions set out therein.

11/02577/FUL – Erection of a four storey building incorporating commercial units at ground floor level with 82 bedroom hotel above and associated refuse storage facilities to rear

Councillor Tye welcomed the proposed development and stated that he hoped this would be the first of many new hotels for the city. He felt that it was a shame that the hotel was not bigger.

Councillor Porthouse commented that there needed to be improvements to the road network in the area; Sunnyside was difficult to find and visitors to the city would find it difficult to get to the hotel. He also queried whether there would be sufficient parking provision in the area.

Councillor Kay stated that at times of peak demand the Sunnyside multi storey car park could get very busy, he queried whether there would be any issues with parking and whether it would be appropriate to look at improving the quality of the surface car parks in the area.

Mr Henderson advised that parking provision in the city was constantly being reviewed to ensure that there was sufficient provision.

Councillor Copeland then queried how many spaces would be allocated to the hotel. Mr Mattok advised that as this was a city centre development there would be no parking allocated as there was parking available throughout the local area. Councillor Copeland then asked whether it would be possible to allocate some spaces to the hotel on a permanent basis as there would be issues caused if the car park was full. Mr Mattok replied that this would not be possible as it would prevent others from using the parking spaces when the hotel did not need them.

Councillor Mordey then spoke in support of the application as the Ward Councillor; he stated that he supported the development of hotels in this area as there was a need for hotels within the city.

4. RESOLVED that the application be approved for the reasons set out in the report and supplement and subject to the 20 conditions set out in the supplementary report.

Town and Country Planning Act 1990 – Appeals

The Deputy Chief Executive submitted a report (copy circulated) concerning the appeals received and determined for the period 1st September, 2011 to 30th September, 2011.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

5. RESOLVED that the report be received and noted.

(Signed) E. GIBSON,
Chairman.

At a Meeting of the DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (SOUTH SUNDERLAND) SUB-COMMITTEE held in the CIVIC CENTRE on TUESDAY, 29th NOVEMBER, 2011 at 4.45 p.m.

Present:-

Councillor E. Gibson in the Chair

Councillors Ball, Copeland, Forbes, Gallagher, D. Richardson, T. Martin, Porthouse, Tye, S. Watson and A. Wright

Declarations of Interest

11/02240/FUL – Change of use from Waste storage area to a waste transfer station.

Councillors D. Richardson and S. Watson declared personal and prejudicial interests as Directors of Gentoo Sunderland Ltd board and withdrew from the meeting prior to consideration of the item.

11/03150/ADV – Retain Banner sign to side & 11/03151/VAR – Variation of condition 4 of planning permission ref 07/05519/FUL (Change of use to A2 (bookmakers) ground floor single storey extension to rear and single storey side extension to form new access to first floor flat) to allow the premises to open from 9:00am to 9:30pm Monday to Saturday and 10:00am to 6:00pm Sunday and bank holidays.

Councillor Porthouse declared a Personal and Prejudicial interest in the applications as he knows the applicant and he withdrew from the meeting prior to the consideration of the two items.

Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Charlton, Ellis, P. Watson and Wood

Applications made under the Town and Country Planning Acts and Regulations made thereunder

The Deputy Chief Executive submitted a report, supplementary report and circulatory report (copies circulated) relating to the South Sunderland area, copies of which had been forwarded to each Member of the Council, upon applications made under the Town and Country Planning Acts and Regulations made thereunder.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

10/03941/OUT – Outline planning permission with all matters reserved except for access for 150 residential dwellings at Rushford Phase 2

The representative of the Deputy Chief Executive, Mr Mike Mattok, advised the questions raised by Members at the previous meeting had been addressed in the officer's report. A set of plans detailing the existing traffic flows and the predicted changes to traffic levels arising from the proposed development were also included in the report. The Highways Engineers were of the opinion that there would not be any material impact on the highways network as a result of the development taking place with there being an increase in 100 journeys at peak times which it was felt that the network could cope with.

Councillor Tye stated that it was pleasing to see that all of the questions raised had been addressed in the report.

Councillor Forbes queried the accuracy of the road cost figures and contributions for the link road as set out in the 1999 Planning Guidance based on the passage of time. Mr Mattok advised that the contribution paid by the Developer in 1999 represented the costs for the construction of the section of the route in order to serve both Phases 1 and 2. At the time, it was also hoped that the redevelopment of Cherry Knowle Hospital would be taking place in the near future although this did not occur. Planning applications for these sites are now expected shortly. The road cost figures and contributions from these sites will inevitably have to be reviewed in view of the passage of time.

The Officer's recommendation was then put to the Committee and it was:-

1. RESOLVED that the determination of the application be delegated to the Deputy Chief Executive to grant permission for the reasons set out in the report subject to the conditions set out therein and to the signing of a Section 106 agreement.

11/02240/FUL- Change of Use from waste storage area to a waste transfer station.

2. RESOLVED that the application be approved for the reasons set out in the report and subject to the 4 conditions set out therein.

11/02650/FUL – demolition of existing garage buildings and erection of three storey building to provide three commercial units at ground floor (Proposed to operate within Use Class A1 (Shops) or A2 (Financial and Professional Services) and six units of multiple occupation residential accommodation (Use Class C4) to first and second floors, each comprising six bedrooms with communal lounge and kitchen facilities, accessed via three communal staircases to the rear, and associated car parking and infrastructure. (Amended description)

Councillor Tye asked for confirmation that the proposed residential component of the development would be six flats each containing 5 bedrooms in each flat with

communal areas. He also asked whether it was known who the prospective tenants would be.

Mr Mattok confirmed the proposals and advised that it was anticipated that the flats would be used as student accommodation.

Councillor Forbes stated that this application was for a number of HMOs in one building which was not inkeeping with the area. She also stated that the parking provision seemed to be inadequate. It was hoped that regardless of the outcome of this application that the owner would demolish the current buildings and clear the site.

Mr Mattok advised that the level of parking was deemed to be acceptable and there was parking to be introduced at the front for users of the new commercial units. However, the development was not acceptable based on its scale and design and the separation distance with the neighbouring properties.

Councillor A. Wright asked for confirmation of whether the previous application was for conventional apartments and Mr Mattok advised that this was the case.

Councillor T. Martin stated that this was a busy road and he shared the concerns which had been raised with regard to the lack of parking provision.

The Chairman then introduced local resident Mr Burke who was in attendance to speak on this application.

Mr Burke stated that he was representing the residents of Grangetown and that his main concern was with the current condition of the site. The structures on site attracted antisocial youths to congregate as well as drug users; he wanted all of the structures on the site, including the front boundary wall, to be removed regardless of the outcome of this planning application.

3. RESOLVED that the application be refused for the 2 reasons set out in the Circulatory Report.

11/03046/FUL – Erection of a disabled access ramp to the front of the property (Retrospective)

Councillor A. Wright circulated some photographs of the ramp to show the Committee the scale and appearance of the ramp. He had no objections to the ramp being installed as the resident required this ramp to be able to access their property, he did however object to the materials used and the style of the construction.

Councillor Porthouse agreed with Councillor Wright's comments. In his view, the large steel construction would look more inkeeping in a factory than in an open plan residential street and was an eyesore.

Mr Mattok advised that this ramp was intended as a temporary structure to allow the resident to access their house; once the ramp was no longer required then the ramp would be removed. It was due to this that a metal ramp had been installed as it could

be easily removed and reused at another location unlike a concrete ramp which would not be able to be removed easily.

4. RESOLVED that the application be approved for the reasons set out in the reports and subject to the 2 conditions set out in the circulatory report.

11/03150/ADV – Advertisement Consent to retain banner sign to side

5. RESOLVED that the application be approved for the reasons set out in the Circulatory Report and subject to the 6 conditions set out therein.

11/03151/VAR – Variation of condition 4 of planning permission ref. 07/05519/FUL (Change of use to A2 (bookmakers), ground floor single storey extension to rear and single storey side extension to form new access to first floor flat) to allow the premises to open from 9:00am to 9:30pm Monday – Saturday and 10:00am – 6:00pm Sunday and bank holidays.

Mr Mattok advised that the proposed opening hours had been stated incorrectly by the applicant when completing the planning application; the proposed hours were in fact to be 10:00 and 21:30 on weekdays, 09:30 and 21:30 on Saturdays and 10:30 and 18:30 on Sundays and Bank/Public Holidays.

Councillor A. Wright stated that parking was currently an issue. While it was stated that the forecourt could accommodate three vehicles the reality was that only two would park there at any one time. Other vehicles were parked on the roadsides and grass verges and vehicles reversed off the forecourt into heavy traffic on the main road.

Mr Mattok advised that the application would not necessarily result in an increase in the demand for parking and it was felt that there was sufficient parking provided.

6. RESOLVED that the application be approved for the reasons set out in the Circulatory Report and subject to the 5 conditions set out therein.

11/02772/FUL – Change of use to restaurant at first floor level with bar to ground floor

Councillor Tye welcomed the application; the unit had stood vacant for a significant length of time so it was pleasing to see a proposal to bring the unit back into use. It was good to see that developer interest in this area.

7. RESOLVED that the application be approved for the reasons set out in the report and supplement subject to the three conditions set out within the supplement.

(Signed) E. GIBSON,
Chairman.

CONSULTATION RESPONSE TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT ON THE REVOCATION OF THE NORTH EAST OF ENGLAND PLAN.**REPORT BY THE DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE.****1.0 Purpose of the Report**

- 1.1 The Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) is seeking views to the “Environmental Report” prepared into the revocation of the North East of England Plan (the Regional Spatial Strategy).
- 1.2 A proposed response to the Environmental Report is attached at Annex 1. It has been prepared jointly by Sunderland City Council, Durham County Council, Gateshead Council and South Tyneside Council. Committee approval is sought to agree the observations so that they may be submitted to DCLG in reply to this consultation.

2.0 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 the preparation and adoption of Regional Spatial Strategies (RSSs) and Local Development Frameworks (LDFs) became a statutory requirement. Together, they comprise the ‘development plan’ for each local authority and act as the starting point to determine planning applications. Emerging LDFs are also required to be in general conformity with the RSS.
- 2.2 In July 2010, the Government attempted to meet its pre-election pledge by announcing, with immediate effect, the abolition of the suite of Regional Spatial Strategies (RSSs) adopted across the country. This decision was subsequently overturned through a series of High Court rulings. In December 2010, the Localism Bill was published containing provisions to repeal the relevant clauses of the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (which provides the legal requirement for RSSs). Whilst the Localism Bill received Royal Assent on 15 December, RSSs still remain legally in place, pending resolution of this latest consultation exercise.
- 2.3 Upon revocation of the RSSs, local authorities would be free to establish their own growth requirements (based upon clear evidence and through working with their communities) and are to be required through the Localism Act to co-operate with other local authorities and public bodies to address strategic cross-boundary issues.

3.0 STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL ~ THE ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT.

- 3.1 Since 2004, European and domestic regulations require that Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEA) and Sustainability Appraisals (SA) are undertaken on all plans and programmes that have a significant environmental affect. These assessments ensure that during the preparation and adoption of plans, socio-economic and environmental considerations are fully taken on board to ensure that plans promote sustainable development. SEA and SA are undertaken jointly where the responsible body must: -

- Prepare an 'Environmental Report' evaluating the likely environmental affects of implementing the plan and evaluates all reasonable alternatives
 - Consult designated environmental bodies and the public
 - Take into account the results of the consultation during the preparation process and before the plan is adopted
 - Make information available on the plan as adopted and how the environmental considerations have been taken into account.
- 3.2 As part of the final move towards the revocation of RSSs across the country, DCLG are consulting on separate Environmental Reports prepared for the eight adopted RSSs.
- 3.3 Preparing Environmental Reports (through the SEA and SA process) has become an essential part of bringing forward RSSs and LDFs. Some plans have been struck down in the absence of robust assessments. Within this particular suite of consultations, the Government has indicated that process is being completed voluntarily, given the regulations only require such reports when plans are being prepared, modified or adopted and not revoked. However, given the level of litigation following the first announcement to abolish RSSs, it is assumed that DCLG is taking a precautionary approach to avoid further delays in their abolition. Consultation on the eight separate RSS Environmental Reports closes on 20 January 2012.
- 3.4 The structure of the Environment Report for the North East RSS follows the necessary stages when completing the Environmental Report. This includes an assessment of the likely implications of revoking the individual RSS policies. The overall conclusions reached by DCLG within this Environmental Report are that : -
- The full environmental effects of revoking the RSS can only really be understood once the local authorities have set out their own land use requirements (on individually or collectively)
 - Revoking top-down RSS targets provides opportunities for securing environmental benefits by removing the threat of development pressures on local environments such as on Green Belts.
 - Decisions taken locally must look to maximise positive environmental outcomes for the local area (based on the legal principle that the planning system must promote sustainable development)
 - Notwithstanding any local decisions there remains the suite of higher tier safeguards to protect the environment such as the draft National Planning Policy Framework and in some cases national and European legislation. This means that its highly unlikely that there would be any significant adverse environmental effects resulting from the RSS revocation.

4.0 MAIN OBSERVATIONS TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT.

- 4.1 In short, the following observations are proposed : -
- Given significant objections to the recent draft National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) consultation, there is concern that the Environmental Report relies too heavily upon the NPPF as the means to safeguard environmental assets rather than referring to the extant suite of adopted national planning policy statements and guidance

- In the short term there will be a policy vacuum until the full suite of local plans are adopted. This necessitates the need for transitional arrangements that allow for key RSS policies to be saved
- The Environmental Report oversimplifies the fact that that environmental assets will be protected as authorities will set lower growth requirements than those set within the RSS (these assumptions are not justified by any robust evidence)
- Whilst the Localism Act imposes a “duty to co-operate” on cross boundary issues, there is no duty to agree. There are concerns on a number of issues that without an overarching regional ‘co-ordinator’ that there will be greater difficulties in reaching an agreed pan-regional policy approach.

5.0 NEXT STEPS

- 5.1 Upon conclusion of the consultations of into the eight Environmental Reports, in January 2012, all responses will be evaluated and reported. It is understood that the individual RSSs will be revoked by separate orders in early 2012.

6.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 6.1 Committee is recommended to note agree the response to the Environmental Report on the Revocation of the North East of England Plan at Annex 1 as the basis for this Council’s formal response to DCLG.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Environmental Report on the Revocation of the North East of England Plan.

Response of Durham County Council, Gateshead Council, South Tyneside Council and Sunderland City Council to Communities and Local Government's Consultation on the Environmental Report on the Revocation of the North East of England Plan

1. This response has been prepared jointly by Durham County Council, Gateshead Council, South Tyneside Council and Sunderland City Council, reflecting our wider efforts aimed at cooperation on strategic planning and cross-boundary issues.
2. The environmental report makes clear that the revocation of Regional Spatial Strategies (RSS) is part of the Government's reform of land-use policy, including the preparation of a National Planning Policy Framework. In this respect, many of the report's findings are subject to the successful adoption of the NPPF. We note however, that the NPPF is currently in draft format, with consultation on the draft framework having ended in October 2011. At the time of writing, a report summarising consultation responses has yet to be published, and it is not clear which elements of the NPPF will be revised in the final draft – nor is it clear when the NPPF is likely to be adopted. While we recognise that the broad objectives of the NPPF (as set out in paragraphs 1.3 to 1.5 of the report) are likely to be retained following consultation, the precise content of the NPPF may be subject to substantial and significant change through the consultation process. We would therefore argue that the environmental report should not attach significant weight to the content of the NPPF. It is further noted that the Environment Report makes no reference to the raft of extant national planning policies which remain in force as material planning considerations.
3. Current guidance in PPS12 clearly states that local authorities should not repeat national or regional policy within their Development Plan Documents. Revocation of RSS will inevitably leave a strategic gap in many authorities' statutory development plans pending the review of adopted and emerging local development documents. Whilst some authorities may have scope to address the loss of regional, (and national) policy through preparation of local development documents, or 'new-style' local plans, for many areas this process is likely to take several years. We therefore urge the Government to consider introducing transitional arrangements which would provide local authorities with the option to save key elements of the RSS that are fundamental to their statutory development plan, pending their replacement and incorporation as necessary into new plans.
4. The assertion that the removal of "top-down pressure on local authorities to review the extent of their Green Belt" through the revocation of RSS is identified in the report as being likely to contribute to the protection of the Green Belt. However, with the impending revocation of RSS it is likely to be population increase, in combination with decreasing average household sizes (as represented in official projections) which will, in many authorities, cause increased pressures on land resources, and in many instances necessitate a review of Green Belt boundaries to accommodate future development needs. Indeed, revocation of RSS, and the abolition of agencies which coordinated strategic planning at the regional level, leaves local authorities with the potential to plan for higher levels of growth than would have been acceptable under previous arrangements. It is therefore questionable as to how far the Environment Report can justify making such sweeping assumptions that Green

Belts and other features will in future be protected as a result of setting locally derived development requirements.

5. The report identifies the 'duty to cooperate' as providing a potential solution to areas of disagreement on cross-boundary issues. It should be noted, however, that the duty includes no mechanism for resolving disagreements, nor does it insist on a 'duty to agree'. The revocation of regional strategies, combined with the abolition of regional bodies removes a level of strategic planning which was able to offer direction on cross-boundary issues, and provide clarity on strategic priorities at a regional, and sub-regional level.
6. Annex A of the report provides an evaluation of the key environmental issues associated with RSS revocation, and assesses almost all of the policies as having potential to be "delivered by other means than through a regional strategy". Whilst this assessment may be appropriate in some cases, it too frequently fails to explore the full implications of revoking RSS policies which establish regional positions and targets, and address cross-boundary issues, which individual plans – even prepared within the context of the duty to cooperate would struggle to emulate. Specific examples include:
 - **Planning for strategic infrastructure, including transport.** The document states that "local authorities will need to work cooperatively with transport providers and operators to deliver sustainable transport and accessibility objectives". This may be the case, but strategic transport necessarily involves strategic planning across whole networks and it is far more difficult to achieve this without any regional framework. To imply that this can be achieved as effectively through individual local authorities working in some form of loose co-operation is disingenuous.
 - **Planning for renewable energy.** RSS includes regional targets as a framework for local contributions to the national targets for renewable energy generation and carbon reduction. The absence of regional targets will make local progress in contributing to national targets less clear and more difficult to monitor.
 - **Planning for minerals.** RSS sets out a regional minerals strategy and sub-regional aggregates apportionment. The report, as justification for Policy 43, states that Mineral Planning Authorities should continue to plan for "an adequate and steady supply of aggregate minerals to support economic growth". They should do this within the longstanding arrangements for minerals planning including receiving technical advice from Aggregate Working Parties. Crucially, however, the arrangements for aggregate minerals planning and continued funding for RAWPs has yet to be agreed, and the justification for the statement under Policy 43 will remain uncertain for as long as this remains the case. Similarly, RSS also sets out an overarching policy approach to opencast coal working and fireclay extraction, thereby ensuring a consistent approach across all coal bearing MPAs in the North East. As justification for Policy 44, the report states that these policy objectives could be delivered by other means than through a regional strategy and that MPAs will continue to be responsible for mineral development frameworks, including policies on opencast coal, having regard to national policy. Given the high profile and controversial nature of continued opencast coal extraction in many areas of the North east, it is unlikely that a regionally consistent approach will be effectively delivered by other means than through an RSS.
 - **Planning for waste management and new waste capacity.** RSS established regional apportionments, co-ordinated by Regional Technical

Advisory Bodies. The entire RTAB network has now been effectively dismantled through removal of funding, making any cross boundary collaboration more difficult to achieve.

7. Lastly, we note that the list of the current status of local plan preparation provided in Annex C of the report neglects to include South Tyneside Council's Development Management Policies DPD (declared 'sound in August 2011, and scheduled for adoption in December 2011), and Site Specific Allocations DPD (examination hearings held in October 2011, with the inspector's report expected in December 2011). Both DPDs should be acknowledged in the appropriate column depending on when the environmental report into RSS revocation is finalised.

**THE NEWCASTLE AND GATESHEAD ONE CORE STRATEGY: UPDATE
ON SUNDERLAND CITY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION****REPORT BY THE DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE****1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1.1 A report to the November meeting of this Committee outlined the Council's response to two emerging planning documents jointly prepared by Newcastle City Council and Gateshead Borough Council:-
- the Newcastle and Gateshead draft Core Strategy (the One Core Strategy) which covers the whole administrative area of Newcastle and Gateshead, and
 - the associated Urban Core Area Action Plan, which covers central shopping and business areas.
- 1.2 At the meeting it was agreed that Gateshead and Newcastle Council's should be informed that the City Council objected to proposals in the Core Strategy for housing development in the vicinity of Leam Lane as this would require development of Green Belt land.
- 1.3 It was also agreed that as the consultation deadline had been extended until the New Year, further discussions should take place between Gateshead and Sunderland Councils so as to enable a fuller understanding of the background to the proposal. The outcome of these discussions would be reported back to this Committee in time for a formal response to be made before the end of the consultation on 4th January 2012.
- 1.4 This report updates Members on these subsequent discussions.

2.0 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Gateshead Borough Council and Newcastle City Council are collaborating on preparing a single Core Strategy which covers the whole of the authority areas of Gateshead and Newcastle. Called the "One Core Strategy", it will provide broad guidance on the scale and distribution of development in the area to 2030 for the two authorities.
- 2.2 Core Strategy Policy CS12 highlights that provision will be made for a total of approximately 36,000 new homes to be built between 2010 to 2030. The gross housing requirement is split between Gateshead (15,000) and Newcastle (21,000).
- 2.3 In this regard, the Core Strategy proposes a Neighbourhood Growth Area at Leam Lane in Gateshead where up to 900 mid/upper market homes could be developed. As outlined in the report to November Planning and Highways Committee, this proposal is of particular concern to the City Council as it would represent a significant intrusion

onto land that has been protected as Green Belt for over twenty five years. For this reason it was considered appropriate to lodge a holding objection to the Core Strategy. It was further agreed that discussions should take place with Gateshead Council

3.0 UPDATED POSITION

- 3.1 Officers from the two Councils met on 1st December at Gateshead Civic Centre to discuss the issue. The following matters were examined:-
- 3.2 **Core Strategy** It was confirmed by Gateshead officers that the Core Strategy will not be allocating sites – including those at Leam Lane - this will be left to the Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) which is to be prepared at the same time as the Core Strategy.
- 3.3 The **Gateshead Strategic Housing Land Assessment (SHLAA)**. It is clear from the latest SHLAA prepared by Gateshead Borough Council (September 2010) that there are no significant suitable and deliverable housing sites in the urban part of east Gateshead where additional new houses could be built.
- 3.4 Whilst a number of sites were put forward in locations to the south of Leam Lane during the SHLAA process, due to their Green Belt status these were considered “unsuitable” for housing development.
- 3.5 **Strategic Land Review and Green Belt Assessment (SLR)** As the SHLAA has not identified sufficient new housing sites to accommodate the proposed housing requirement, a Strategic Land Review and Green Belt Assessment was undertaken to identify the most appropriate additional sites to meet development needs. This tested all parts of the Green Belt within Newcastle and Gateshead to establish how well they meet the five Green Belt objectives set by national planning guidance (PPG2). This allowed the identification of those parts of the Green Belt which only make a very limited contribution to Green belt objectives.
- 3.6 The SHLAA sites at Leam Lane were tested against criteria relating to:-
- Preventing the merging of neighbouring towns
 - Preserving the setting and special character of historic towns
 - Safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
 - Checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas
 - Assisting in urban regeneration
- 3.7 The Leam Lane sites scored 21 points out of a possible 25 which meant that in terms of the SLR, they were appropriate for consideration for housing development.

- 3.8 Discussions with officers from Gateshead have highlighted that whilst the SLR has identified the Leam Lane sites as potentially suitable, this does not mean that all of the land will be released for housing. The need to take into account the topography of the area and identify a defensible long-term Green Belt boundary could result in only part of the land being considered appropriate. This has yet to be determined. It is important to note that the SLR has for the present time identified more land than is required. All landowners and developers who have interests in the sites identified within the SLR – including those at Leam Lane - have been requested to submit broad concept plans of how their site could be developed with particular emphasis as to landscaping and Green Belt boundary treatments. It is understood these are to be submitted by January 2012. They will be assessed by both Gateshead and Newcastle Councils, where the most suitable sites are likely to be allocated within the separate Allocations DPD.
- 3.9 At the present time the draft Core Strategy must adhere to the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS). However, in the light of the impending revocation of the RSS, and due to changing economic circumstances, the preferred development requirements will be reappraised prior to the next formal stage of the Core Strategy. As the Localism Bill was enacted on 15th November 2011, it is now the case that this reappraisal will need to be undertaken so as to inform the next stage of plan making. It is possible that this could result in a reduction in the level of new housing required over the plan period.
- 3.10 Officers from the City Council will continue to monitor this situation to ensure that the One Core Strategy is based on robust population and growth assumptions. Further discussions will take place as part of the ongoing cross-boundary working group in the spirit of the duty to cooperate established under the Localism Act.
- 3.11 On this matter in general, there is a growing need for the three neighbouring Councils – Gateshead, South Tyneside and Sunderland – to work together in appraising the Green Belt in the Leam Lane/ Follingsby / Nissan area to jointly agree any potential for bringing forward new sites to support proven regeneration requirements. This issue will need to be addressed in terms of the proposed Strategic Site to the North of Nissan where a new low-carbon business cluster is proposed in the City's emerging Core Strategy. The mechanism for delivering this appraisal will be the subject of a future report to this Committee.

4.0 CONCLUSION

- 4.1 As outlined above, the scale of new housing at the proposed Neighbourhood Growth Area at Leam Lane will require the development of land which has been in Green Belt for many years.

- 4.2 It is recommended that Newcastle and Gateshead Councils are informed that the City Council maintains its holding objection to the draft Core Strategy. This objection would be subject to : -
- Newcastle and Gateshead re-appraising their growth requirements in the light of the enactment of the Localism Bill and demonstrating there is still a requirement for the Leam Lane site in order to deliver the Councils' overall housing requirements;
 - Future consideration of the concept plans that will be produced for these specific sites. .

- 4.3 The City Council would then offer a formal response - either positive or negative - at the next iteration of the Newcastle Gateshead Core Strategy.

5.0 NEXT STEPS

- 5.1 Subject to Committee approval, this report will be forwarded to Newcastle City Council and Gateshead Borough Council as constituting the formal response of Sunderland City Council.

6.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 6.1 Committee is requested to:-
- i) Endorse the comments as detailed within this report and make any additional comments considered appropriate;
 - ii) Agree that the City Council maintains its holding objection to the current proposals for the Leam Lane Neighbourhood Growth Area on the grounds that it will significantly impact on the Green Belt in this location;
 - iii) Authorise officers to forward a copy of this report to Newcastle City Council and Gateshead Borough Council as constituting the City Council's formal response to the Newcastle and Gateshead One Core Strategy.

7.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS

NewcastleGateshead One Core Strategy
NewcastleGateshead Strategic Land Review and Green Belt Assessment
Gateshead Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

Contact Officer: Gary Clasper (0191) 561 1537
Gary.clasper@sunderland.gov.uk

SUNDERLAND CITY COUNCIL LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK: ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT

REPORT BY THE DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 This report informs committee of the Council's Local Development Framework Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) for 2010 / 11.

2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1 Under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, all Councils are required to prepare a Local Development Framework (LDF). The LDF will replace the current Unitary Development Plan which was adopted in 1998. As the statutory development plan for the city, the LDF will be the starting point in considering planning applications. Furthermore, it will be the fundamental mechanism to deliver the key spatial objectives of the Economic Masterplan.

2.2 As part of the LDF, authorities are required to prepare an Annual Monitoring Report (AMR). Existing regulations require that AMRs contain :

- Progress on the preparation of development plan documents against the timetable within the Local Development Scheme (the LDF project plan)
- Any local development orders adopted or revoked
- Adopted policies that are to be rescinded and why
- The annual number of net housing completions.

2.3 Under the terms of the Localism Act 2011, future AMRs must also contain information relating to affordable housing completions; details of monies received from the Community Infrastructure Levy; the number of adopted neighbourhood plans; and any actions taken under the new 'duty to co-operate'.

2.4 Previously, the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) published detailed guidance on what AMRs should contain. Legally, AMRs had to be submitted to the Secretary of State by 31 December each year.

2.5 With the raft of planning reforms proposed and implemented by this Government since coming into power (outlined at Section 3), DCLG has withdrawn its previous guidance relating to AMRs. Authorities may now determine the content of AMRs (subject to the minimum regulatory requirements set out at paragraph 2.2). AMRs no longer need to be submitted to the Secretary of State.

2.6 This is the Council's eighth AMR and covers the period 1 April 2010 to 31 March 2011. A draft of this AMR is attached at Annex 1. Given the move to monitoring locally derived issues, this AMR has been prepared in accordance with the regulatory requirements. For completeness, this AMR includes more up to date information on matters that fall outwith the 2010/11 monitoring period.

2.7 Through the development of the emerging LDF Core Strategy, the emerging Corporate Outcomes Framework and 'Low Carbon City Village' project, it is

proposed that more appropriate monitoring requirements will be developed through 2011/12 to examine the spatial affects of policy implementation.

3.0 UPDATE TO THE PRINCIPAL REFORMS TO THE PLANNING SYSTEM

3.1 From 2010/11 to the present, there have been a number of important changes to policy at the national and regional level which has and will continue to have a significant bearing on LDF preparation within Sunderland. The principal changes are summarised below.

Amendments to Planning Policy Statement 3 “Housing”

3.2 In June 2010, private gardens were removed from the definition of brownfield land and removed national minimum density targets of 30 dwellings per hectare.

Revocation of Regional Spatial Strategies

3.3 In July 2010, Government announced the immediate revocation of RSSs prompting a series of High Court judgements. The Localism Act 2011 has now removed the relevant clauses from legislation requiring their need and use. DCLG is presently consulting on a series of Sustainability Appraisals (as required by EU law) to formally remove them. Their formal revocation is not expected until early 2012. In the interim, RSS remains legally in force, though the weight afforded to it varies:-

- For development control purposes, the revocation can be treated as a ‘material consideration’ which means that depending on the nature of the application, RSS policies may or may not be applied
- Emerging LDFs must by contrast still conform with the RSS provisions until they are formally abolished.

The Localism Act 2011

3.4 In December 2010, Government published the Localism Bill which received Royal Assent in November 2011. The Act will introduce significant changes to the planning regime over the coming months as secondary legislation and regulations are introduced. In short, the Act :-

- Confirms that RSS’s will be abolished (as outlined above)
- Allows communities to bring forward their own ‘neighbourhood plans’ that deliver more, but not less, development than is set out in the authority’s local plan. These are to be prepared by the community. Once adopted, these would form part of the Council’s development plan for that particular neighbourhood.
- Requires pre-application consultation on major schemes to be mandatory
- Permits financial incentives to be material considerations in determining planning applications
- Neighbourhoods are to be given a proportion of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) raised from development which can be spent locally at their discretion
- No longer requires the Inspector’s report (following a public examination into a Development Plan Document of the LDF) to be binding on the local authority
- Introduces a duty to co-operate between all public bodies on strategic planning.

The Draft National Planning Policy Framework

3.5 In July 2011, the draft National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published for consultation. Whilst present national policy is set out in over 1,000 pages of themed policy statements, the draft NPPF would consolidate all national policies into a single document. Linked to provisions of what is now the Localism Act, the NPPF proposes the following key reforms to Local Development Frameworks :-

- The planning system should remain plan-led
- Plans should be brought forward as quickly as possible, failure to do so would mean that the NPPF would become the primary decision making document
- Only in exceptional circumstances should more than one planning document be brought forward. The implication is that a single 'local plan' is produced setting out the broad strategic requirements and site specific allocations.
- Further guidance is provided on the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans.

4.0 PROGRESS ON SUNDERLAND'S DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENTS (DPD'S)

4.1 The Local Development Scheme (LDS) provides a timetable for the preparation of the constituent development plan documents that will comprise Sunderland's LDF. The council's current LDS was approved in March 2009. Progress of the Council's three DPDs against the adopted LDS are considered below.

DPD1 ~ The Core Strategy

4.2 This document will set out the overarching strategic policies for growth across the city. Subject to the timing of the revocation of the RSS, it will further set out the City's long term development requirements including those for housing and employment.

4.3 Following consultation on a range of "Alternative Spatial Development Approaches" in late 2009, a Revised "Preferred" Option Draft was approved in March 2010 (in accord with the LDS). Given the then impending national elections, the formal consultation was deferred. With the range of sweeping changes introduced by this Government (particularly the ensuing High Court decisions following the announcement to revoke RSSs in 2010) the intervening period has been used :

- Review and update the emerging Core Strategy document itself and continue to maintain an alignment between the Core Strategy and the Economic Masterplan
- Assess the evidence base that underpinned the original RSS policies
- Formally respond to a range of DCLG consultations regarding proposals to modify the planning system.
- Develop and update the evidence base that is required to underpin the LDF which includes :

i. Employment Land

Working to an RSS requirement of providing up to 225 hectares of employment land, the Employment Land Review was adopted in September 2009 to assess the city's portfolio of employment sites. Work has commenced to establish the city's own employment requirements against more up to date information including the key objectives of the Economic Masterplan. A final report is expected in early 2012.

ii. The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA)

The annual update of the SHLAA is progressing to inform the LDF of the potential availability of housing sites over 15 years and to establish that there is a rolling 5 year supply of ready to develop housing sites. The final report is expected in early 2012.

iii. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA)

The principal role of the SHMA is to model the level of housing need and demand across the city by location, house type, size and tenure. It further

determines the demand for general market housing and affordable housing. Proposals under the draft NPPF would require SHMAs to further establish the authority's long term housing requirements (in the absence of RSS). From July 2010, substantial evidence has been to date been gathered and analysed to develop scenarios as to the levels of future housing requirements. The City's last SHMA was adopted in February 2008, though its data is only robust for a 5 year period. Work has commenced to update the SHMA in accordance with the requirements of the draft NPPF (programmed for completion in mid-2012).

iv. Green Space Audit

The emerging Green Space audit has reviewed both the quantum and quality of some 1800 green spaces across the city (including public consultation in 2011). Categorised into 9 different typologies (eg amenity open space, formal recreational areas and country parks), it will identify areas where there are surpluses and deficits of green space by each typology. The data will further evidence the setting of standards by sub-area as to what types of open space should be secured through the development process; those areas of open space that should be protected from development and those that might be considered for release.

v. Green Infrastructure Strategy

The Green Space audit will further inform development of the Green Infrastructure Strategy. This will develop and enhance the existing network of open spaces and countryside that surrounds the city and extends into its built areas. The Strategy will consider not only the types of green spaces, but also the functionality of each. To develop a GI network, the strategy will consider the range of additional functions that could be designed into green spaces eg playing fields could have boundary tree planting providing shelter, a visual attraction and a habitat for wildlife, in addition to including pedestrian and cycle links to the local neighbourhood and wider GI network. These strands are programmed for completion in March 2012.

vi. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)

Infrastructure planning is a key component to the Core Strategy. The planning Inspector will test the soundness of the plan to ensure that its policies and proposals are as far as possible deliverable. The IDP will identify what physical, social and green infrastructure is required; as far as possible, identify how and when infrastructure will be delivered (which includes planned spending and funding gaps); and who will deliver the necessary infrastructure. Sunderland's emerging IDP was first drafted in March 2010 and has been updated in 2011, involving a range of partners, agencies and service providers from both the public and private sector.

vii. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA)

The SFRA models and identifies areas at most risk of flooding from all sources (including rivers, the sea and surface water). The objective being that future development is not located in areas at most risk. The City's SFRA was updated and adopted in July 2010.

viii. The Nature Conservation Audit.

Though not critical to the Core Strategy, the Audit will inform the Allocations DPD and will inform current development control decisions. This audit has reviewed the quality of the City's existing nature conservation sites and will make proposals to designate new sites and where necessary delete others. The findings of the survey are presently being analysed. This will subsequently be reported through Cabinet for consideration in early 2012.

DPD2 ~ Allocations Development Plan Document

4.4 Taking its lead from the Core Strategy, the Allocations DPD will identify sites for employment, retail, community facilities and open space, areas of nature conservation and transport routes. Previously preparation of DPDs of this nature had to follow behind Core Strategies. Its preparation has, as a consequence, slipped behind the timetable set out within the adopted LDS. That said, to support site specific issues, substantial evidential work has been undertaken to maintain an up to date evidence base as detailed above.

DPD3 ~ Hetton Downs Area Action Plan

4.5 Centring on the Hetton Downs / Eppleton area, this plan will provide the development framework for the area's long-term sustainable improvement and regeneration. The formal "Publication" draft was provisionally timetabled for July 2010, but this date was not met as a consequence of detailed issues around the School Place Planning exercise and the impacts this may have had on particular sites and road proposals within the plan area. Further investigative work is presently being undertaken to consider the proposed access road linking Houghton Road (at Broomhill) and the north end of Church Road in addition to the recent completion of an Neighbourhood Renewal Assessment undertaken for Maudlin Street (approved by Cabinet in November 2011). Consideration is now to be given as to how best progress the Area Action Plan.

Alteration No. 2 to the Unitary Development Plan

4.6 In September 2007, Alteration No. 2 was formally adopted to provide an up to date planning framework for the regeneration of Central Sunderland. Whilst not formally a constituent part of the City's emerging LDF, it remains a legal part of the city's development plan. Under the planning legislation, these policies technically had a 3 year lifespan and would have expired in September 2010. In July 2010, the full suite of policies set out in Alteration No. 2 were legally "saved" in perpetuity (until formally rescinded or replaced by the LDF).

The Duty to Co-Operate

4.7 The Localism Act now requires cooperation between local authorities on cross-boundary issues. Historically, there have been a number of examples of working together on cross boundary issues such as :-

- The development of a regionally accepted approach to preparing Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments
- The Tyne and Wear authorities have jointly commissioned the gathering of evidence for commercial and industrial waste
- Working with adjacent authorities to agree best working practices to deliver future SHMAs.
- At officer level, formal meetings are now convened with the Gateshead, South Tyneside and Durham Councils.

Neighbourhood Plans

4.8 At this stage, further regulations relating to the production of Neighbourhood Plans have only recently been released. At this stage it is too early to report on the possible take up regarding these plans in Sunderland.

Monies received from the Community Infrastructure Levy.

4.9 The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) will be a roof tax on all development, where the developer must make a contribution to the authority for the provision of infrastructure that is deemed essential to the enabling and meeting the growth requirements of the authority's Core Strategy. Presently, the Council does not have an adopted CIL, though its preparation is presently being scoped out to be delivered in tandem with the Core Strategy.

5.0 NEXT STEPS IN DPD PRODUCTION

A Revised Local Development Scheme (LDS).

5.1 Retaining an up to date LDS remains a statutory requirement. The Council's last LDS was adopted in 2009. Whilst on track as at March 2010, given the national upheavals, the programme has now slipped. The LDS is presently being reviewed as part of the wider work programming exercises of the newly established Economy and Place Team (which is now responsible for the LDF preparation).

Core Strategy

5.2 Given the emerging changes nationally and the call for moving to locally derived land requirements, it would remain expedient to continue with the programme to prepare and consult upon a Revised Preferred Options draft (as originally programmed). Whilst, no longer a statutory stage, it could be used to test and agree as far as possible, proposals for locally derived land requirements. This would offer time savings prior to moving to the next statutory stage (the Publication Draft). Subject to the actual timing of the RSS revocation, the emerging Core Strategy must still conform to the RSS requirements, though it would seem reasonable to introduce the City's own derived requirements.

5.3 A provisional timetable for the Core Strategy is as follows :

Key Milestone	Date
Revised Preferred Options Draft	Full Council - March 2012 (+ 6 week consultation)
Publication Draft	Full Council – October 2012 (+ 6 week consultation)
Submission Draft	March 2013
Examination in Public	June 2013
Receipt of Inspector's Report	October 2013
Adoption	Full Council – January 2014

Allocations Development Plan Document

5.4 Whilst formal preparation of this DPD has yet to commence, its future programme will be considered through the review of the LDS. As previously discussed at Section 4, the evidence base to take this document forward is largely complete or in the final stages of completion.

5.5 The Planning Inspectorate presently stipulates that other DPDs should not be prepared in tandem with Core Strategies. In the event that a Core Strategy is struck down for being unsound, all subordinate DPDs would also be declared unsound. Accordingly, it is currently good practise to run subordinate DPDs some 6 months

behind a Core Strategy programme. Given Inspector's reports are no longer binding upon authorities under the Localism Act 2011, this advice may change. It could be reasonable to assume that production of an Allocations DPD could be accelerated to the point of almost 'catching up' with the Core Strategy programme, potentially delivering a single local plan as per the proposals within the NPPF.

Hetton Downs AAP

5.6 Given the potential levels of potential changes since the Preferred Options draft was first published in 2007, it would presently appear expedient to revisit this stage of the process. As, with the Allocations DPD, its future timetable will be established through the review of the LDS.

6.0 Policy Monitoring

6.1 In summary, key performance of the UDP's main policies in 2010 / 11 are as follows: -

- **Business Development and Town Centres** – In 2010 / 11 some 36,523m² of new employment floorspace was granted consent primarily for (31,600 m² for manufacturing operations and 4923 m² for office uses). The latter permission representing the £10m Software City development at Tavistock Place. By the same token, there were some losses in employment floorspace, where permission was granted for residential development on some 7.65 hectares of employment land in Washington and at Fencehouses. The primary retail activity within this period related to consent being granted for the 8,378 m² (net) Tesco foodstore at Sunderland Retail Park along with the provision of four additional retail units totalling some 3000 m² (net) and the consent for the new 5,574 m² Primarck within the City Centre.
- **Housing** – In gross terms, new house building delivered some 714 dwellings (an increase from the previous year where gross additions to the housing stock were 614 dwellings). The main characteristic of house building activity in the city was the increased activity of Registered Providers which for the second successive year, saw their schemes outstrip those of the private sector. The key contributory factor was the previous Government's "Kickstart" programme which actively intervened in the market place by directly supporting house building activity in the city with some 403 affordable homes being delivered by the social house building sector. Equally for the second year running losses in housing stock (either through demolition or conversions to other uses) remained lower than previous years totalling some 338 dwellings. The net effect reduced the number of net new homes completed in 2010 / 11 to 376 (though this remains the fourth highest net gain since 1999/2000).
- **Waste** – 33.4% of the city's municipal waste was recycled or composted, which shows a steady rise year on year with 22% having been recycled in 2006/07, 24% in 2007/08 and 26% in 2008/09 and 27% in 2009/10.

7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Committee is requested to endorse the Annual Monitoring Report attached at Annex 1.

Background Papers

Sunderland City Council Annual Monitoring Report December 2010
Sunderland City Council Annual Monitoring Report December 2009
Sunderland City Council Annual Monitoring Report December 2008
Sunderland City Council Annual Monitoring Report December 2007
Sunderland City Council Local Development Scheme March 2007
Sunderland City Council Annual Monitoring Report December 2006
Sunderland City Council Annual Monitoring Report December 2005

Local Development Framework

Annual Monitoring
Report 2010/11

December 2011

INTRODUCTION

Under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the City Council is required to prepare a Local Development Framework (LDF). As statutory development plan for the city, the LDF will set out policies for land use across the entire city and be the primary basis for considering planning applications for the development or use of land. The LDF is the collective term for the variety of planning documents (which are both statutory or non-statutory) that the council will bring forward to undertake this function. The LDF will replace the current Unitary Development Plan which was adopted in 1998.

The 2004 Act requires every local planning authority to produce an Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) to assess:-

- The implementation of the Local Development Scheme (the timetable for preparing the LDF);
- The extent to which policies in the Local Development Framework are being achieved.

The Planning Regulations require the AMR to contain the following information:-

- Progress of the preparation of development plan documents against the timetable set out in the Local Development Scheme (the LDF project plan), including any that have been adopted in that year;
- Any local development orders adopted or revoked (not applicable to this Authority);
- Adopted policies that are to be rescinded and why (not applicable to this Authority);
- The annual number of net housing completions.

In addition, the Localism Act will require that future AMRs monitor performance on :

- The additional affordable housing completions;
- The amount received from the Community Infrastructure Levy;
- The number of Neighbourhood Plans that have been adopted; and
- Actions taken under the new duty to co-operate with public bodies on strategic planning issues.

The AMR must be completed by 31 December each year. This is the eighth such Annual Monitoring Report prepared by the City Council and primarily addresses the period 1 April 2010 to 31 March 2011. However, where necessary and for completeness, up to date information as at December 2011 is provided.

SUMMARY

The Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) is in two main sections:-

1. Local Development Scheme implementation

The first section provides detail on progress on implementing the council's Local Development Scheme. The current LDS details the timetable for the preparation of three local development documents:-

- Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD)
- Allocation DPD
- Hetton Downs Area Action Plan (AAP)

2. Policy implementation and monitoring

The second section provides detail on how the policies of the current development plan – the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - have been implemented.

DEVELOPMENTS AND CHANGES IN PLANNING POLICY

Over the course of 20010/11 there were a number of important changes to policy at national, regional and local level which will have a significant bearing on both the preparation and content of the LDF.

National

Since the new Coalition Government came into power in May 2010, it is seeking to remove centralised controls and give neighbourhoods and local areas the flexibility to innovate, access new resources and control their own futures. As part of this approach, it has sought to deliver on a series of pre-election pledges to reform the planning system. The Government sees that the planning system has a central role in delivering three key functions : -

- To give people more control over the shape, look and feel of their communities including the protection and promotion of important environmental and social interests;
- To provide sufficient housing to meet demand;
- To support economic development by providing infrastructure and using land use planning.

In June 2010, Planning Policy Statement 3 “Housing” was reissued setting out two key changes :

- The removal of private residential gardens from the definition of previously developed land
- The removal of the national minimum density target of 30 dwellings per hectare.

In October 2010, the Government published the first National Infrastructure Plan outlining its vision for the future of UK economic infrastructure. A detailed version of the plan is expected by the end of 2011 setting out the long term investment needs and priorities for UK economic infrastructure.

The mechanics of delivering many of these reforms, including those to the planning system were set out in the Localism Bill published in December 2010 which subsequently received Royal Assent in November 2011. Supplementary legislation and regulations will be required that will have a significant bearing on spatial planning which will require further consideration as they emerge. Among the reforms set out in the Act are:

- The abolition of Regional Spatial Strategies to include the scrapping of top down house building targets on local authorities
- A commitment to a plan led system, albeit in a modified form, that includes
 - The consolidation of all national planning policies into a consolidated National Planning Framework which was published for consultation in July 2011 requiring *inter alia* that authorities should prepare a single Local Plan as a matter of urgency
 - The move to preparing a single Local Plan setting out both strategic and site specific policies for the development of the area
 - A non-binding Inspector’s report
 - Giving the power for local communities to prepare Neighbourhood Plans to bring forward more development than that set out in the Local Plan
- The commitment to retaining the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), but modified to permit
 - Funds to be passed to neighbourhoods where development has taken place
 - Funds that can be spent on new, and on the ongoing costs of infrastructure
 - Local authorities have greater control over setting charging levels.
- The replacement of the Infrastructure Planning Commission with a fast track Major Infrastructure Unit where major projects would require ministerial approval.

Regional

In July 2010, Government confirmed its earlier statements by revoking all Regional Spatial Strategies (RSS) with immediate effect. This meant that the starting point to determine all planning applications lay with adopted plans such as Sunderland’s saved Unitary Development Plan (1998). This announcement prompted a series of High Court judgements. Their formal revocation is not expected until early 2012. In the interim, RSS remains legally in force, though the weight afforded to it varies:-

- For development control purposes, the revocation can be treated as a 'material consideration' which means that depending on the nature of the application, the RSS policies may or may not be applied
- Emerging LDFs must by contrast still conform with the RSS provisions until they are formally abolished.

Local

In October 2010, the Council and its partners launched the city's first Economic Masterplan that will guide the city's economic growth over the next 10 to 15 years. The Economic Masterplan seeks to integrate both the urban economic strategy and the spatial framework for the area and will become a powerful development and marketing/ promotional tool. The Masterplan's long term vision for the city is :

"To create an entrepreneurial university city at the heart of a low carbon regional economy"

This is underpinned by five aims that will have a spatial dimension :

- Aim 1 : A new kind of University City – developing Sunderland University's ability to facilitate enterprise and innovation in the city.
- Aim 2 : A national hub of the low carbon economy – emphasising the city's potential in pioneering a low carbon economy and linked to the Ministerial designation in July 2009 that Sunderland will be at the geographic heart of the Low Carbon Economic Area in the North East.
- Aim 3 : A connected waterfront City Centre – emphasising the importance of the city's waterfront position as a driver for economic development and place-making
- Aim 4 : A whole-life, inclusive city economy – ensuring the strategy delivers economic interventions that directly contributes to improving access to opportunity and reducing wordlessness and social exclusion in the city
- Aim 5 : Entrepreneurial in economic leadership – driving this ambitious city agenda will require clear, strong and entrepreneurial leadership around which resources and appropriate governance arrangements can be assembled.

As the Economic Masterplan is not a statutory document it cannot allocate land for development or set spatial planning policies to guide the future development of the city. However, it is a fundamental building block, forming part of the evidence base for the LDF.

The LDF, in particular the Core Strategy will therefore be the key delivery mechanism for delivering the spatial objectives of the Economic Masterplan.

1.0 LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME IMPLEMENTATION

Background

1.1 A key requirement of the Annual Monitoring Report is to review actual progress in terms of Local Development Document preparation against the timetable set out in the adopted Local Development Scheme (LDS).

1.2 The Local Development Scheme is a vital part of the LDF. It is a public statement setting out details of those Local Development Documents the City Council intends to produce, in what order and when. Producing the LDS is a priority as it will set out the timetable for document preparation over the coming years.

1.3 The city's first Local Development Scheme was adopted in March 2005 and was last updated in March 2009.

1.4 The change in Government and the new direction it is now seeking to introduce (namely the position of the Regional Spatial Strategy and the spatial planning issues arising from the Localism Act and the emerging National Planning Policy Framework) has and will continue to have a significant affect on the present programme for delivering the LDF in accordance within the adopted timescales. Therefore it will be essential to review the Local Development Scheme.

1.5 This Annual Monitoring Report assesses the delivery of the adopted LDS which details the timetable for the preparation of three local development documents:-

- Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD)
- Allocations DPD
- Hetton Downs Area Action Plan

1.6 The LDS establishes the following key targets (or "milestones") for document preparation, based on Government guidance :

- i) Consulting the statutory bodies on the scope of the sustainability appraisal;
- ii) Publication of the DPD;
- iii) Submission of the DPD;
- iv) Adoption of the DPD

DPD progress: Core Strategy DPD – Background

1.7 The Core Strategy lies at the heart of the LDF. It will set out the overarching strategic planning framework for the development of the city for the next 15 years and draw from other strategies of the City Council (such as the Sunderland Strategy and Economic Masterplan) and other organisations. In the main, it will not set out site-specific proposals or allocations. Apart from consideration being given to proposed Strategic Sites, the Core Strategy will indicate the broad locations for delivering new development such as housing, employment and transport. Once the Core Strategy is adopted, all other DPD's must be in conformity with it.

1.8 The first formal Core Strategy stage began with consultation on the Issues and Options between November 2005 and February 2006. The Preferred Options Draft was consulted upon between December 2007 and February 2008. However, given the availability of new evidence and regulatory changes during 2008 and 2009, it was considered appropriate to revise Preferred Options draft prior to advancing to its next formal stage, the Publication Draft.

1.9 During late 2009, the Council developed and consulted upon a four realistic alternative approaches regarding the overall spatial distribution of development across the city which included :

- § Approach A ~ Focussing Development on the Conurbation
- § Approach B ~ Proportional Distribution of Development
- § Approach C ~ Focus Development within the Current Urban Area

§ Approach D ~ Meeting Sub-Area Spatial Requirements - a Hybrid of Approaches A-C

1.10 Ten strategic sites were also identified and proposed for consultation.

1.11 Some 150 responses were received showing that Approach D was the preferred option favoured by residents and stakeholders which was corroborated by the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal. The number of strategic sites was also reduced to two – namely Vaux and land to the north of Nissan.

1.12 The format of the Revised Preferred Options Draft was also reviewed, moving away from a thematic based policy approach to one that focussed more on place making. In other words, it set out to tell the 'story' of where Sunderland has come from and where it will be in 15 years through the delivery of the policies. To provide greater local distinctiveness, five separate sub-area chapters were developed for Central Sunderland (and the City Centre), Sunderland North, Sunderland South, Washington and the Coalfields. These set out local visions, the key issues and constraints and the opportunities for potential growth together with bespoke policies that responded to the distinctive issues of each sub-area.

1.13 In accordance with the LDS the Revised Preferred Options Draft was approved in March 2010 by the Council for consultation purposes.

Overview of Progress during 2010 / 11

1.14 Given the then impending national elections, the formal consultation of the Revised Preferred Options draft was deferred. With the range of sweeping changes introduced by this Government (particularly the ensuing High Court decisions following the announcement to revoke RSSs in 2010) the intervening period has been used :

- Review and update the emerging Core Strategy document itself and continue to maintain an alignment between the Core Strategy and the Economic Masterplan
- Assess the evidence base that underpinned the original RSS policies
- Formally respond to a range of DCLG consultations regarding proposals to modify the planning system.
- Develop and update the evidence base that is required to underpin the LDF which includes :
 - i. *Employment Land*
Working to an RSS requirement of providing up to 225 hectares of employment land, the Employment Land Review was adopted in September 2009 to assess the city's portfolio of employment sites. Work has commenced to establish the city's own employment requirements against more up to date information and to reflect the objectives of the Economic Masterplan. A final report is expected in early 2012.
 - ii. *The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA)*
The annual update of the SHLAA is progressing to inform the LDF of the potential availability of housing sites over 15 years and to establish that there is a rolling 5 year supply of ready to develop housing sites. The final report is expected in early 2012.
 - iii. *The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA)*
The principal role of the SHMA is to model the level of housing need and demand across the city by location, house type, size and tenure. It further determines the demand for general market housing and affordable housing. Proposals under the draft NPPF would require SHMAs to further establish the authority's long term housing requirements (in the absence of RSS). From July 2010, substantial evidence has been to date been gathered and analysed to develop scenarios as to the levels of future housing requirements. The City's last SHMA was adopted in February 2008, though its data is only robust for a 5 year period. Work has commenced to update the SHMA in accordance with the requirements of the draft NPPF (programmed for completion in mid-2012).
 - iv. *Green Space Audit*
The emerging Green Space audit has reviewed both the quantum and quality of some 1800 green spaces across the city (including public consultation in 2011). Categorized into 9 different typologies (eg amenity open space, formal recreational areas and country parks), it will

identify areas where there are surpluses and deficits of green space by each typology. The data will further evidence the setting of standards by sub-area as to what types of open space should be secured through the development process; those areas of open space that should be protected from development and those that might be considered for release.

v. *Green Infrastructure Strategy*

The Green Space audit will further inform development of the Green Infrastructure Strategy. This will develop and enhance the existing network of open spaces and countryside that surrounds the city and extends into its built areas. The Strategy will consider not only the types of green spaces, but also the functionality of each. To develop a GI network, the strategy will consider the range of additional functions that could be designed into green spaces eg playing fields could have boundary tree planting providing shelter, a visual attraction and a habitat for wildlife, in addition to including pedestrian and cycle links to the local neighbourhood and wider GI network. These strands are programmed for completion in March 2012.

vi. *The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)*

Infrastructure planning is a key component to the Core Strategy. The planning Inspector will test the soundness of the plan to ensure that its policies and proposals are as far as possible deliverable. The IDP will identify what physical, social and green infrastructure is required; as far as possible, identify how and when infrastructure will be delivered (which includes planned spending and funding gaps); and who will deliver the necessary infrastructure. Sunderland's draft IDP was first prepared in March 2010 and has been updated in 2011, involving a range of partners, agencies and service providers from both the public and private sector.

vii. *The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA)*

The SFRA models and identifies areas at most risk of flooding from all sources (including rivers, the sea and surface water). The objective being that future development is not located in areas at most risk. The City's SFRA was updated and adopted in July 2010.

viii. *The Nature Conservation Audit.*

Though not critical to the Core Strategy, the Audit will inform the Allocations DPD and will inform current development control decisions. This audit reviews the quality of the City's existing nature conservation sites and makes proposals to designate new sites and where necessary delete others. The findings of the survey are presently being analysed. This will subsequently be reported through Cabinet for consideration in early 2012.

1.15 Given the emerging changes nationally and the call for moving to locally derived land requirements, it would remain expedient to continue with the programme to prepare and consult upon a Revised Preferred Options draft (as originally programmed). Whilst, no longer a statutory stage, it could be used to test and agree as far as possible, proposals for locally derived land requirements. This would offer time savings prior to moving to the next statutory stage (the Publication Draft). Subject to the actual timing of the RSS revocation, the emerging Core Strategy must still conform to the RSS requirements, though it would seem reasonable to introduce the City's own derived requirements.

1.16 A provisional timetable for the Core Strategy is as follows :

Key Milestone	Date
Revised Preferred Options Draft	Full Council - March 2012 (+ 6 week consultation)
Publication Draft	Full Council – October 2012 (+ 6 week consultation)
Submission Draft	March 2013
Examination in Public	June 2013
Receipt of Inspector's Report	October 2013
Adoption	Full Council – January 2014

DPD progress: Allocations DPD – Background

1.17 Taking its lead from the Core Strategy, the Allocations DPD will identify sites for employment, retail, community facilities and open space, areas of nature conservation and transport routes.

Overview of progress during 2010 / 11

1.18 Previously preparation of DPDs of this nature had to follow that of the Core Strategy. Consequently, progress has slipped against the adopted LDS given the issues outlined above. Whilst formal preparation of this DPD is yet to commence, its future programme will be considered through the review of the LDS. However, as set out above, the evidence base to take this DPD forward is largely complete or in the final stages of completion.

1.19 The Planning Inspectorate presently stipulates that other DPDs should not be prepared in tandem with Core Strategies. In the event that a Core Strategy is struck down for being unsound, all subordinate DPDs would also be declared unsound. Accordingly, it is currently good practise to run subordinate DPDs some 6 months behind a Core Strategy programme. Given Inspector's reports are no longer binding upon authorities under the Localism Act 2011, this advice may change. It could be reasonable to assume that production of an Allocations DPD could be accelerated to the point of almost 'catching up' with the Core Strategy programme, potentially delivering a single local plan as per the proposals within the draft NPPF.

DPD progress: Hetton Downs Area Action Plan – Background

1.20 A Private Sector Housing Condition Survey carried out in 2002 identified parts of Hetton Downs as being in an advanced state of decline. A subsequent Neighbourhood Renewal Assessment revealed a range of key regeneration issues in the area. An Area Action Plan will provide a robust planning framework for the area, to provide the development framework for the area's long-term sustainable improvement and regeneration.

1.21 A baseline assessment of the area was undertaken and this was used to inform the preparation of four land use options which were consulted upon in August 2006, prior to consulting on the Preferred Options draft in between August and September 2007. Responses to this latter consultation exercise focussed upon :

- Concerns about the proposed access road linking Houghton Road (at Broomhill) and the north end of Church Road – concerns included the proximity of the proposed route to Eppleton Primary School and associated issues of road safety, increased traffic on Church Road and the loss of Eppleton Cricket Club and a (disused) football pitch.
- Opposition to the proposals to relocate Eppleton Cricket Club and allocate the ground for housing development and to accommodate part of the route of the new access road.

Overview of progress during 2010 / 11

1.22 The formal "Publication" draft was provisionally timetabled for July 2010, though at the time of preparing the LDS in 2009, it was unclear at what point the School Place Planning process would be resolved (given that the potential closure of the school could have created significant issues for taking forward particular sites and road proposals within the plan area). It was agreed with Government Office North East that due to these circumstances the AAP timetable was provisional and would be amended upon resolution of the School Place Planning programme.

1.23 Now that the School Place Planning exercise has been completed, further investigative work is presently being undertaken to consider the proposed access road linking Houghton Road (at Broomhill) and the north end of Church Road. In addition, a Neighbourhood Renewal Assessment was undertaken for Maudlin Street (approved by Cabinet on 3 November 2011). Consideration is now to be given as to how best progress the Area Action Plan through the review of the Local Development Scheme.

Sustainability Appraisal – Background

1.24 Sustainable development is central to the planning system. Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Strategic Environmental Appraisal (SEA) are essential requirements for Local Development Frameworks and provide a way in which the sustainability effects of a plan can be described, analysed and compared. It also marks the beginning of the development plan process.

1.25 An initial part of the SA / SEA process is the preparation of a Scoping Report which sets out the context, establishes baseline information, and proposes sustainability objectives for a plan.

1.26 In May 2005 Scott Wilson Consultants were appointed to undertake the SA / SEA of the LDF Core Strategy and Unitary Development Plan Alteration No. 2 (Central Sunderland). A Scoping Report was published in October 2005 and separate SA / SEA's were subsequently carried out on the two plans and the emerging Hetton Downs Area Action Plan.

1.27 In the light of the proposed changes to the programme for the LDF it was necessary to revise and update the SA Scoping Report so that it would provide a basis for both the revised Core Strategy and Allocations DPD. In particular, much of the information contained in the 2005 Scoping Report was becoming out-of-date and would not be sufficiently robust to support emerging the DPD's.

1.28 In accordance with the LDS, a revised SA Scoping Report was prepared and was subject to a statutory five-week public consultation (including the three statutory Consultation Bodies – Natural England, English Heritage and the Environment Agency) between 29 May and 6 July 2009.

1.29 All three statutory environmental bodies responded as did One North East, Nexus, the Highways Agency and Northumbrian Water. The majority of comments received were supportive. The main points which arose highlighted that the range of other plans reviewed in the Scoping Report was not sufficient and other documents should be included (e.g. the 2007 Pitt Review on flood-related emergencies), also the need to include more recent data or amend data in the Scoping Report.

1.30 The SA Scoping Report, appropriately revised to take account of consultation responses, was adopted by the Council in September 2009. This Scoping Report was used to development the SA / SEA Environmental Report for both the Alternative Approaches consultation (and was subsewurntly held up as good practise by PAS) and the Core Strategy Revised Preferred Options Draft.

Overview of progress during 2010 / 11

1.31 Given the recent adoption of the revised Scoping Report, there has been no need to undertake other formal elements of the Sustainability Appraisal during 2010/11 other than ensuring that due cognisance was given to the SA Objectives as part of reviewing the Core Strategy policies.

Saved Unitary Development Plan Policies – Background

1.32 On commencement of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (September 2004) the policies of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) previously adopted in 1998, were automatically "saved" for three years, that is they would remain in force until September 2007.

1.33 In view of the need to consider policy coverage beyond this period, guidance was released by the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) which informed local planning authorities on how to save policies beyond September 2007. It required the council to submit a list of those policies it wished to save to the Government Office for the North East (GO-NE) by 1 April 2007.

1.34 Following Cabinet approval (February 2007) a schedule outlining which policies the Council wished to save was submitted to GO-NE. A subsequent directive was issued which confirmed saved UDP policies. These saved policies will continue to provide guidance in development plan matters and be used as a material consideration in assessing proposals for development until replaced by their counterparts in the LDF.

Overview of progress during 2010 / 11

1.35 The UDP Alteration for Central Sunderland (UDP Alteration No.2) was adopted in September 2007. As this Alteration was brought forward under the Transitional Provisions of the 2004 Act these policies also technically had a 3 year lifespan ending in September 2010. Working to the same procedure as outlined above, the full suite of policies set out in Alteration No. 2 were formally saved in July 2010.

Actions Undertaken Through The Duty to Co-Operate

1.36 The Localism Act now requires cooperation between local authorities on cross-boundary issues. Historically, there have been a number of examples of working together on cross boundary issues such as:-

- The development of a regionally accepted approach to preparing Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments
- The Tyne and Wear authorities have jointly commissioned the gathering of evidence for commercial and industrial waste
- Working with adjacent authorities to agree best working practices to deliver future SHMAs.
- At officer level, formal meetings are now convened with the Gateshead, South Tyneside and Durham Councils.

Adoption of Neighbourhood Plans

1.37 At this stage, further regulations relating to the production of Neighbourhood Plans have only recently been released. It is too early to report on the possible take up regarding these plans in Sunderland.

Monies received from the Community Infrastructure Levy.

1.38 The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) will be a roof tax on all development, where the developer must make a contribution to the authority for the provision of infrastructure that is deemed essential to the enabling and meeting the growth requirements of the authority's Core Strategy. Presently, the Council does not have an adopted CIL, though its preparation is presently being considered to be delivered in tandem with the Core Strategy.

2.0 POLICY MONITORING

2.1 This section provides a broad overview of significant developments taking place in the city during the course of 2010/11.

Context

2.2 Sunderland City covers 137km². It includes the main built up area of Sunderland including the city centre, plus the new town of Washington and the main former mining towns of Houghton-le-Spring and Hetton-le-Hole.

Demographics

2.3 As with the other Tyne and Wear districts and most authorities in the North East, Sunderland's population fell significantly between 1991 and 2001 by over 10,000 people. In some instances small increases are now beginning to be seen. Based on the latest estimates, Sunderland's population rose by 1,800 (or 0.6%) in the year to mid-2010, to 283,500. This is the first time the city's population has risen (year on year) for over a decade. Notwithstanding this, the population remains -4.9% less than it was in 1981. This compares to the other Tyne and Wear districts whose population remains on average some -3.2% less than it was since 1981. Between 2001-2010 the population in Sunderland fell by -0.4%, compared to a growth of 3.0% in Tyne and Wear.

City of Sunderland population change (in thousands)											
Year	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Pop'n	285,700	284,600	283,600	282,700	282,000	281,700	281,300	281,000	280,900	281,700	283,500

Source : 2010 Mid- Year Estimates (June 2011)

2.4 The table below compares the most recent population profile of the city to the North East and England.

Population by age group						
Age	Sunderland		North East		England	
0-14	45900	16.4	427.2	16.5	9075.7	17.5
15-29	59600	21.2	532.2	20.6	10377.7	20
30-44	55300	19.7	493.3	19	10874	21
45-64	74600	26.6	690.2	26.7	13047.9	25.2
65-84	41200	14.7	387.1	15	7271.6	14
85+	4300	1.5	54.3	2.1	1162.9	2.2
	280900		2584.3		51809.7	

Source: ONS Mid-Year Estimates 2008 (published August 2009)
Note: Figures may not sum to totals due to rounding

Socio cultural issues

2.5 The 2004 Indices of Deprivation (IMD) ranked the city as the 22nd most deprived local authority out of 354. The latest IMD data (2010) ranked Sunderland as the 38th most deprived local authority in England - an improvement of 16 places.

2.6 The city has the highest proportion (24%) of persons with a limiting long-term illness of all the Tyne and Wear Local Authorities (2001 Census). This compares to 23% of North East residents and 18% of England and Wales' population (2001 Census).

Economy

2.7 The proportion of people economically active in Sunderland has decreased from 75% in 2009/10 to 71.5% in 2010/11. This figure is below the regional average, where in the same time period the proportion of people economically active in the region actually increased 0.4% to 73.4%, and the national average which saw the number of people economically active decrease 0.2% to 76.2%. Workplace earnings in Sunderland continue to be below the North East average and UK average. The gross weekly pay for a full time worker in the city is £440.70 whilst in the North East it is £451.80. Whilst both local and regional

figures are increasing at a quicker rate when compared against national indicators, both remain significantly lower than national gross weekly pay which stands at £502.60.

2.8 The city has 194.5 hectares of available employment land and a further 19.1 hectares available for mixed use regeneration in Central Sunderland. 55% of the available employment land is in Washington. In the long term there are over 20 hectares available at South Ryhope and approximately 30 hectares available to the west of Nissan. A 20ha Strategic Site to the north of the Nissan factory is proposed in the Core Strategy (March 2010).

2.9 In 2010/ 2011 a number of planning decisions resulted in the loss of employment land in the City. Following a planning appeal in December 2010, permission was granted for the development of 71 houses on the former SIG Combibloc factory at Fencehouses; this would result in the loss of 5.5ha of employment land in the Coalfield (though it should be noted that the company relocated to a 5,000 sqft unit at Rainton Bridge Business Park). In February 2011, 60 houses were approved on the former Volker Stevin site at Springwell (the de-allocation of this site had previously been recommended in the Council's 2009 Employment Land Review).

2.10 A number of employment developments were granted permission in Washington in 2010/11 including the erection of a steel framed storage building (1,600 m².) at Washington Envelopes in Hertburn, and a 30,000 m² manufacturing plant for Rolls Royce at Radial 64 (the former Dunlop tyre factory).

2.11 In April construction started on the new electric battery plant at Nissan. The 25,000sqm facility will be operational in early 2012 and will provide a centrepiece for the North East region in its capacity as a Low Carbon Economic Area and is expected to create 200 new jobs at the plant.

2.12 Also at Nissan, Gateshead College and One North East announced the creation of a unique new open-access test track facility at the plant. One North East is investing £2.4 million to fund the refurbishment of the on-site workshop and the initial running costs of the new facility, transforming the centre into a hub for Low Carbon Vehicle development. The centre will be the only one of its type in Europe linked to a training facility. These characteristics were fundamental in the designation of the North East Enterprise Zone in 2011 which focuses on low carbon technologies, of which some 42 hectares of the Enterprise Zone are located at Nissan.

2.13 In January 2011 planning permission was granted for the £10m Software City development in Sunderland City Centre at Tavistock Place. The 4,923 m² development will include space for 60 software businesses, as well as exhibition space. Presently under construction, the development is scheduled for completion in early 2012.

2.14 North Sunderland has been the focus for the largest retail development in the City. In September 2010 permission was granted for a Tesco superstore at the Sunderland Retail Park. This store (8,378sqm [net]) will be developed along with 4 retail units totalling some 3,000sqm (net). Work on the scheme is expected to start early in 2012. Within the City Centre, consent was granted for new 5,574 m² Primarck store at The Bridges.

Housing

2.15 The city has a total of 124,859 dwellings¹, of which the majority are within the private sector, either in owner occupation or private rented. This tenure has seen a gradual increase however this increase is mirrored by a declining number of properties within the Registered Social Landlord (RSL) sector.

2.16 The average house price in the city as at November 2011 was £93,394. This was a decrease from the 2008 levels, when the average house price was £115,909.

2.17 In gross terms, new house building in 2010 / 11 saw 714 new homes completed in the city through either new-build completions or changes to properties which created additional homes. This figure is an

¹ Housing Flows Reconciliation Return 2010

improvement on gross completions in 2009/10 (where gross completions totalled some 614). However, when discounting losses in housing stock through demolitions and changes out of residential use, the net completion rate fell to 376 for 2010 / 11. That said, this represents the fourth highest net gain since 1999 / 2000. It is potentially, too early to suggest that this is demonstrating a recovery in the city's housing market. The rate of new house building in Sunderland was the subject of active intervention through the previous Government's Kickstart project which pumped a number of social housing developments led by Gentoo alongside increased provision of extra care accommodation. To further clarify this, a total of 403 affordable homes were built by Registered Providers (totaling some 56% of the total homes built). Since the economic downturn the increased activity of the Registered Providers compared to the private house builders has been fundamental to sustain house building activity within the city.

2.18 Private sector development continues to fall in comparison to previous years. The principle factor being the lack of mortgage availability as opposed to the lack of available sites that remain ready to develop for housing.

Environment

2.19 Sunderland's urban character varies considerably in its age, style, and the scale of its built form. This reflects the city's former industrial history of glass, shipbuilding, and coalmining.

2.20 The city has fourteen conservation areas. Management strategies have already been completed for twelve of these following the adoption of the Silksworth Hall, Sunnyside and Ryhope CAMS.

2.21 The city has 17 sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) totaling 104 hectares. All of this land meets Natural England's condition targets with 84% by area considered in favourable condition and 16% unfavourable but recovering. The Tyne and Wear average is approximately 73.5% favourable and 22% unfavourable but recovering. Other nature conservation designations include 1 Special Protection Area/Ramsar Site, 5 Local Nature Reserves, 1 Special Area of Conservation and 68 Local Wildlife Sites (formerly SNCIs)². As referred to in Section 1, the council is presently undertaking an extensive audit of all its nature conservation sites, to ensure that the appropriate levels of protection can continue to be afforded to these sites through the development management process. Equally, the audit will further assess the potential to designate new sites of nature conservation importance.

2.22 The integrity of the defined Green Belt and open breaks/ wedges was maintained during 2010 /11 where no applications in the Green Belt were approved contrary to policy.

Renewable Energy

2.25 In recent years a significant wind turbine scheme has been implemented in stages at the Nissan site. During 2008/09 a further two turbines were installed, each 660KW capacity. This brings the total on site to ten turbines, providing a cumulative total installed-capacity of approximately 6.6MW. In addition, 2 small 6KW wind turbines were installed at Houghton Kieper School.

2.26 In 2009 / 10, four wood biomass systems (each 400KW) were installed at secondary schools across the city in Academy 360, Castle View, Red House Academy, and Washington School. A Ground Source Heat pump was installed at in the new purpose built City Space building on the University's Chester Road campus.

2.27 However, there were no renewable energy schemes granted consent in 2010 / 11. Therefore, the total planned and installed capacity existing in the city remains at 17.2MW and contributing significantly to meeting the extant RSS renewable energy generating capacity target in Tyne and Wear of 22MW.

Waste

2.28 During 2010/11 33.4% of the city's municipal waste was recovered via recycling or composting, a 6.4% increase on last year's figure. Recycling has been growing steadily for several years, from only 11% in 2004/05. The other primary method of waste disposal remains landfill, although recycling initiatives have seen this fall from 80% of the city's waste in 2005/06 to 65.76% in 2010/11.

Municipal waste by disposal method						
Method	2005/06 %	2006/7 %	2007/8 %	2008/9 %	2009/10 %	2010/11 %
Landfill	80	78	73	74	72	65.76
Recycling/ composting	20	22	24	26	26	33.4
Other			3			
Source LDF AMRs 2005-2009						

Transport

2.29 In April 2010 permission was granted for the new river crossing at Claxheugh. Part of the Sunderland Strategic Transport Corridor (SSTC), the new “landmark” bridge will improve access between the A19 and the Port of Sunderland supporting regeneration such as the Groves, Vaux and Farrington Row sites in the river corridor, and the City Centre as a whole. Currently the bridge is the subject of Compulsory Purchase proceedings and funding decisions by Government. If successful on both counts, the new bridge could be open by the end of 2015.