

SUNDERLAND CENTRAL AREA URBAN DESIGN STRATEGY

Report of the Director of Development and Regeneration

1.0 Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To advise Planning & Highways Committee of the responses received following consultation on the proposed policies and proposals outlined in the Sunderland Central Area Urban Design Strategy (SCAUDS) Consultation Draft, and advise Committee of Cabinet's decision on 9 July 2008 to adopt the resulting amended SCAUDS as a Supplementary Planning Document.

2.0 Background

- 2.1 The City Council adopted Alteration No2 to its Unitary Development Plan (UDP) for the City in September 2007. UDP Alteration No2 covers central Sunderland. Policy B2A of the Plan states that "The City Council will seek to secure the highest possible quality of built environment and the creation of desirable places to live, work, shop and visit." One element of this policy requires developments to conform with the council's relevant supplementary planning guidance stating that "specific guidance for the central area will be prepared in the form of a design strategy."
- 2.2 Accordingly work commenced to prepare this strategy and at its meeting on 10th October 2007 Cabinet considered a report by the Director of Development and Regeneration and approved the Sunderland Central Area Urban Design Strategy as a Draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the purposes of public consultation.

3.0 Consultations on the Sunderland Central Area Design Strategy

- 3.1 In order to facilitate the adoption of the SCAUDS and to ensure compliance with all relevant planning policies, the draft SCAUDS was the subject of a formal six week consultation process with statutory consultees, stakeholders, and the broader community. Copies of the draft SCAUDS were placed in the City Library and the Civic Centre. In addition public exhibitions were held within The Bridges Shopping Centre and the Civic Centre. The exhibition within the Civic Centre ran for 6 weeks from Monday 12th November to Friday 21st December 2007. Staff from the City Council's Planning Implementation Team attended the exhibition within The Bridges Shopping Centre from Wednesday the 14th to Friday the 16th of November 2008 to give members of the public the opportunity to discuss the Strategy. Executive Summaries and comment forms were provided at all the display points to allow members of the public to express their views.
- 3.2 Copies of the draft SCAUDS were also sent to statutory consultees, community groups, estate agents and private planning consultants. An Executive Summary was sent to all residents and businesses within the study area. A press release was made in the Sunderland Echo to advertise the consultation. Annex 1 contains a schedule of the key stakeholders consulted.

Summary of Consultation Responses

- 3.3 A total of 62 written responses were received from external consultees; 6 from statutory consultees and 56 from non-statutory consultees. The majority of responses were broadly in support of the SCAUDS suggesting that the document sets out a clear vision and strategy for the city centre.
- 3.4 A summary of the main comments received is set out below. These comments have been grouped together under a series of subject headings. Annex 2 contains all comments received together with the Council's proposed response to them and an indication of any changes required to the document where considered appropriate.

Statutory Consultees

- 3.5 The North East Assembly and One NorthEast were supportive of the document suggesting that it will assist in delivering the Regional Spatial Strategy's objectives and that it is an important document in terms of its focus on regeneration opportunities. English Heritage welcomed the document and broadly supports its objectives. Other statutory consultees were broadly supportive of the Strategy document or had no adverse comment.

Land Securities

- 3.6 Land Securities expressed general support for the Strategy. Concerns were raised in relation to the proposal to improve pedestrian permeability through the Bridges at all times of the day. They expressed the need for other uses such as restaurants to facilitate greater use in the evening but they do not support unlimited 24 hour-a-day public access at this stage. The public realm design guidance was welcomed by Land Securities and general support given to a new east-west pedestrian route linking the Bridges with the Town Park.

Sunderland Civic Society

- 3.7 The majority of comments related to minor amendments to the Strategy although some critical comments were made regarding the construction and approval of various schemes in recent years in the Central Area. The Civic Society was supportive of concepts such as the Great Street, pedestrian footbridges, criteria for tall buildings and measures to protect the setting of St Peter's church as a potential World Heritage Site.

GL Hearn (on behalf of North of England Civic Trust and God TV)

- 3.8 The North of England Civic Trust (NECT) are the freehold owner of the Scotia Quays site. NECT raised concerns with the indicative layout masterplan in the document. This plan has been amended to reflect these concerns. Further comments were expressed in relation to the proposed position of the footbridge landing and concerns that this encroaches onto the Scotia Quays site. This is not the case and is further clarified by the revised masterplan. NECT and God TV objected to the wording of the preface and para 4.2 of the

document, in particular the need for all development proposals and public realm works to conform with the SCAUDS. In particular concerns were expressed in relation to the indicative layout plan. It is accepted that the wording under para 4.2 suggests that no flexibility will be permitted when assessing development proposals that differ from the strategy and strategic design guidance. The text has therefore been amended to address these concerns.

- 3.9 The Council does not agree with the assertion by the North of England Civic Trust that as the SCAUDS is to be progressed as an SPD and is not part of the statutory plan it is not justifiable or appropriate to require proposals to conform with it. The SPD is founded in Policy B2A of UDP Alteration No2 which clearly states that developments will be required to conform with the Council's SPDs.
- 3.10 Various other comments were made on behalf of God TV, the owner of Angel House (formerly Crown House) in relation to the potential redevelopment of this site and building heights. This section of the document has been amended to reflect the emerging Sunnyside Planning and Design Framework and the guidance contained within this document which relates to this specific site.

Metnor / Akenside

- 3.11 Although generally supportive of the document, an objection was raised in relation to the masterplan shown throughout the document, in particular the plans on page 130 which show how the St Peter's area may be developed in the future. The masterplan has been amended to partially reflect the layout based on the emerging scheme which is the subject of an outline planning application from Metnor/Akenside which has been the subject of pre-application discussions. The previous layout plan was based on an existing planning consent granted a number of years ago to Akenside Developments. It should be noted that although the amended layout plan in the Strategy document reflects the current outline application it does not imply that the relevant scheme is considered acceptable and is included without prejudice to any decision that will be made on the submission by the Council as Planning Authority.

Local residents

- 3.12 A number of responses were received from local residents, the majority of which were supportive of the strategy. Issues commented on included the positioning of district boundaries, a desire to see the central station redeveloped, redeveloping Crowtree, deliverability of proposals, lighting and sense of arrival in the central area. Annex 2 provides further details of the responses received during the public consultation period.

Amendments to the Central Area Urban Design Strategy

- 4.1 In light of the submitted comments received and following a period of analysis the SCAUDS has been amended and considered by Cabinet at its meeting on 9 July 2008. Cabinet resolved to:

- (i) Adopt the amended Sunderland Central Area Urban Design Strategy as a Supplementary Planning Document.

4.2 Annex 2 outlines the key changes that have been made to the SCAUDS. Copies of the revised SCAUDS are available in the Members' library.

5.0 Reason for Decision

5.1 The decision is necessary in order to establish an Urban Design Strategy that will achieve a co-ordinated approach to the future development of the central area and establish a clear urban design vision for the central area to guide emerging and future development proposals.

6.0 Alternative Options

6.1 The Council could have chosen not to adopt the amended SCAUDS as a Supplementary Planning Document. However, this would have significantly weakened the Council's ability to control development in terms of securing a high quality of urban design throughout the City Centre, therefore this is not considered to be an acceptable option.

7.0 Other Relevant Considerations and Consultations

7.1 Financial Implications: At this stage there are no direct costs arising from the Strategy's proposals.

7.2 Legal Implications: The SCAUDS has been prepared in accordance with the relevant Planning Regulations. The City Solicitor has been consulted and his views incorporated into the body of the report.

7.3 Policy Implications: as an adopted Supplementary Planning Document the SCAUDS will be a material consideration in determining planning applications in the central area.

8.0 Recommendation

8.1 The Committee is recommended to note the report and the amended SCAUDS.

9.0 Background Papers

- UDP Alteration No 2. Central Sunderland
- Unitary Development Plan (UDP)
- Interim Strategy for Housing Land (ISHL)
- Planning Policy Statement 1 – Delivering Sustainable Development (PPS1)
- Planning Policy Statement 3 – Housing (PPS3)
- Planning Policy Statement 6 – Planning for Town Centres
- Planning Policy Statement 12 – Local development Framework (PPS12)

- By Design – Better Places to Live, A Companion Guide to PPG3 (DTLR)
- By Design – Urban Design in the Planning System (DTLR)

ANNEX 1 – SCHEDULE OF KEY STAKEHOLDERS CONSULTED

STATUTORY CONSULTEES

COUNCILS

Chester-le-Street Council
City of Durham Council
City of Newcastle upon Tyne Council
Durham County Council
Easington District Council
Gateshead MBC
North Tyneside MBC
South Tyneside Council

REGIONAL BODIES

Government Office for the North East
One North East
North East Assembly
North East Chamber of Commerce
University of Sunderland
House Builders Federation

UTILITIES

NEDL
NTL
British Telecom
Network Rail
Northumbrian Water Ltd
British Gas (Transco)

SERVICES

Highways Agency
Strategic Health Authority
City Hospitals Sunderland NHS Foundation Trust
Northumbria Police HQ
Priority Healthcare Wearside
Sunderland Health Commission

NON STATUTORY CONSULTEES

MISCELLANEOUS

Andy Lees
British Waterways
Church Commissioners
City Centre Management
Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment
County Archaeologist
CPRE Sunderland
Defra

Durham Wildlife Trust
Forestry Commission GB
Go-Ahead Northern
Sunderland arc
National Playing Fields Association
Nexus
NHS Executive North & Yorkshire
North East Housing Board
North of England Civic Trust
Northumbria Ambulance Service NHS Trust
Port of Sunderland
RSPB Northern England Office
Country Landowners Association
Sport England
Sunderland Civic Society
Sunderland Divisional Police HQ
Sustrans
The Coal Authority
The Crown Estate
Tyne & Wear Development Company
Tyne and Wear Metropolitan Fire Brigade
Tyne and Wear Passenger Transport Authority
Transport 2000
Regional Railways NorthEast
English Nature
British Wind Energy Association

BUSINESS

Cable and Wireless & Mercury
N Power
Northern Electric
O2
Orange Communications
Stagecoach North East
T-Mobile Customer Services
Vodafone Corporate Communications
Joplings Ltd
Edward Thompson Group
Land Securities Properties Ltd
The Bridges Shopping Centre
Cottam Bros Ltd
Sunderland AFC
Sunderland Business Network Ltd
Business Link Tyne & Wear
Marks and Spencer
Tesco

HOUSING ASSOCIATIONS

Anchor Trust
Banks of the Wear HA
Home Housing Association
Housing 21
Enterprise 5's Housing Ass.
Cheviot Housing

North British Housing Ass.
Pele Housing Association
Riverside & Wearmouth Housing Association
Three Rivers Housing Association
Turnbull House
Two Castles Housing
Gentoo Group Ltd
Housing Corporation

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

Fraser Kemp MP
Chris Mullin MP
Bill Etherington MP
Sharon Hodgson MP

COMMUNITY/VOLUNTARY GROUPS

Community Access Point
North Welfare Rights Service
CLASS
City Centre Residents Association
Round Table (Sunderland)
Sunderland Council for Voluntary Service
Headlight
Hetton Resource Centre
North Regional Association for the Blind
CHANCE
Juvenile Service-Sunderland
Sunderland Naval Club Ltd
Sunderland People First
City of Sunderland Council for the Disabled
MIND-Sunderland
Sunderland Law Society
Federation of Small Businesses
North of England Refugee Service
Sunderland Federation of Community Associations
North East Business & Innovation Centre
Refugee and Asylum Seekers Support Network
Samaritans
Sunderland Bangladeshi Community Centre
Sunderland Carers' Centre
Sunderland Sikh Associations
Sunderland Volunteer Bureau
Sunderland Mosque
Sunderland Deaf Society
REACH Project
Sunderland Counselling Services

CONSERVATION

Department for Culture, Media & Sport
English Heritage
Monkwearmouth Local History Group
Buildings Historian
Institute of Historic Building Conservation

Living History North East
Sunderland Antiquarian Society
Society for Protection of Ancient Buildings
Sunderland Heritage & Local History Forum
The Georgian Group
Twentieth Century Society
Victorian Society

URBAN DESIGN & ARCHITECTURE

AHM Design Partnership
Alfred McAlpine
Anthony Watson Architects
Baker Builders
Barrett Newcastle
Bellway Homes NE
Gladedale (Sunderland) Ltd
Bill Hopper Design Ltd
Bowey Homes
Browne, Smith, Baker
Bryant Homes NE & Yorkshire
Burgess Dent Partnership Ltd
Burns Architects
Cecil M Yuill Ltd
Charles Church NE
Christopher Brummit
Coulson, Swinburne & Moses
David Johnson Architects
Dixon Dawson Chartered Architects
Dunelm Property Services
Elder Lester Garland McGregor
Façade Design
Fitz Architects
G Craig
George Wimpey
Glenrose Developments
Gray Fawdon & Riddle
Haslam Homes NE
Home Group Ltd
I.J Bell & B. Wilkinson
Ian Darby Partnerships
Ian M Cook
JDDK Ltd
Jeff Park Building Consultancy Services
M.W.E Architects
Mackella Architects
Mandale Properties Ltd
Mario Minchella Architects
McCarrick Homes
McCarthy & Stone Ltd
Miller Homes
Miss M.R.M Ambelez
Mosedale Gillat Architects
Mr B Walker
Akenside Wharf Ltd
Mr J Waugh

Mr S.L Reader
Napper Architects
Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners
NE Premier Homes
Northern Architecture
Owen Technical Services
P and HS Architects
PHS Architects
Plot of Gold
Red Box Design Group
Roker Developments
Ryder HKS Ltd
Self Build & Design Architects
Shenstone Properties LTD
Shepherd Homes Ltd
The Planning Bureau
UK Central Office
WSP Development LTD
Aken-side
Building Design Partnership
Calmont
CTP
Elder and Cannon
Fairhursts
Faulkner Brown
Thornfields Properties
Vico Properties
Jill Pate
GL Hearn
Life Homes
Metnor
Page and Park
JM Architects

ANNEX 2 – SCHEDULE OF RESPONSES AND KEY CHANGES TO DRAFT SUNDERLAND CENTRAL AREA URBAN DESIGN STRATEGY

Consultee	Summary of Response	Council Response
<p>M P Lancaster, Government Office for the North East (Statutory)</p>	<p>All of the matters covered in the SPD must relate to policies in a development plan document or a saved policy in a development plan, and SPDs should state clearly which DPD policies or saved policies they support.</p> <p>Section 19(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires local planning authorities to produce a Sustainability Appraisal of SPDs and a report of the findings.</p> <p>Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 sets out the requirements for publicising and consulting on draft SPDs.</p> <p>This SPD is not one of those identified as being among those the Secretary of State wishes to track. We have, therefore, no specific comments to make on the Council's draft SPD.</p>	<p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p>
<p>P Jones, Planning Manager, North East Assembly (Statutory)</p>	<p>The North East Assembly supports the progress made on the development of a central area urban design framework for Sunderland. The regeneration of the core areas of the conurbation are identified as a key priority in RSS proposed changes policies 5 and 7. The urban design strategy for Sunderland central area proposes to establish a vision and co-ordinated approach to the future development of the central area. This is considered particularly important given that the site is identified as a regionally significant brownfield mixed use development opportunity in RSS proposed changes policy 13.</p> <p>There are a number of regional planning policy objectives, which should be taken into consideration in establishing the urban design framework. RPG1 policy ENV22 and RSS proposed changes policy 5B direct strategies and planning proposals to promote a high quality of design and development. The urban design framework will assist in delivering these objectives, and ensuring that new buildings contribute to the city's local distinctiveness and respect the historic townscape is particularly supported.</p> <p>RSS Proposed changes policy 13 provides specific guidance on the means</p>	<p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p>

<p>P Jones, Planning Manager, North East Assembly continued</p>	<p>by which regional brownfield mixed-use development areas should be delivered. The development of an urban design framework supports these objectives and the consideration given to improving arrival points and movement through the city on foot is welcomed.</p> <p>Design and layout of development has an important role in delivering sustainable communities. RSS proposed changes policy 24 directs local authorities to assess the contribution that design can make to strengthening local communities. Reference in the document to enhancing the quality and the safety of the pedestrian environment and establishing good links between the central area and the surrounding residential communities is supported.</p> <p>It is noted that the UDP Alteration No. 2 requires new developments to address energy efficiency measures; incorporate embedded renewable energy; and provide sustainable drainage systems. Reference to this in the urban design framework is welcomed.</p> <p>The production of the urban design framework is supported and the approach considered to be in general conformity with RPG1 and the RSS proposed changes.</p>	<p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p>
<p>P Ritchie, Assistant Chief Executive One North East (Statutory)</p>	<p>One NorthEast welcomes the Council's intention to provide this SPD in respect of the Sunderland Central Area which, once adopted, will be taken as a material consideration for determining development proposals within the area.</p> <p>The Agency supports the three fold aims of the proposed Urban Design Strategy and the Council's strong commitment to achieving 'first class' urban design within the Central Area of Sunderland. We endorse the Council's Vision for the Central Area.</p> <p>The focus on the key regeneration opportunities within the central area is also welcomed. The Agency would urge the City Council to ensure that the aims and objectives of the final Urban Design Strategy complement and accord with those proposed by other guidance frameworks currently being prepared and that issues such as storey heights are dealt with consistently by the various emerging advice/policy documents.</p>	<p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed The relevant documents have been assessed to ensure consistency in the Councils guidance.</p>

<p>C Dewar Historic Areas Advisor English Heritage continued</p>	<p>P.48: there needs to be some recognition of the importance of St Peter's as an area of green space that would benefit from some enhancement (possibly through S106 contributions from neighbouring sites).</p> <p>P.53 Mowbray Park is included in English Heritage's Register of Historic Parks and Gardens.</p> <p>P.58 we welcome the reference to contextually sensitive design – this doesn't preclude innovative, contemporary architecture but ensures that it does respect context.</p> <p>P.58-59: the reference to landmark buildings is also welcome and a clear definition is provided in para. 4.12. A similarly useful definition could be given for tall buildings for clarification. The reference to point blocks rather than slab blocks is also welcomed.</p> <p>P.60: following on from the above point, whilst we welcome and support the main thrust of the statement in para. 4.19, what is meant by tall in this context, particularly given presence of the Echo 24 building on the opposite riverbank?</p>	<p>World Heritage Site. Therefore, whilst the Council is committed to improving the wider area the suggested additional scope for the strategy is outside the remit of the document.</p> <p>Comments noted – document amended Agreed. The area around St Peter's, which is the subject to a public realm/landscape study, will be included as a key location under paragraph 3.69. An additional paragraph has also been inserted at 3.92 stating 'The area around St Peter's Church is a key area of public open space. This space will be protected and enhanced to reflect the important role it plays in preserving the character of St Peter's Church and the wider area.'</p> <p>Comments noted – document amended Additional text added to paragraph 3.86 stating that Mowbray Park is included in English Heritage's Register of Historic Parks and Gardens.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed It should be noted that UDP Alteration No.2 includes a definition of a tall building in the supporting text of Policy B2B. However, whilst it is understood that a clear definition of a tall building could be desirable within the document, it is considered difficult to provide such clarity as whether or not a proposal could be considered a 'tall building' will depend on a number of factors, including the scale of the existing buildings in the area, local topography, proposed building form etc. Some development proposals could therefore have the same impact as a tall building whilst falling outside any prescribed definition within the Strategy.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed As is stated in para. 4.19 'Further guidance on development opportunities around St Peter's including appropriate building heights is given in Section 5 'Delivering the Vision'. Para. 5.181 states that for key development opportunities in St Peter's Wharf 'Developments should be in the range of six to ten storeys having regard to the gradient and topography of the site, preserving views toward the setting of St Peter's Church, and complementing the setting of the Wearmouth Bridge'. Para.</p>
--	---	--

<p>C Dewar Historic Areas Advisor English Heritage continued</p>	<p>P.65: this section on the historic environment could usefully set out a commitment to prepare conservation area appraisals and management strategies. It would be useful to set out here the value of conservation area character appraisals when assessing the context of a development site.</p> <p>P.74: Objective 7: Achieve Environmental Sustainability. There is an opportunity here to emphasise the role that good urban design can play in achieving sustainable neighbourhoods, an issue often underplayed due to the current prominence of energy and waste issues. Well designed neighbourhoods are more likely to be successful places, many estates of the 60s and 70s being examples of poorly designed neighbourhoods. Also worth mentioning is that the retention of existing buildings is often a more sustainable solution than demolition due to the embodied energy within existing buildings.</p> <p>P.91: 5.17 West Park – it would be worth mentioning the value of the park as a setting for Sir Basil Spence Civic Centre buildings.</p> <p>P.91: 5.23 – the tiled floorscape is a particularly important element of the complex’s landscaping.</p> <p>P.129: 5.180 “celebrate the architectural quality and diversity of the area ensuring that all development proposals are stylish and contemporary contributing to St Peter’s identity of history and innovation”. More appropriate wording may be to “ensure all development proposals are contemporary and of a very high quality...” rather than using the word</p>	<p>4.20 also states that in considering proposals for tall buildings in the central area the City Council will have regard to Policy B2B of UDP Alteration No. 2, which as stated above includes a definition of a tall building in the supporting text.</p> <p>Comments noted – document amended Para. 4.27 has been amended to include the following sentences ‘The Council is currently in the process of producing Conservation Area Character Appraisals and Management Strategies for the three conservation areas within the central area. These documents will have an important role to play when assessing the context of a development site.’</p> <p>Comments noted – document amended The desire to create sustainable neighbourhoods, as well as minimising energy use, waste etc. is agreed. Additional text added to para. 4.49 stating ‘Good urban design has an important role to play in creating sustainable neighbourhoods.’ With regard to the retention of existing buildings paragraph 4.50 includes the following: ‘It will be important to actively promote the regeneration of previously developed and vacant land in the central area and the re-use and refurbishment of existing buildings.’ An additional sentence added to the end of the paragraph states ‘The retention of existing buildings is often a more sustainable solution than demolition and new build due to the embodied energy within existing buildings.’</p> <p>Comments noted – document amended Additional text added to the start of para. 5.17 so that first two sentences read ‘West Park is an important area of open space within the city that provides a setting for the Sir Basil Spence Civic Centre buildings. The park will become the ‘anchor’ at the southern end of the ‘Great Walk’.’</p> <p>Comments noted – document amended Additional sentence added to para. 5.23 stating ‘The tiled floorscape of the Civic Centre is an important element of the complex’s landscaping.’</p> <p>Comments noted – document amended Agreed, appropriate text amended within document.</p>
--	---	---

<p>C Dewar Historic Areas Advisor English Heritage continued</p>	<p>stylish.</p> <p>P.131: could the inclusion of the photo of the existing building at St Peter's Wharf suggest that this monolithic, 'slab' form of development is acceptable? Perhaps some wording on an appropriate form of development could be included in this shaded box?</p> <p>P.134: Pann's Bank – this section should reference the fact that the Pann's Bank area is located in the defined buffer zone to the candidate WHS. It should therefore incorporate several of the objectives that have been included for the St Peter's area, including the need to ensure that all development proposals have careful regard to the setting of the candidate WHS.</p> <p>P. 137: Long 'walls' of development can restrict views and permeability to the river and go against the historic grain of the area.</p> <p>P.141: reference should also be made to Conservation Area Management Strategies as they are also a very valuable tool in managing beneficial change.</p> <p>P.142: "in recognition of the increased costs often associated with developing listed buildings there will be a general exemption from the developer making a s.106 contribution. Whilst we appreciate the intention of this statement, it is making certain assumptions and perhaps evidence should be required to substantiate claims? Works that require listed building consent may be zero rated for VAT which can make a difference to issues of viability.</p>	<p>Comments noted – document amended Photograph on p.131 amended.</p> <p>Comments noted – document amended Agreed, additional bullet point and text added to paragraph 5.200 stating 'Ensure that all development proposals have careful regard to the setting of the proposed World Heritage Site'.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed Agreed, however paragraph 5.201 and 5.204 include the requirement for permeability through new development to enable access to the river.</p> <p>Comments noted – document amended Para. 4.27 has been amended to include the following sentences 'The Council is currently in the process of producing Conservation Area Character Appraisals and Management Strategies for the three conservation areas within the central area. These documents will have an important role to play when assessing the context of a development site.'</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed The document has been produced to present a vision of how the city centre should be developed in the long term and to help guide future development proposals. It is not appropriate for the Central Area Urban Design Strategy to provide this level of detail.</p>
<p>Northumbrian Water (Statutory)</p>	<p>NWL welcome principle of an Urban Design Strategy document and looks forward to working with Sunderland Council as the area development schemes come forward.</p> <p>Important that there is early and close liaison with the Council and development partners about any impacts on existing/new water and sewerage infrastructure.</p>	<p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p>

	NWL supports objective 7 in section 4 of the document, to achieve environmentally sustainable development, in particular the inclusion of water conservation measure and Sustainable Urban Drainage (SUDS).	Comments noted – no change proposed
Sport England (Statutory)	Sport England Considers this consultation provides a perfect opportunity to include the principles of Active design within the strategy. Active Design is an innovative set of design guidelines to promote opportunities for sport and physical activity in the design and layout of development. Sport England considers that the Urban Design Strategy should include references to Active Design and promote the general principles of Active Design in the regeneration and redevelopment of urban Sunderland.	Comments noted – no change proposed The Central Area design strategy incorporates the principles of good urban design throughout the document which can be considered to be compatible with the active design principles. The Central Area Design Strategy does not set out firm development proposals for individual parts of the city rather it provides an indicative plan. The guidance document Sport England refer to provides a detailed checklist against which to assess masterplanning of new developments. The CAUDS provides an over arching framework for a large area it would be inappropriate to apply the active design checklist to the strategy document. The CAUDs seeks to improve accessibility and enhance the overall amenity of the City centre, which are two of the three key design objectives outlined in the publication.
GL Hearn on behalf of North of England Civic Trust	<p>NECT are the freehold owner of the Scotia Quays site. The strategy shows an ‘indicative’ layout for development across the Central Area but with little detail. It is critical that the strategy makes clear that any such plans are purely indicative and do not represent a proposed layout.</p> <p>There is an apparent contradiction to the position as set out in preface i.viii and para 4.2. It is stated that all development proposals and public realm works will be required to conform with the Central Area Urban Design Strategy. For the reasons given above, to require all development proposals to conform with the strategy is considered inappropriate and the text at this section should be amended accordingly. The design strategy is proposed to be a Supplementary Planning document and does not form part of the statutory plan. Whilst it could therefore be a consideration, it is not justifiable, or appropriate, to require all proposals to conform with it. We would also note that Supplementary Planning Documents should not seek to allocate land.</p>	<p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p> <p>The document already makes it clear in the preface that the plans within the strategy are indicative.</p> <p>Comments noted – text amended</p> <p>Para i.viii states that the diagrams and illustrations in the strategy are indicative and do not preclude the promotion of alternative proposals where these meet the strategic design objectives. Schemes which differ from the Objectives or the site specific design principles will have to demonstrate and justify the reasons for this difference including robust design analysis. It is accepted that the wording under para 4.2 suggests that no flexibility will be permitted when assessing development proposals that differ from the strategy and strategic design guidance. Therefore it is proposed to amend this text to read</p> <p>“Generally all development proposals and public realm works will be required to conform with the Central Area Urban Design Strategy and Strategic Design</p>

<p>GL Hearn on behalf of North of England Civic Trust (continued)</p>	<p>East Bridge & Old Port Square</p> <p>Although text states that the open space shall be provided on the route of the Sunderland Riverside Walk it appears from the plan that part of the square may be proposed on the Scotia Quay site. If the open space/ bridge landing is proposed on land owned by NECT then they would object strongly as it could potentially compromise the site's potential and could adequately be provided on the Riverside walk.</p> <p>Panns Bank</p> <p>NECT object to the Panns Bank indicative plans that appears to show Scotia Quay site developed with any single narrow building in an east to west alignment. The potential of the site should be maximised and NECT consider that the site has further scope for development that that showed in the indicative plan through an extended footprint and different alignment. We would note that the indicative layout shown on the Urban Design Strategy does not accord with advice our client has received previously from the City Council in terms of layout the layout of any development.</p> <p>The level of detail provided in these plans is however minimal and we would suggest that individual sites with development potential are identified but the design Strategy should not attempt (even indicatively) to indicate what the footprint of the development may be.</p>	<p>Guidance as required by Policy B2A of the UDP Alteration No2. Schemes which differ from the objectives or these site-specific design principles will have to demonstrate and justify the reasons for this difference including a robust design analysis.”</p> <p>However the Council does not agree with the assertion that as the SCAUDS is to be progressed as an SPD and is not part of the statutory plan it is not justifiable or appropriate to require proposals to conform with it. The SPD hangs from Policy B2A of UDP Alteration No2 which clearly states that developments will be required to conform with the Council's SPDs.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p> <p>The masterplan has been misinterpreted. The bridge landing does not encroach onto the area of land owned by the North of England Civic Trust.</p> <p>Comments noted – document amended</p> <p>The indicative masterplan layout has been amended and an alternative block configuration drawn. The revised block layout reflects the emerging proposals for the Scotia Quay site and the development proposals that the Council has provided design advice in relation to.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p> <p>The CAUDS sets an overarching framework the level of detail in the plans for district areas is no different to the overall masterplan. It is considered perfectly appropriate to set out some sort of</p>
---	--	---

	<p>It is not clear which 'Key development Area' of Panns Bank Scotia Quay is within, but it appears it may be Fish Quay. On the basis that Scotia Quay is within Fish Quay we consider the mix of uses proposed to be appropriate but other complementary uses should not be ruled out.</p> <p>The "Old Port Square" should be wholly provided on the existing walkways – if it was proposed on the Scotia Quay site then we would firmly object. Parking should be permitted in the riverside area providing it is sensitively located and treated. To not provide car parking could undermine the viability of developments and the regeneration of the area.</p>	<p>indicative plan for the study area to guide future development.</p> <p>Comments noted – document amended</p> <p>The Pann's Bank plan has been amended to clearly identify the Fish Quay sub area.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p> <p>The "Old Port Square" does not fall within the Scotia Quays site as suggested. The revised masterplan helps clarify this. There is no reference to parking requirements within the CAUDS in relation to Pann's Bank.</p>
<p>GL Hearn on behalf of God TV (non statutory)</p>	<p>God TV is the owner of Angel House (referred to as Crown House in the draft Central Area Urban Design Strategy).</p> <p>Status of Guidance</p> <p>The strategy shows an 'indicative' layout for development across the Central Area but with little detail. It is critical that the strategy makes clear that any such plans are purely indicative and do not represent a proposed layout.</p> <p>There is an apparent contradiction to the position as set out in preface i.viii and para 4.2. It is stated that all development proposals and public realm works will be required to conform with the Central Area Urban Design Strategy. For the reasons given above, to require all development proposals to conform with the strategy is considered inappropriate and the text at this section should be amended accordingly. The design strategy is proposed to be a Supplementary Planning document and does not form part of the statutory plan. Whilst it could therefore be a consideration, it is not justifiable, or appropriate, to require all proposals to conform with it.</p>	<p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p> <p>The CAUDS clearly states that the plans are indicative in para viii of the preface.</p> <p>Comments noted – document amended</p> <p>Para i.viii states that the diagrams and illustrations in the strategy are indicative and do not preclude the promotion of alternative proposals where these meet the strategic design objectives. Schemes, which differ from the Objectives or the site specific design principles, will have to demonstrate and justify the reasons for this difference including robust design analysis. It is accepted that the wording under para 4.2 suggests that no flexibility will be permitted when assessing development proposals that differ from the strategy and strategic design guidance. Therefore it is proposed to add</p> <p>"Generally all development proposals and public realm works will be required to conform with the central Area Urban Design Strategy and Strategic Design Guidance as required by Policy B2A of the UDP Alteration No. Schemes which differ from the objectives or these site specific design</p>

	<p>City Gateways</p> <p>It should be confirmed that, given Crown House’s scale and prominence, Crown House is within the gateway area and any development on the site should reflect this role as being a key landmark.</p> <p>Landmark Buildings</p> <p>Crown House is identified as one of the few tall buildings within the central area. Para 4.15 notes that existing tall buildings tend to be “point” rather than slab blocks, i.e. they are slim towers with a small footprint – this is seen as a design response that should be maintained within the central area. We consider however that the profile of Crown House could be significantly enhanced by retaining and refurbishing the existing tower but with new build at lower levels and extension at the upper levels. As an alternative, the redevelopment of the site with a replacement, high quality contemporary tall building should be provided for.</p> <p>Sunniside</p> <p>The Sunniside plan shows a “C” shaped footprint with what appears to be planting on the Crown House site. This is not the current footprint and it is not clear what the footprint is intended to represent – it does not appear to be the retention of the existing tower block as is suggested elsewhere in the document. Moreover, our client is concerned that a proposal appears to have been suggested for their site without them being consulted. If a proposal is to be shown in the strategy then it would be more appropriate to show our client proposals for the site that have been developed following detailed analysis of the site and surrounding area. There is nothing in the strategy in the strategy to explain why a “C” footprint is proposed.</p> <p>Crown House is identified in the Tavistock sub area of Sunniside. The proposed mix of uses in this sub area is considered appropriate. There is scope for taller</p>	<p>principles will have to demonstrate and justify the reasons for this difference including a robust design analysis.”</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p> <p>The SCAUDS identifies a series of gateways without specifying which buildings specifically fall within a gateway area. Further detailed design guidance for the Crown House site is provided within the Sunniside Planning and Design Framework.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p> <p>The SCAUDS does not preclude such an approach. Further detailed design guidance is provided within the Sunniside Planning and Design Framework.</p> <p>Comments noted – document amended</p> <p>The indicative’ block plan has been amended and updated to reflect the merging proposals for Sunniside in the Sunniside Planning and Design Framework. God TV were consulted and commented (GL Hearn) on these proposals.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p> <p>The text for the Sunniside district has been amended to reflect the design criteria set</p>
--	---	--

	<p>development than the three of four storeys on the Borough Road frontage given the existing scale of the buildings in the area and the need to provide a prominent streetscape at this gateway.</p> <p>Specific references are made to Crown House and it is noted as being “tired and dated” with significant opportunity to refurbish the structure to a higher standard to provide an appropriate mix of uses – the ground floor must present frontage development on Borough Road. Whilst this is supported in principle, the strategy should recognise that if the site were redeveloped a tall building would be appropriate in this location. The text should also recognise that if retained and refurbished the site represents the potential for new build at lower levels (to circa six storeys) and additional floor on top of the tower in order to improve the profile of the building in the streetscene</p>	<p>out in the Sunnside Planning and Design Framework. Further detailed design guidance is provided in the Sunnside Planning and Design Framework.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p> <p>The text for the Sunnside district has been amended to reflect the design criteria set out in the Sunnside Planning and Design Framework. Further detailed design guidance is provided in the Sunnside Planning and Design Framework. The revised text recognises the opportunity for a new development of equal height to the existing building. A detailed design analysis has informed the Sunnside Planning and Design Framework and set maximum heights for any new build at the lower levels and a maximum block height. The CAUDS reflects these heights.</p>
<p>Fairhurst on behalf of Metnor/Akenside (Non statutory)</p>	<p>W.A Fairhurst & Partners (Fairhurst) support the vision set out in the Central Area Strategy and generally support the principles being proposed. Similarly Fairhurst support the objective set out in section 4.0 Fairhurst support para 5.180 and the objectives for St Peter’s Wharf which are being fully considered in the proposals being developed in the outline planning application for St Peter’s Wharf.</p> <p>W.A Fairhurst & Partners (Fairhurst) object to section 5.181 regarding the key development opportunities for St Peter’s Wharf. Similarly the Masterplan shown throughout the document, most specifically on page 130, does not address the objectives of the vision proposed, and would not deliver a development that would meet the requirements of Sunderland City Council and CABE.</p>	<p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p> <p>Comments noted – document amended</p> <p>The indicative plan on page 130 of the SCAUDS has been amended and updated to reflect the general layout as proposed in the outline application submitted by Metnor / Akenside. The Planning Authority has not yet determined this application however Metnor / Akenside have been made aware that although some elements of the submitted scheme are acceptable in principle, there remain fundamental concerns about the scale and massing of their scheme. The building heights referred to in section 5.181 will not be amended. These are based on the design analysis undertaken by the Council’s consultants in the preparation of the document.</p> <p>The Council does not share the view that the revised masterplan shown throughout the document and development opportunities set out for St Peter’s will not</p>

		deliver development that will meet the requirements of the Council or CABE.
Physical Disabilities Alliance (Non statutory)	Concerned that the issue of access to services for disabled people is not mentioned in the executive summary and that there is no reference to that changing places campaign for improved toilets and changing facilities across the City.	Comments noted – no change proposed The Central Area design Strategy promotes streets, squares and public spaces that area carefully designed to ensure ease of mobility for everyone maximising accessibility around the Central Area.
L Hughes, Senior Project Manager, Sunnyside Partnership (Non statutory)	The Partnership has completed a revised Sunnyside Planning and Design Framework to be taken forward as an SPD in support of Policy EC10A of UDP Alteration 2. The visions and objectives identified in the draft framework are fully in accordance with the overarching objectives outlined in the Urban Design Strategy. Detailed areas of guidance should be incorporated into the final Urban Design Strategy to ensure a coherent approach to regeneration of Sunnyside.	Comments noted – document amended Agreed, paragraphs 5.95 – 5.124 have been amended to ensure consistency with the Sunnyside Planning and Design Framework.
L Edwards Home Builders Federation (Non statutory)	<p>Opposed to the separate requirement for 10% of a developments energy requirement to be generated by renewable energy. Housebuilders are working to improve the energy efficiency of new housing. However the industry believes that the best way to improve energy efficiency and to promote renewable energy is through innovations in materials, technology development and economies of scale to incorporate the best of these technologies, not by setting arbitrary targets that are impossible to measure. We feel that the prescription of minimum percentages for the incorporation of certain types of micro-renewable energy is neither constructive nor beneficial in helping to tackle the long term challenges of climate change. The generation of energy via micro renewables will do little to help reduce carbon emissions. The reduction of CO2 is best tackled through the design and construction of homes, improvements to the existing stock, changes in consumer preferences and individual behaviour, and at the macro scale, through investment in cleaner power generation by Central Government.</p> <p>The HBF welcomes the Council's recognition of the Code for Sustainable Homes as a means of improving energy efficiency in new housing. However the Council must be realistic when setting requirements. The Code is a staged introduction of energy improvements so that homes are carbon neutral by 2016.</p>	<p>Comments noted – no change proposed The Central Area Urban Design Strategy has been produced in response to a requirement within Policy B2A of UDP Alteration No.2, which has been adopted by the Council, and amplifies the policies it contains. The requirement for 10% of the embedded energy supply of new major developments to be provided by renewable sources (unless it can be demonstrated that this is not feasible) is a direct requirement from Policy B2A and is therefore existing adopted Council Policy for the Central Area. Similar requirements are also included within the emerging Core Strategy.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed As stated above, the Central Area Urban Design Strategy has been produced in response to a requirement within Policy B2A of UDP Alteration No.2. The requirement for new housing to achieve high energy efficiency and to minimise consumption so that it achieves BREEAM</p>

	Therefore the Council should not seek to accelerate the timetable by imposing higher standards prematurely. Staged national delivery of improved levels of the Code will ensure pioneering technologies are robust, meet customer expectations and are backed by proper warranties. A multitude of differing targets around the country put these efforts at risk. It is important that all LPAs accept this framework as a legitimate national route for effective progress, and do not take it upon themselves to try to move faster than the timetable outlined in national documents.	and eco-homes very good or excellent rating is a direct requirement from Policy B2A and is therefore existing adopted Council Policy for the Central Area. The requirement within the Central Area Urban Design Strategy for new housing to meet level 3 or 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes is comparable with these requirements and simply reflects Central Government's amended method of measuring sustainable construction standards as the Code has replaced the previous EcoHomes standards.
D Abercrombie, Technical Manager Fairhurst On behalf of Akenside Metnor (Non statutory)	Support the Vision set out in the Central Area Strategy and generally support the principles being proposed. Similarly support the objective set out in Section 4, para 5.180 and the objectives for the St Peter's Wharf.	Comments noted – no change proposed
J Morrison Tyne and Wear Archaeology Officer (Non statutory)	Many of the key regeneration opportunities are within sites or areas of archaeological importance (sites listed). Archaeological work will be needed for any new developments and could potentially be required in advance of construction of new pedestrian bridges, public works, road works, landscaping etc. We would welcome the enhancement of the historic environment. Interpretation may include archaeological background and the results of archaeological excavations of keysites. Excellent opportunity to tie in with the WHS process and to improve setting of the Scheduled Ancient Monument.	Comments noted – no change proposed Agreed. Archaeology Officer will be consulted regarding major development proposals within the Central Area.
Montagu Evans for Land Securities (Non statutory)	Land Securities (LS) consider the development and adoption of the Central Area Urban Design Strategy as a significant tool in reshaping the city's heart and wishes to play its full part in assisting the City Council in delivering the aims and objectives of the strategy. At 2.14 it is stated that any urban design analysis will be structured around three topics, namely arriving in Sunderland, moving around Sunderland and being in Sunderland. We support the identification and consideration of these elements and concur with the strategy's assessment, which suggests that together each of these elements are vital in contributing towards the central area's sense of place.	Comments noted – no change proposed Comments noted – no change proposed

<p>Montagu Evans for Land Securities continued</p>	<p>We note at 2.25 the assertion that the Bridges and Crowtree Leisure Centre both diminish permeability through consisting of unmanaged routes that are no longer part of the public realm and that the closure of these routes in the evening diminishes pedestrian access. LS acknowledge that it is a delicate balance between maintaining the quality of routes through both cleaning and security which takes place during evening periods of closure and the needs of those using the city during the evening. We suggest that improvements to the quality and quantum of restaurants is integral to the issue of permeability. If such facilities are available there will be greater usage in the evening, increased natural surveillance and thus a stronger case for increasing opening hours.</p> <p>At 2.38 the analysis states that The Bridges has protected the retail function of the central area but at the expense of the integrity and continuity of the of the central area urban form and movement routes. These issues can be addressed with more catering, though alone this will not address the issue. This needs to be balanced with providing the appropriate type and size of retail attractions which will draw people through the city centre, including The Bridges. The challenge which LS requests the Council recognise, built on recent experience from exemplar town centre regeneration projects such as Princeshay in Exeter, is to agree balance between retail and ancillary uses. If there is insufficient 'critical mass' the spin-off benefits of good quality catering and other uses will be diluted.</p> <p>At 2.51 it can be confirmed that the City of Sunderland UDP Alteration No. 2 was adopted on 26 September 2007.</p> <p>At 3.45 it is stated that 'It will be important to work with the owners of the Bridges to promote pedestrian permeability at all times...in order to promote east/west connectivity'. LS is pleased to examine this matter further and recognise east/west permeability is a key objective of the Strategy. However any such measures will almost certainly bring significant obligations in terms of security for LS and their tenants. While this may be partly addressed through management initiatives, likely that this will also require physical reconfiguration, redevelopment and extension.</p>	<p>Comments noted – no change proposed The desire for increased pedestrian permeability is an important element of the aims and aspirations of the document. Whilst improvements in the range of facilities that contribute to the evening economy would make a substantial contribution to this area of the city, there are aspirations to increase pedestrian permeability through alternative means other than increasing the opening hours of the Bridges shopping centre. However it is noted that in the short term this is likely to be the simplest solution as alternative methods are likely to require large-scale redevelopment.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed The Council recognises the need to secure an appropriate balance of uses within the central area and is committed to achieving a successful and sustainable city centre. It is the intention of the document to help regenerate the city centre and the parallels drawn with the award winning Princeshay scheme are considered appropriate.</p> <p>Comments noted – Document amended Document has been updated to reflect the adoption of UDP Alteration No. 2.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed Agreed, in order for the long term aspirations of the document to be realised, especially in terms of pedestrian permeability it is likely that some physical reconfiguration may be required.</p>
--	---	--

<p>Montagu Evans for Land Securities continued</p>	<p>At 4.31 in Objective 2 the matter of east/west connectivity is considered and again Bridges identified as a barrier 'particularly as it is not open 24hrs'. as suggested above we may be amenable to look at the possibility of improving access through the centre, however unlimited 24hr public access should be considered unlikely at this stage.</p> <p>LS welcome the public realm design guidance at 4.51 and the objectives of seeking to restore the character and identity of areas through the design of the public realm, ensuring a pedestrian friendly environment, reducing clutter, specifying high quality materials and enriching and animating the public realm.</p> <p>At 5.40 the strategy refers to the possibility of improving pedestrian accessibility through the Bridges. We would refer to our previous comments and reiterate that while LS might be willing to investigate improved public access, assurances would be sought that safety and security would not be compromised as a result of any future redevelopment of extension.</p> <p>LS notes the Strategy's identification of the Bridges as a key development opportunity and will, as the Strategy suggests, hope to identify areas of the development where there can be improvements in its relationship with adjoining streets. Regarding 5.45, as an established and forward thinking investor in Central Sunderland, LS are committed over a much longer term to explore opportunities to re-establish a more fine grained urban form for The Bridges that is more outward looking than at present.</p> <p>At 5.79, Bishopwearmouth is identified as a key development area. It is a significant part of the City's central area for LS in that it is in close proximity to The Bridges and therefore any design guidance may influence possible redevelopment or extension opportunities which may be delivered in the short to medium terms.</p> <p>At 5.83 objectives for the area are identified including redevelopment of the Crowtree Leisure Centre, improving east/west linkages and creating an outward looking and sympathetic contextual built form. LS supports this objective, along with all others identified, notably an espousal to further enhance the nearby historic Town Park.</p>	<p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed The commitment to explore such opportunities is welcomed and coincides with the aspirations of the document.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed Agreed</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p>
--	--	---

<p>Montagu Evans for Land Securities</p>	<p>At 5.85, The Crowtree Leisure Centre is identified as a possibly opportunity for redevelopment. A number of planning issues such as the necessity for active frontages, usages, height, pedestrian linkages and how any redevelopment might preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area are listed and LS acknowledges that any redevelopment scheme would need to fully address all these matters.</p> <p>In any successful town centre regeneration it is important to investigate the requirements of existing businesses to minimise disruption. LS considers that the integration of the site currently occupied by the Crowtree Leisure Centre with The Bridges will open up opportunities to reconfigure the existing centre and thus address permeability. LS considers that this should be appropriately addressed in the masterplan so the Council's aspiration for the Bishopwearmouth area can be considered in the context of full integration with The Bridges. This will allow key operational concerns to be addressed, not least lack of large modern retail units capable of meeting current occupational requirement, the need for a new anchor store to provide critical mass and pedestrian footfall. An adjacent site such as Crowtree also provides opportunities for ensuring continuity of trade.</p> <p>In previous representations the City Council will be aware that LS has already reviewed the development potential of the Crowtree Leisure Centre. While it may be appropriate for indicative floorspace thresholds to be set in other development plan documents (DPDs), LS wishes the City Council to note that the site is likely to deliver a minimum of 15,000sq m net of additional floorspace. Therefore the gross retail floorspace could be in excess of 25,000 sq m. Clearly further work will need to be undertaken to establish the net additional retail floorspace allowing for demolitions, and also the implications of including other parts of the Bishopwearmouth area. LS looks forward to taking forward this analysis with the City Council. Without this critical mass, the other benefits deriving from a masterplan led approach are unlikely to be capable of delivery.</p> <p>At 6.0 the Strategy broadly sets out how change throughout the central area might be delivered referring to stakeholders and</p>	<p>Comments noted – no change proposed A separate development brief has been produced for this site which covers development requirements in greater detail than the Central Area Urban Design Strategy.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed A separate development brief will be produced for this site which covers development requirements in greater detail than the Central Area Urban Design Strategy.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed A separate development brief has been produced for this site which covers development requirements in greater detail than the Central Area Urban Design Strategy.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p>
--	---	--

	<p>means of funding. LS would wish to commit to genuine co-operation with all interested agencies in regard to any possible redevelopment and will aim to take a holistic and long term view to help achieve the vision for central Sunderland as set down in the Design Strategy. Further work will need to be taken to agree any development principles, including matters such as phasing.</p> <p>In respect of Section 106 funding given the wider regeneration benefits that would be derived, the scope and quantum should relate to the viability of the scheme. LS would advise against a tariff approach that might affect the ability to implement the outputs sought by the draft strategy.</p>	<p>Comments noted – no change proposed A separate development brief has been produced for this site which covers development requirements in greater detail than the Central Area Urban Design Strategy.</p>
<p>Sunderland Civic Society (Non statutory)</p>	<p>We agree with the ‘vision objectives’ set out in para 1.5.</p> <p>The improvements to the Central Station referred to in Paras 2.22 and 2.23 are welcomed, especially as the City is to be the terminus for express trains to London. A prestigious station is needed to make a bold statement about the City.</p> <p>We agree very much with the environmental issues raised in para 2.28 and the objectives of para. 2.29.</p> <p>Para 2.34 makes adverse reference to the Travel Lodge. The Society is not in disagreement with the sentiments expressed, but is concerned as to the quality of design, which the Council may achieve in the future, using this building as a recent example. We understand that the Council was the landowner as well as the planning authority, that a design brief for the development was prepared, and that in judging bids for the site, quality of design was of equal importance to the financial offer made. Despite these exceptional circumstances the present mediocre building ensued, even though its is within a conservation area and in proximity to the listed Minster building. How in future will the Council be able to ensure a better standard of design, especially when the same constraints and opportunities are not present?</p> <p>There are some errors in street names in part of the report. In para 2.33 we think ‘Brougham St’ should read ‘Blandford St’ whilst contrary to the assertion in para 2.35, Brougham St does not meet Park Lane; however, Blandford St does meet</p>	<p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed It is the intention of the Council that this document will strengthen the Council’s position in policy terms regarding the design standard of new development considered acceptable.</p> <p>Comments noted – Document amended Text has been amended and errors in street names corrected.</p>

<p>Sunderland Civic Society continued</p>	<p>Crowtree Rd and indeed people do stop and sit there!</p> <p>We agree with the list of issues to be addressed as set out in para 2.37.</p> <p>The society supports the concept of the creation of a 'Great Street' along the ring road, as set out in para 3.14 and 3.31 – 3.35; also to the creation of gateways as referred to in 3.19.</p> <p>With reference to para 3.23, we would like to see the central station redeveloped rather than refurbished and support the creation of a station square.</p> <p>The Society agrees with the idea in para 3.58 of continuing to promote a high level pedestrian bridge from the Vaux site, although question of viability/finance.</p> <p>Support the proposal in para 3.59 for a further two low level bridges provided in practice they continue to allow water borne movement along the river.</p> <p>The 15 key squares proposed in para 3.69 will create attractive civic spaces which Sunderland currently lacks, and the Society supports the principle, although we wonder how many will/can be created in practice.</p> <p>The Society considers the criteria for tall buildings on page 61 to be generally acceptable, especially in protecting sensitive areas such as Sunnyside, Bishopwearmouth and St Peter's, but possibly there is a need for some clarification e.g. why should taller buildings only be in the form of slim point blocks; how and when will the visual impact of tall buildings from the wider area will be assessed.</p> <p>We are concerned that the proposed public realm improvement on Burdon Road may be compromised by the likely need to provide vehicular access to Holmeside Triangle development site, as referred to in the Inspector's Report into UDP Alteration No. 2.</p> <p>The Society are of the view that the defined central district is illogical. There is</p>	<p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed The document has been produced to present a vision of how the city centre should be developed in the long term and to help guide future development proposals. It is not intended, nor is it able, to act as a regeneration document detailing how such development can be achieved.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed Development proposals will be subject to Section 106 agreements in order to realise the deliverable aims of the document.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed A condition that future bridges 'must be designed to allow the river Wear to remain navigable' included within paragraph 3.59.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed The document has been produced to present a vision of how the city centre should be developed in the long term and to help guide future development proposals. It is not intended, nor is it able, to act as a regeneration document detailing how such development can be implemented.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed All development proposals will be considered on their individual merits, however as stated in paragraph 4.15 the existing tall buildings within the City tend to be slim towers with a small footprint. The continuation of this design response is encouraged 'as it helps to reduce visual impact of development and allows a more elegant built form which is already a characteristic of the city'.</p> <p>Comments noted – document amended Agreed, additional text added to paragraph 5.22 stating 'These works may be subject to future access requirements for the Holmeside Triangle site, where the requirements of pedestrians and vehicular traffic will need to be carefully considered.'</p> <p>Comments noted – document amended Agreed. The subdivision of the city centre is</p>
---	--	---

<p>Sunderland Civic Society continued</p>	<p>no obvious distinction between the retail offer on the east and west sides of Fawcett St. Further the northern end of John St contains Joplings, again excluded. The report itself recommends treating Fawcett St and Bridge St as a single design entity. We would like to see the eastern boundary of the central district redefined to more accurately reflect the extent of the main retail area, rather than the arbitrary use of the centre line of Fawcett St.</p> <p>Photograph on p.93 wrongly locates it on Bridge St; it should be on High St West. Further it is outside the central district as defined, although within the area which the society considers appropriate.</p> <p>How practicable would it be to introduce the 'finer grain' to The Bridges as mentioned in para 5.45 and shown on the plan on p.95 without total redevelopment of the centre, is such redevelopment feasible?</p> <p>The Society would like an assurance that only 20th century infill buildings on Fawcett St will be considered for redevelopment; design standards and quality of materials will be of paramount importance.</p> <p>With regard to the University Quarter surely the reference to new buildings in the first bullet point to para 5.69 should refer to Silksworth Row not Trimdon Street, reflecting map on p.102 (should this map not also identify the site between the Art Centre and the Inland Revenue as a key prominent development opportunity?)</p> <p>In Bishopwearmouth we support the objectives and would very much like to see the land north of High St West better utilised, and the Leisure Centre to be redeveloped at a more sensitive scale with appropriate materials. Particularly supportive of efforts to secure the re-use of the fire station, and possibly some new development to complete the square in front of it.</p> <p>In the Sunnyside area, whilst appreciating the quality of renovation which has been undertaken, especially 176 High St, we are dismayed by some recent developments, not of a high standard e.g. Bede House and sincerely hope that</p>	<p>based on grouping appropriate character areas together. The division of such sections will be considered further to ensure that they are appropriate.</p> <p>Comments noted – document amended Agreed. Document to be amended to ensure accuracy of photograph notation.</p> <p>Comments noted – no changes proposed Comment noted, however the desire to increase pedestrian permeability through the City, in particular east-west movement remains.</p> <p>Comments noted – no changes proposed Retaining the existing high quality buildings is an important element of retaining and improving the character of the area. More detailed design guidance for this area of the city is covered by the draft Sunnyside Planning and Design Framework.</p> <p>Comments noted – document amended Agreed, text amended to refer to Silksworth Row as opposed to Trimdon Street. The plans of the city centre included within the document are representational only and are not intended to prescribe which sites are suitable for development. It is agreed that a high quality redevelopment would enhance this gateway site.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed In addition to this document an updated version of the Sunnyside Planning and Design Framework has been produced to help ensure high quality development is achieved in the Sunnyside area of the City.</p>
---	---	---

<p>Sunderland Civic Society continued</p>	<p>future applications will be subject to more detailed and critical scrutiny.</p> <p>Hope that further archaeological investigations will be undertaken in the vicinity of the Vaux site prior to any development of the Riverside South area, esp. land north of Gill Rd, which has not to date been investigated.</p> <p>The society is of the opinion that any loss of car parking to form 'Stadium Square' is to be regretted – will only exacerbate existing problems. Situation could be compounded in the event of residential development in Sheepfolds area as proposed.</p> <p>Para 5.160 refers to the need to encourage existing businesses to relocate 'to ensure the continuation of established employment uses within the city'. Concerns that small businesses may not survive relocation, if Council genuinely concerned certain matters (including financial assistance) will need to be addressed.</p> <p>The Society is supportive of the Council's measures to protect the setting of St Peter's as a potential World Heritage Site and its development as a major visitor attraction. We are also supportive of the proposed low level bridge over the river in this vicinity, as it will help integrate the north and south sides of the town east of the Wearmouth Bridge.</p> <p>We are pleased to note that owners of listed buildings will be exempt from making s106 contributions. If securing the future of the historic fabric is to be a priority it is important that every effort is made to make investment in listed buildings an attractive proposition; indeed a case could be made for also exempting buildings in conservation areas from such contributions, especially where there may be complications affecting their attractiveness for refurbishment.</p>	<p>Comments noted – no change proposed The Tyne and Wear Archaeology Officer will be contacted during discussions on any significant development within the Central Area that comes forward as part of the statutory planning process.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed A separate Development Framework for the Stadium Village is currently being prepared by the Council that will provide more detailed guidance for this section of the city, including parking solutions.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed Suggestion is outside the remit of the design strategy.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed Proposal is outside the remit of the design strategy.</p>
<p>J Lloyd, Wearside University of the Third Age Trust (Non statutory)</p>	<p>There is no clear definition of what exists, what is able to proceed or what is a long term hope.</p> <p>The roads into the city have considerable stress throughout but there are no</p>	<p>Comments noted – no change proposed The document has been produced to present a vision of how the city centre should be developed in the long term and to help guide future development proposals. It is not intended, nor is it able, to act as a regeneration document detailing how such development can be achieved.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed A new road bridge is proposed as part of</p>

<p>J Lloyd, Wearside University of the Third Age Trust continued</p>	<p>proposals based on the need for another road bridge or increasing the provision of car parking outside the 'ring road' and relating them to a bus or metro service.</p> <p>The aim of improving pedestrian flow is stressed throughout but no observations on how traffic flow can be improved at the same time.</p> <p>The comments regarding roads / crossings / barriers / tree planting / landscape impact were applauded. But current / recent works on the road improvements at the Raich Carter Centre and the treatment of the trees in Gray Road raised the question of 'control'.</p> <p>The proposed increase in living spaces within the city was accepted and the need to provide parking for residents but where unobtrusive parking was to be, both to replace the existing parking removed and new proposals was not clear.</p> <p>Parks, squares, open spaces and views all need exploitation but also how they are maintained needs to be considered before they are provided. Mowbray Park is accepted as a major feature of the city but its water features have been awaiting repair for a considerable time.</p> <p>On page 147 Para. 6.38 there is mention of a digital model of the centre. Was this used by the consultants and why was it not used for public viewing of the proposals?</p> <p>Much is made of more provision of shopping, cafes and entertainment but no explanation is given to show the need and potential customers. In the brief to the consultants were any facts provided?</p> <p>How were the present residents within the city centre consulted? It was accepted that until recently virtually all were in ex local authority multi storey blocks but were they encouraged to comment on changes to date and the future.</p>	<p>the Strategic Transport Corridor linking the A19 to the City Centre and the port.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed Query is outside the remit of the design strategy.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed The need for a high quality public realm to be implemented and maintained throughout the central area is a key aspiration of the document. It is not considered to be the role of this document to provide detailed design guidance for specific sites however.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed Digital model was produced in order to ascertain the impact of new developments on the City's existing built form.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed The document sets out the long term vision for the city centre, which includes an increase in the number of people living in and visiting the city centre. In turn this will require more facilities to be provided in order to strengthen the city centre's economy.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed The following methods of consultation were implemented: 1) The Council circulated a press release. 2) Posters were displayed at libraries within Sunderland. 3) Copies of the draft document were available at Sunderland Civic Centre and all libraries. 4) A public exhibition presenting the main content of the draft SPD was displayed in The Bridges Shopping Centre. 5) A permanent exhibition was on display in Sunderland Civic Centre. 6) An executive summary of the strategy was made available at libraries and the exhibitions. 7)</p>
--	--	---

<p>J Lloyd, Wearside University of the Third Age Trust continued</p>	<p>Will the current planning views on residents parking for new developments in fact be able to encourage living without a car? has the present national use of car been assumed to reduce?</p> <p>The bus stops in Fawcett Street make segregation of safe walking difficult if not impossible. Should the Park Lane Interchange be duplicated at St Peter's / Sheepfolds and a City Bus Link cover the central area only?</p> <p>Could the Inner Ring Road become one way only clockwise and increase the easy access of pedestrians into the centre?</p> <p>How much public consultation there should be was raised. It was accepted that there was an increasing need and how proposals and costs and long term maintenance were to be funded must have a positive support. Would the Council consider 'open meetings' to first pictorially present and then discuss the total strategy?</p>	<p>Staff from the City Council's Development & Regeneration Directorate attended the exhibition in the Bridges. 8) A dedicated web page was created. The page included the draft Design Strategy and a printable comment sheet.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed The present level of car ownership is not expected to reduce in the near future. However greater flexibility in parking requirements for new development is acceptable in the city centre given the close proximity of numerous public transport facilities.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed The following methods of consultation were implemented: 1) The Council circulated a press release. 2) Posters were displayed at libraries within Sunderland. 3) Copies of the draft document were available at Sunderland Civic Centre and all libraries. 4) A public exhibition presenting the main content of the draft SPD was displayed in The Bridges Shopping Centre. 5) A permanent exhibition was on display in Sunderland Civic Centre. 6) An executive summary of the strategy was made available at libraries and the exhibitions. 7) Staff from the City Council's Development & Regeneration Directorate attended the exhibition in the Bridges. 8) A dedicated web page was created. The page included the draft Design Strategy and a printable comment sheet.</p>
<p>J Tumman (Non statutory)</p>	<p>The Council is to be congratulated for commissioning such a far reaching and imaginative strategy which will, if applied rigorously, provide an invaluable contextual basis upon which to evaluate and co-ordinate development proposals which could have a major effect on the future built form of the Central Area. I am certainly pleased to see that design issues, at least within the defined area, appear to be assuming a higher priority than was previously the case.</p> <p>As an SPD the boundary of the strategy</p>	<p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p>

<p>J Tumman continued</p>	<p>should be redefined to exclude the Central Area Boundary as referred to in the Inspector's Report to UDP Alteration No. 2. This will ensure consistency between the area of concern of the strategy and the city centre boundary as defined in the adopted plan. Although there is much merit in looking at the issues of the wider areas, these are not now part of the Central Area.</p> <p>Para i.ii of the Preface indicates one aim of the strategy as being to 'Define clearly the role of Sunderland central area and to describe a range of opportunities that will contribute clearly to that role'. This is potentially misleading as the adopted UDP Alteration No. 2 provides the policy framework and land allocations. This being the case, surely the role of the present document is to elaborate on and resolve issues arising, particularly of a design and public realm nature.</p> <p>The definition of the Central District (the main retail core) as shown on page 29 seems arbitrary and not to bear any relationship with 'on the ground' factors. The use of the middle of Fawcett St as the eastern boundary places the east side of Fawcett St and the northern part of John St in a different district, whereas in practice the eastern and western sides of the street are indistinguishable functionally and architecturally, whilst of course the northern part of John St contains a major department store. Perhaps boundary should be redrawn to include the northern block of John St and the eastern side of the central and southern blocks of Fawcett St. (NB the report refers to the need to treat Fawcett St and Bridge St as a single design entity, which is surely at odds with the present definition of the sub areas).</p> <p>The use of the centre line of Crowtree Rd is a similarly arbitrary boundary, given the fact that major retail outlets, including Debenhams, which face inwards to the mall, are not within the defined Central</p>	<p>The first draft of the Central Area Design Strategy was completed prior to the formal submission of the Inspectors report on UDP Alteration No2, which required the removal of the Central Area Boundary from the DPD. From an urban design perspective it is essential to consider sites north and south of the river together rather than in isolation to ensure a comprehensive approach towards developments within the city centre and on adjacent sites. For clarity the central area design framework covers the entire city centre area as defined in chapter 4 of UDP Alteration No2 and the following comprehensive developments sites and strategic locations for change:</p> <p>Stadium Park Sheepfolds Bonnersfield/St Peters University Campus World Heritage Site.</p> <p>Comment noted - no change proposed The document has been produced in order to ensure that a comprehensive approach is adopted when considering development proposals within the central area. It is important that any approach to redeveloping sections of the city centre is aware of the development opportunities available to enhancing the central area's role.</p> <p>Comment noted - Document amended Agreed. The subdivision of the city centre is based on grouping appropriate character areas together. The division of such sections will be considered further to ensure that they are appropriate.</p> <p>Comment noted - Document amended The division of such sections will be considered further to ensure that they are appropriate.</p>
---------------------------	--	--

<p>J Tumman continued</p>	<p>District whilst small shops in the 'Park Lane Village' are. The stated intention within the strategy to extend the retail area onto the Leisure Centre site reinforces the incoherent logic to this boundary. It should be redefined to include the Leisure Centre and Vine Place.</p> <p>It is understood that the document is intended to be aspirational. However to be successful in this respect it must also be practical; in some instances it is difficult to see how the desired outcomes can be achieved in reality, as major issues arising from the ideas are not addressed.</p> <p>Throughout there is a tendency for the text to confuse 'Brougham St with Blandford St, and by implication, in para 2.35, Crowtree Road is referred to as Park Lane.</p> <p>The range of uses proposed for many of the sub areas seems to assume an almost limitless demand for uses presenting an active frontage at ground floor. There is no evidence of the suppressed demand at present and whilst it is accepted that more intense development will result in changes in the pattern and level of demand, this is unlikely to be sufficient, especially in locations which do not form major pedestrian thoroughfares. It may be better to adopt a more focussed approach to active frontages where there is a realistic prospect of being able to achieve them, and elsewhere encourage such uses at key nodes.</p> <p>Whilst appreciating the long term nature of the document I am not convinced that it will ever prove feasible to construct three pedestrian bridges over the river – however supportive of intention in principle. Those at a lower level would need to open to enable the ongoing use of the river. Personally I would give priority to the eastern crossing as this would greatly enhance north/south movement east of Wearmouth Bridge, benefit students and aid regeneration of the East End.</p> <p>Section 1.0, setting out the vision of the central area states that the City is '<i>prosperous, vibrant and attractive</i>'. Doubt whether the City can be shown objectively to be either prosperous, vibrant or attractive – matter of opinion. Suggest that</p>	<p>Comments noted – no change proposed The document has been produced to present a vision of how the city centre should be developed in the long term and to help guide future development proposals. It is not intended, nor is it able, to act as a regeneration document detailing how such development can be achieved.</p> <p>Comment noted - Document amended Text has been amended and errors in street names corrected.</p> <p>Comment noted – no change proposed The document provides a vision for the long term future of the central area and the inclusion of active frontages to new developments is an important factor in enlivening the public realm. In terms of individual proposals they will be considered on their own merits but expected to conform with the document guidance in general. It is not appropriate for the Central Area Urban Design Strategy to identify specific locations for active frontages as it provides an overarching Strategy. Further detailed guidance is provided in other documents such as the Sunnyside Planning and Design Framework.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed The document is intended to be aspirational and show a vision for how the central area could be developed over a long time period.</p> <p>Comment noted - Document amended Document amended to state 'Vision -' prior to The Vision to ensure clarity.</p>
---------------------------	---	--

<p>J Tumman continued</p>	<p>this should be more clearly stated as an aspiration rather than current reality.</p> <p>I concur with the sentiment expressed in paras 2.22 and 2.23 concerning the need to redevelop the Central Station. If Sunderland really wishes to promote itself as a first rate City a prestigious, iconic building in an attractive setting is required to enable a positive first impression – highlighted by commencement of direct trains to London.</p> <p>Slightly perplexed by para 2.33. The city centre is relatively compact, so even if attractions are dispersed they tend to be accessible, although accept point regarding signposting. The paragraph refers to the concentration of retail uses around certain streets as being a problem. However the City Council, in common with planning authorities throughout the country, has for many years sought to retain a continuity of active retail frontages to maximise the attractiveness of the shopping offer: indeed the adopted UDP contains policies to this end. Unless modifications are to be sought to the adopted plan, any proposal to break up the continuity of shopping frontages could be contrary to policy. Elsewhere in the Strategy, the importance of continuous active frontages in more peripheral areas is emphasised.</p> <p>Whilst agreeing it would be preferable to enhance pedestrian priority in the City Centre, particularly in Fawcett Street and at certain major road junctions, I consider it easy to overstate the problem as it exists in Sunderland. Unlike many other major towns and cities, Newcastle being the obvious local example, the centre and its approaches are not carved up by major roads which present physical and psychological barriers.</p> <p>Whilst supporting the concept of ‘gateways’ as identified in para 3.19, I would suggest that to maximise impact, the definition of the ‘<i>St Peter’s Gate</i>’ should include the Wheatsheaf one-way system, as referred to in greater detail under the ‘Stadium Quarter’ sub-heading.</p> <p>I agree strongly with the wish to improve the Central Station as set out in para 2.32 in my opinion this could only be satisfactorily achieved through a major redevelopment scheme possibly incorporating commercial development to both give it an urban scale and make it</p>	<p>Comments noted – no change proposed The Council is continuing to pursue funding opportunities to undertake further feasibility studies in respect of Central Station. It is considered essential that a new, enhanced station is created in keeping with its importance as a major public transport entry point into the City.</p> <p>Comment noted - Document amended Agreed, an additional sentence has been added to this paragraph stating ‘whilst it is important to retain and encourage continuous retail frontage in certain areas, where opportunities arise a greater mix of uses will be encouraged’.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed Comment noted, however it is considered important to encourage pedestrian movement and to reduce the impact of certain obstacles, such as the City ring road, when the opportunity arises. An increased emphasis on pedestrian priority is in line with Central Government Policy.</p> <p>Comment noted - Document amended Agreed, reference to the Wheatsheaf one way system included in the text of paragraph 3.19.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p>
---------------------------	---	--

<p>J Tumman continued</p>	<p>financially viable.</p> <p>Why a maximum of 6 storeys at gateways? Surely it is in such locations that dramatic visual statements involving taller, iconic buildings could be made, subject to concerns regarding the setting of listed buildings, conservation area status etc.</p> <p>How will the issues of longer distance views be policed? There is no indication of which long distance views should be of concern, nor a trigger in terms of storey height for consideration of such matters. A number of recent developments in the centre have dramatically altered the skyline.</p> <p>Is it not unduly prescriptive to require tall buildings to be designed as slim point blocks? This would preclude such buildings as Echo 24 which, whilst slim at its eastern and western ends, is essentially a slab block making a bold design statement on the entry to the city from the north.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.22 proposes the introduction of 'public realm' improvements to the north end of Burdon Road to improve the quality of the pedestrian environment. There is however no reference to the probable need for this stretch of Burdon Road to provide access for either cars or service vehicles to the Holmeside Triangle development as referred to in the Inspector's Report into UDP Alteration No.2 relating to proposal SA55A.1, nor how such conflicts could be resolved.</p> <p>On a point of detail, para 5.36 is misleading. The oldest properties date from the 1830's and were indeed built as residences. However Sydenham & Corner Houses were not, they were both redevelopments designed by Frank Caws to provide prestige commercial premises.</p>	<p>Comments noted – no change proposed Tall buildings are often viewed as beacons of economic growth and can become iconic structures, however they can have a significant impact on the area that surrounds them, especially if they are out of character with the locality. Sheer scale alone is not sufficient to ensure a tall building is successful. All development proposals will be considered on their individual merit and required to justify the scale of development proposed.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed Agreed, however all development proposals must be considered individually depending on their location, local topography and the surrounding built form.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed All development proposals will be considered on their individual merits, however as stated in paragraph 4.15 the existing tall buildings within the City tend to be slim towers with a small footprint. The continuation of this design response is encouraged 'as it helps to reduce visual impact of development and allows a more elegant built form, which is already a characteristic of the city'.</p> <p>Comment noted - Document amended Agreed, additional text added to paragraph 5.22 stating 'These works may be subject to future access requirements for the Holmeside Triangle site, where the requirements of pedestrians and vehicular traffic will need to be carefully considered.'</p> <p>Comment noted - Document amended Agreed, paragraph 5.36 now states 'In contrast Fawcett Street is characterised by architectural diversity and quality on a grand scale. The oldest properties date from the mid 19th century and many were originally built as city residences. Of particular note are the richly detailed Sydenham House and Corder House both originally commercial properties designed by Frank Caws, which feature terracotta panels and mouldings. Several impressive 'classical' style buildings occupy prominent</p>
---------------------------	--	---

<p>J Tumman continued</p>	<p>The section on Holmeside Triangle (paras 5.41 – 5.43) makes no reference to the outstanding issues relating to access arrangements as referred to in the Inspector’s Report into proposal SA55A.1 of UDP Alteration No.2 even though these matters, relating to the impact on pedestrian movement on Stockton Rd and the visual quality of the Conservation Area at the western end and Burdon Rd at the eastern will impact on public realm matters. The Inspector clearly thought the issue to be of some importance and I would have thought that this current appraisal could reasonably provide at least the parameters to indicate how access issues could be reconciled with environmental issues.</p> <p>It appears from the map on page 95 and the text of para 5.45 that there is a long-term desire to provide a finer grain to The Bridges by introducing a new east-west pedestrian link north of Market Square. Desirable though this may be, there are many major issues, which must be addressed before this could become a reality.</p> <p>There appears to be some confusion regarding the redevelopment and refurbishment of buildings on Fawcett St in the first bullet point to para. 5.48. This refers to ‘management and reuse of the historic built fabric’, whilst immediately afterwards reference is made to the ‘redeveloping poor quality infill’. Hopefully this means that the ‘historic fabric’ including remnants of the original houses which are not listed’ will be retained wherever possible with redevelopment only as a last resort if structurally unsound or incapable of restoration, and that the redevelopment referred to will be solely of certain more modern buildings.</p> <p>The map on p102 omits what could well be a key development site on Silksworth Row. This is the site immediately north of the Arts Centre, currently cleared and grassed. A high quality redevelopment here would enhance this important entry to the city centre and should surely be included for development.</p> <p>Proposals for the ‘Great Street’ in this locality show, in schematic form, tree planting in front of St Mary’s building, a</p>	<p>corner sites, at the St Thomas Street junction for example, and Hutchinson’s Buildings on the corner of Bridge Street.’</p> <p>Comment noted - Document amended The issue of likely pedestrian and vehicle access points is covered by the document at present. Methods for resolving the conflicting interests of these movement patterns will be carefully considered should a development proposal come forward for the Holmeside Triangle site. Additional text added to the document stating ‘The detrimental impact of vehicular access to the site on the public realm and pedestrian movement should be minimised’.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed The desire to increase pedestrian permeability through the City, in particular east-west movement remains a valid aspiration that conforms with current policy.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed Agreed, historic buildings will be retained wherever possible.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed The plans of the city centre included within the document are representational only and are not intend to prescribe which sites are suitable for development. It is agreed that a high quality redevelopment on this site would enhance this gateway site.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed As stated above the plans included within the document are intended to be indicative</p>
---------------------------	--	--

<p>J Tumman continued</p>	<p>prominent, visually attractive listed building. In time planting could obstruct views of this building and it might be preferable to emphasise its importance as a 'landmark' by not landscaping in front of it, instead creating a visual punctuation to the peripheral landscaping to the road.</p> <p>I really query the basis on which this area has been defined (Bishopwearmouth). I have already commented on the inappropriateness of the eastern boundary in relation to the resulting exclusion of major retail/potential major retail areas from the Central District. To go further, if Olive and Derwent Streets are within the defined Central District, for the sake of consistency, so should Vine Place. Perhaps the boundary of the Bishopwearmouth District should be redrawn to more closely respond to the historic village, being focussed on The Green, Low Row and the western part of High Street West, which is also perhaps where the main focus of sensitive design issues lies, bearing in mind both the history of the locality and the disposition of listed buildings.</p> <p>I agree with the objectives listed under 5.83 and the development opportunities in 5.84, in particular the re-use of the former fire station and creation of 'Empire Square'. The existing space in front of the fire station could be greatly enhanced were development of the western end, abutting 'The Dun Cow' encouraged. This could enable relocation of the sub station which is currently an eyesore, and also provide a fitting return to the public house, which presently terminates in an unattractive brick gable.</p> <p>I strongly support the redevelopment of the leisure centre to provide city centre/active frontages, especially if it is done in a way which draws people further west on High Street towards the Minster and Empire. However sensitive design/quality materials are desirable given the proximity of listed buildings and the Conservation Area. Also reservations concerning suggested building heights; impact on Alms Houses and The Londonderry (listed). Prefer a variable roof line to The Green of predominantly 2-3 storeys, perhaps rising to 4, with possibility of 5 storeys to provide a feature at the Crowtree Rd/High St West junction.</p> <p>Servicing and parking issues arising from the redevelopment of the Leisure Centre</p>	<p>only and do not represent detailed landscaping or public realm improvement schemes.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed Comment noted, however it is important that should the Crowtree Leisure Centre site be redeveloped that it is done so taking due consideration to its location in close proximity to the Town Park, Minster, Alms Houses and the wider conservation area. Placing the site within the Bishopwearmouth area of the city will help to ensure that this is the case.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed A separate development brief has been produced for this site which covers development requirements in greater detail than the Central Area Urban Design Strategy.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed A separate development brief has been</p>
---------------------------	--	--

<p>J Tumman continued</p>	<p>are not addressed, although they would need to be sensitively handled if they are not to impact adversely on pedestrian movement or the visual environment of the locality.</p> <p>Whilst agreeing with the objectives at 5.103, I am unsure as to the reality in relation to 'ensure that all proposals are of the highest architectural and design standards and are contextually sensitive to the historic form and townscape qualities of the area'. Recent examples do not inspire hope. Bede House on Coronation Street, developed since regeneration of the Sunnyside Area commenced, is squat and featureless with unsatisfactory relationship with adjacent listed building.</p> <p>Doubtful there will be sufficient latent demand for the scale of A1, A3 and A4 uses suggested for Sunnyside North. May be more realistic to seek continuous active frontage to High St West. Suggest first bullet point to para 5.111 be strengthened to refer to a continuity of active uses at ground floor.</p> <p>Although the indicative map on p.110 seems to indicate a positive attitude towards possible development on the south east side of the junction of Borough Rd and Toward Rd it may be beneficial to take a more positive attitude to this prominent site with greater emphasis given to it and design guidelines set out.</p> <p>Point out that the site north of Gill Rd where the southern end of the proposed pedestrian footbridge will land, may contain significant archaeological remains. This site falls outside recent 'digs' on the Vaux site.</p> <p>It is regrettable that this redevelopment area was not initially built to an overall plan, as it would have enabled creation of better civic design, quality of public spaces, circulation patterns etc. I am not generally supportive of the creation of the Stadium Square now proposed as it does not form a logical focus for the uses in the quarter; further it may well prove difficult to create a visually attractive 'balanced' square, as opposed to place of congregation. Concerns also raised</p>	<p>produced for this site which covers development requirements in greater detail than the Central Area Urban Design Strategy.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed It is the intention of the Council that this document and the draft Sunnyside Planning and Design Framework will strengthen the Council's position in policy terms regarding the standard of new development required for the Sunnyside area of the city.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed The Council, together with the Sunnyside Partnership and other relevant bodies, are working towards securing the redevelopment of large section of the Sunnyside area of the city centre. As this is a clear aspiration of the Council it is expected that demand for such uses will increase as new development proposals are brought forward. More detailed design guidance for this area of the city is covered by the draft Sunnyside Planning and Design Framework.</p> <p>Comments noted – document amended More detailed design guidance for this area of the city is covered by the draft Sunnyside Planning and Design Framework. This chapter of the Strategy has been amended to more closely reflect the guidance contained with the Sunnyside Planning and Design Framework.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed The Tyne and Wear Archaeology Officer will be contacted during discussions on any significant development within the Central Area.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed A separate Development Framework for the Stadium Village is currently being prepared for adoption by the Council that will provide more detailed guidance for this section of the city, including appropriate uses and parking solutions.</p>
---------------------------	---	--

<p>J Tumman continued</p>	<p>regarding the possible loss of parking and impact on adjacent streets.</p> <p>St Peter's Gate – I agree entirely with para 5.170. However issue reintroducing two way traffic onto North Bridge St was investigated in the Monkwearmouth Local Plan. At that time major problems with junction capacities, solution would be demolition – expensive and require land acquisition/large scale redevelopment. In practice more likely to retain existing system. Suggest works to the Wheasheaf, Roker Avenue and west side of Church St North to provide attractive entry into the City Centre.</p> <p>Query the desirability of further planting in front of the Monkwearmouth Station Museum, obscure views of listed building. Reinstatement of iron railings would be more historically accurate.</p> <p>Panns Bank – doubts as to whether this locality could sustain the level of demand for A1, A2, A3 and A4 uses implied. More appropriate to locate such uses on High St East. Panns Bank South, Fish Quay and Numbers Garth will be 'enclaves' rather than major routes so lack 'visibility' factor.</p> <p>Fully support initiatives to improve cross river links in this general location, improve circulation, enhance access to facilities and assist in regeneration.</p> <p>Document refers to the preparation of development frameworks for key sites. However there are issues arising for the development of certain sites such as Holmeside Triangle and The Bridges, which have public realm implications. It would be appropriate for this document to at least identify these issues for future reference and make tentative suggestions as to how they may be addressed.</p> <p>I note that in the schedule of implementation the redevelopment of Panns Bank and Numbers Garth is intended to be short term and private landowner led. I appreciate the development interest in the sites adjacent to the Quayside Exchange but wonder whether there is sufficient in other areas. Possible 'pump-priming' needed by the Arc or Council.</p>	<p>Comments noted – no change proposed Whilst introducing two way traffic has been deemed unfeasible in the past it remains a long term aspiration if a suitable solution can be found and should not therefore be ruled out entirely.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed As stated above the plans included within the document are intended to be indicative only and do not represent detailed landscaping or public realm improvement schemes.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed Agreed that at present the city centre is unlikely to support the level of uses proposed within Panns Bank, however this document, and the draft Sunnyside Planning and Design Framework, aspire to significant changes within the city at which point sustaining the level of uses proposed may become economically viable.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed The need for a high quality public realm to be implemented and maintained throughout the central area is a key aspiration of the document. It is not considered to be the role of this document to provide detailed design guidance for specific sites if they are intended to be covered by specific development briefs.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed Proposal is outside the remit of the document.</p>
<p>C</p>	<p>The central station, is it to be redeveloped</p>	<p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p>

<p>Chesborough (Non statutory) C Chesborough continued</p>	<p>or refurbished? This is crazy. I know it's a ridiculous comparison, but we are in the era of St Pancras. Central railway station of a significant city. Building that stands over our station is a complete embarrassment – should be demolished. Can't talk of public squares offering a 'high quality entrance to the city' when that building lies at the heart of it. What also of the horrible Waterloo Place girdered building opposite with the broken clock that has never worked? This area needs comprehensive, total redevelopment, vision and inspiration.</p> <p>Market Square – the booklet acknowledges an 'uninspiring' space. It is far worse than that! Manager of the Bridges frustrated that they and Land Securities wish to expand the Bridges into that area. Would not a Bridges expansion that goes all the way down to include the station entrance/exit be the perfect solution? An indoor Market Square would be a different proposition.</p> <p>Blandford Street – one of the most dreadful city centre shopping thoroughfares in the western world. Illustrates your own phrase that describes part of the city centre as hostile, driving discerning customers away from Sunderland – yet the booklet has not a word about it. The entire street with its rear exposure towards the Bridges should be pulled down and redeveloped.</p> <p>Arriving by train or car from the north, sense of arrival within sight of our two bridges – superb asset. Echo 24 building has added to this but immediate area adjacent to it remains a big let down. Bridge House that replaced Grand Hotel is a spectacular failure/complete anticlimax on what should be a prestigious site – a far better building is now desired. Red brick looks like a council house, lack of height makes the sight lines draw a poor conclusion to Fawcett Street. Sight lines should go at least a storey higher. Bridge House looks worse from south - makes a mockery of the decent buildings that surround it. Building on that site should create impression of the city centre as a classy and vibrant place. City has never recovered from the loss of the Town Hall. The Grand Hotel site gives opportunity to correct great wrong/give the city centre back some heart and soul. Prestigious stone built civic building in a classic style would create a 'city gate' of some</p>	<p>The document includes proposals for the improvement to the Central Station and Waterloo Place within paragraphs 2.22-2.23 and 3.22-3.23. The Council is continuing to pursue funding opportunities to undertake further feasibility studies in respect of Central Station. It is considered essential that a new, enhanced station is created in keeping with its importance as a major public transport entry point into the City.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed Expansion of the Bridges shopping centre would remove an important area of public realm from the heart of the city centre. The document includes proposals for the improvement of the Market Square within paragraph 3.84.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed Document recognises the long term opportunity for the Bridges to enhance the central area through selective redevelopment opportunities so that it better relates to adjoining streets (paragraph. 5.44).</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed Document recognises the importance of gateway sites in creating good first impressions of the city. Design guidance for Bridge House site included within this document and also the Draft Sunnyside Planning and Design Framework. A separate Development Brief for the site is currently being produced to ensure a high standard of development is realised.</p>
--	--	---

<p>C Chesborough continued</p>	<p>meaning. The council, arc, Gentoo should combine to produce such a building on that site.</p> <p>Sunniside Gardens- superb development, yet is rarely anything but deserted. Partly due to the many vacant buildings but also the seating arrangements - very uninviting. Marble blocks are ugly and impractical. Seats should be traditional wooden ones, gardens need constant security to prevent vandalism and assure people. Lights are also a let down. Where are the statues and works of art that this square deserves? Decision to have no 'flat' space in the gardens is strange – ideal place for German Christmas market for example. Why is there a reluctance amongst the business community to take up available buildings - something to do with derelict areas along the road around Joblings – what is happening to those unattractive industrial units?</p> <p>High Street West, principle shopping thoroughfare, dismal shopping experience. Early Sunday afternoon with Christmas shopping in full flow inside the Bridges. High Street West was virtually deserted. Over half the shops were boarded up. Ugly steel shutters. Tatty buidings. If council is serious about regeneration this should be top priority. I worry about Marks and Spencer. This company is notoriously intolerant of poor standards yet surrounded by empty units. Should be immediate consultation with Land Securities about extension of Bridges.</p> <p>How can the Mackie's corner building be left standing so run down and forlorn? Splendid old building in the middle of an area of regeneration. Should be restored to form part of a block that includes the redevelopment of the Grand Hotel site.</p> <p>How can we have a situation as exists at the corner of Vine Place and Stockton Road? That demolished building site has been there for years.</p> <p>How long will Darke Cycles be allowed to have a home made tatty shop sign in such a high profile area?</p> <p>Why is the Legends bar never open only a</p>	<p>Comments noted – no change proposed Award winning Sunniside Gardens have made a significant positive impact on the character of the area. Proposals for improving Sunniside are included within the Document but are covered in more detail within the Draft Sunniside Planning and Design Framework document.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed Discussions with individual companies lie outside the remit of the Document, however the Document recognises the importance of restoring the character and identity of High Street West and improving the quality of the public realm.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed Document recognises the importance of retaining and enhancing Listed Buildings/Heritage Assets within the Central Area. As stated previously a Development Brief for the site is currently being produced to ensure a high standard of development is realised and that the Listed Buildings are retained and refurbished.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed The Document sets out the Councils aspirations for the city centre, however it is not intended to detail regeneration methods for individual sites. The query is therefore outside the remit of the document.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed Query is outside the remit of the document.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p>
--	---	--

	<p>month after its launch?</p> <p>There are many sold signs up along High Street East – how long before those ‘owners’ will have to develop those plots?</p> <p>Why no Christmas lights leading people down to Sunnyside Gardens?</p>	<p>Query is outside the remit of the document.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed Query is outside the remit of the document.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed Query is outside the remit of the document.</p>
Mrs O Maddison (Non statutory)	<p>Well done, preserved architecture and new buildings. I see a lot of thought and planning evident in the proposed plans. Good Luck! I look forward to the rejuvenation of my city. Would like to see similar scheme started in surrounding villages such as Ryhope & Silksworth.</p>	<p>Comments noted – no change proposed The document is required to support policy B2A of UDP Alteration No. 2, which only covers the central area of the city. As a result the central area design framework covers the entire city centre area as defined in chapter 4 of UDP Alteration No2 and the following development sites and strategic locations for change in order to ensure comprehensive approach to development:</p> <p>Stadium Park Sheepfolds Bonnersfield/St Peters University Campus World Heritage Site.</p> <p>Therefore, whilst the Council is committed to improving the wider area the suggested locations are outside the remit of the document.</p>
H Cole W Cole (Non statutory)	<p>We returned to Sunderland in 2006 after 12 years absence. Both extremely impressed with the changes in the city, including the Metro, Park Lane, Mowbray Park, Winter Gardens, promotion of the Empire, Glass Centre and the regeneration of the Sunnyside area. I travel nationwide and internationally on business and my husband regularly travels across the North and Midlands and have seen what successful regeneration can do to breathe life into cities and boost pride. I'd particularly like to add support to your plans for the Vaux site and am happy to be named as an objector to any possibility of it featuring a Tesco. I look forward to showing our friends from the South bigger and better things in Sunderland in the future!</p>	<p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p>
J Thompson (Non statutory)	<p>Promoting Sunderland great, it will improve if we dealt with the city entrance Wheatsheaf Pub, and the student accommodation rubbish blockboards ground floor, Monkwearmouth opposite the Library, and less of steel shutters on commercial shops, window shopping. Station £6m peanuts, Haymarket Metro £20m, Central Newcastle Library £40m, Fawcett St upgrading.</p>	<p>Comments noted – no change proposed Document includes proposals for the redevelopment of the Central Station and other key Gateway sites. The Council is continuing to pursue funding opportunities to undertake further feasibility studies in respect of Central Station. It is considered essential that a new, enhanced station is created in keeping with its importance as a major public transport entry point into the City.</p>

Greenhow (Non statutory)	<p>Accessibility is key and delivery of a modern railway interchange plus pedestrian crossings are essential but are they deliverable financially?</p> <p>The recent decision to focus taxi services in Park Lane is big own goal that needs to be promptly reconsidered.</p>	<p>Comments noted – no change proposed The document has been produced to set out the Councils aspirations for the city centre. Development proposals will be subject to Section 106 agreements in order to realise the deliverable aims of the document.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed The query is outside the remit of the document.</p>
McEvoy (Non statutory)	<p>Change from vehicle focus to pedestrian focus is welcome. Improvements to Central Station should be a priority. Agree with bridges over river to connect south to north. Improved public realm should be a priority, especially Market Square and Empire Square. Crowtree Leisure Centre – consider demolition.</p>	<p>Comments noted – no change proposed Document proposes improvements to the public realm and the general experience for pedestrians plus alterations to the structure of the city, including the Crowtree Leisure Centre, to enable greater pedestrian permeability.</p>
J Bee (Non statutory)	<p>I particularly liked Sunderland Central gateway station, and the bus stops (page 15 of the booklet). The structure behind the bus stops was also impressive. Public art and spaces are vital. All in all, excellent proposals. I'm excited to see the conclusion.</p>	<p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p>
A Mawson (Non statutory)	<p>Nowhere in your booklet have you addressed the problem of the approach to the Mainline Station. We must be the only city in the UK where access to the Railway Station one has a circuitous drive, ending up a back lane. 20 minutes parking in a minute area is useless. The station itself is filthy (but I know this isn't your problem). But the one way system and trouble free driving is.</p>	<p>Comments noted – no change proposed The document sets out detailed aspirations for the Central Station and the approach routes to it, including the provision of convenient 'gold standard' parking within paragraph 2.23.</p>
G Sheppard (Non statutory)	<p>Emphasis on pedestrians over vehicles. Good Park & Ride facilities. Mixture of Highstreet brands and independent small shops. Subsidised rents if necessary. Avoid 'Cloneville', just another copy of every other City in the Country. Newcastle is obviously a comparison. Sunderland has to be distinctly different City to be in.</p>	<p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p>
M Mitchell (Non statutory)	<p>The sooner these proposals are started the better as I would like to see these proposals finished in my life time (I am 64) particularly Central Station and Market Square.</p>	<p>Comments noted – no change proposed</p>
G Johnson (Non statutory)	<p>Redirecting buses away from central areas such as Fawcett St (page 16) and onto the Great Street will leave you with a ghost town. People who use buses will not carry shopping halfway across town to get a bus back home. For a council who doesn't want car traffic in the city centre all you are doing is encouraging it. This</p>	<p>Comment noted – no change proposed The Council has yet to commission a feasibility study investigating the possibility of altering the existing pattern of vehicle movement with the aim of improving the quality of the pedestrian environment in Fawcett Street. There is however an ongoing City Centre Public Transport Study</p>

	will result in less ridership on buses, which will result in even worse services (total madness). But the powers that be that make these decisions have a car (silly me).	which may make recommendations for Fawcett Street.
V Thompson (Non statutory)	After looking at the Urban Design Strategy much emphasis is given to improving the approaches and gateways into Sunderland. You state 'there is no second chance at first impressions' which I strongly agree with, so why is there no budget to improve the main gateway into Sunderland which also appears to be the most run down, dirty, poverty stricken street in Sunderland? I am referring to the vile, Eden Vale, Riversdale Terr. Ivanhoe Crescents, Burn Park area. this once fine area has been left to rot over the years and is surely one of the busiest gateways into Sunderland. Shame on you!	<p>Comments noted – no change proposed The document is required to support policy B2A of UDP Alteration No. 2, which only covers the central area of the city. As a result the central area design framework covers the entire city centre area as defined in chapter 4 of UDP Alteration No2 and the following development sites and strategic locations for change in order to ensure comprehensive approach to development:</p> <p>Stadium Park Sheepfolds Bonnersfield/St Peters University Campus World Heritage Site.</p> <p>Therefore, whilst the Council is committed to improving the wider area the suggested additional scope for the strategy is outside the remit of the document.</p>
J Daly (Non statutory)	<p>Do not close Crowtree Leisure Centre. Redevelop Holmeside Triangle before any extension to The Bridges. Extend Bridges development towards Blandford St.</p> <p>Create more traditional pubs, not disco pubs.</p> <p>Increase number of pedestrian bridges over the River Wear.</p> <p>Create areas with distinctive character and strong identity. Need the closure of Durham Rd/Vine Place access to vehicle access.</p>	<p>Comments noted – no change proposed Alterations to the Crowtree Leisure Centre site will separate development brief has been produced for the Crowtree Leisure Centre site which covers development requirements in greater detail than the Central Area Urban Design Strategy.</p> <p>Comments noted - no change proposed There is a clear desire to create a mixed and vibrant range of services and economy within the central area, however dictating what type/character of public house is deemed acceptable is outside the remit of the document. Some further guidance on drinking establishments is included with the City Council's Evening Economy SPD.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed Document includes proposals for pedestrian bridges to cross the River Wear.</p> <p>Comments noted – no change proposed Protecting and enhancing the distinctive character and identity of streets within the central area is a core aspiration of the document that is referred to on numerous occasions.</p>
B. Honari (Non statutory)	It would benefit the people and the image of this city. As I am a resident in the area I believe this is a right move.	Comments noted – no change proposed

S Bittlestone (Non statutory)	Doing something is better than nothing. Wear Rail bridge was vandalised a week after it was painted, why weren't the same painters called back to do some corrective day work?	Comments noted - no change proposed The query is outside the remit of the proposals.
S Owen Otec (Non statutory)	Proposals are fine. It would be great to see the City come into the 21st Century - but alas no new road bridge!! What is needed is a new bridge to take you straight from Church Street North - linking into the new City by pass.	Comments noted – no change proposed A new road bridge is proposed as part of the Strategic Transport Corridor linking the A19 to the City Centre and the port.
A Patchett (Non statutory)	This cohesive approach to creating a vision for the city centre is excellent and to be greatly welcomed. Let's get on and do it.	Comments noted – no change proposed
Smithson (Non statutory)	The work already completed in Sunderland has enhanced city, and plans appear to be as encouraging. We have potential as a city - these plans would make most of it.	Comments noted – no change proposed
R Jones (Non statutory)	I would like to see better lighting in Church Lane and surrounding areas. And trees are being uprooted by vandals.	Comments noted – no change proposed The document supports improvements to the public realm, including appropriate lighting solutions.
Haswell (Non statutory)	The City needs things of interest such as the Adelaide & Maritime Museums also statues, as in other European countries. But not like the Cambit! (Floating dustbins) If the City is made attractive and interesting investment will come.	Comments noted – no change proposed The document is intended to ensure continued improvements to the central area's public realm and standard of architecture. The document also encourages the use of public art.
P Forster (Non statutory)	I think this is an excellent idea which the city desperately needs to give it focus and a high quality plan to compete and compare with other cities in the north east.	Comments noted – no change proposed
Richardson (Non statutory)	When is this going to happen, we have waited far too long. Build less fancy apartments – too expensive, we need more affordable houses for young people.	Comments noted – no change proposed Proposals within the draft Sunnyside Planning Framework include the provision of family housing within the Tavistock area of the city.
M Devitt (Non statutory)	I approve of the 'vision' but do not think I will still be around when any of it comes to fruition – meanwhile could our central station not be brought into line with other stations in the area and have a layer of bright plastic cladding attached over the filthy walls that give the impression of going into a black hole or even a coal mine!	Comments noted – no change proposed The document includes proposals for the improvement to the Central Station and Waterloo Place within paragraphs 2.22-2.23 and 3.22-3.23. The Council is continuing to pursue funding opportunities to undertake further feasibility studies in respect of Central Station. It is considered essential that a new, enhanced station is created in keeping with its importance as a major public transport entry point into the City.

G E Brown (Non statutory)	Page 23: 'Vaux Square and Magistrates Square'. But please please resolve the site issue over facilities for a combined court (Magistrates/County – possibly Crown?): Thirty years of the Councils inept and vacuous policies have not yet solved this problem. Its resolution is urgent.	Comments noted – no change proposed The proposed location of new court facilities lies outside the remit of the document.
D Overs (Non statutory)	Object to bridge opposite Panns Bank and University of Sunderland, could have a dramatic effect on river trade in the future.	Comments noted – no change proposed Condition that future bridges 'must be designed to allow the river Wear to remain navigable' included within paragraph 3.59.
L Dobson (Non statutory)	Anyone who believes the strategy will come to fruition should also believe in fairies at the bottom of the garden. How many years have the Arc promised the development of the Holmeside Triangle? Any promises made by the trio of Sunderland Cabinet, the Arc and Gentoo lie in the realms of fantasy.	Comments noted – no change proposed
Lloyd (Non statutory)	Basic key plan not up to date and does not highlight which are proposals existing and/or demolished i.e. Mowbray Hotel, Vaux Site. If low level bridges are possible for pedestrians why no consideration for roads? No mention of parking in longterm.	Comments noted – no change proposed The indicative plans within the document will be checked to ensure they remain as up to date as feasible. Comments noted – no change proposed A new road bridge is proposed as part of the Strategic Transport Corridor linking the A19 to the City Centre and the port.
Ross (Non statutory)	Just get on with it, too much time seems to have been wasted, other councils seem to work quicker.	Comment noted – no change proposed
Glen Palmer (Non statutory)	We need new road bridge across the river, the green bridge gets congested and the Queen Alex bridge should be replaced.	Comments noted – no change proposed A new road bridge is proposed as part of the Strategic Transport Corridor linking the A19 to the City Centre and the port.
R Parkinson (Non statutory)	I would like a transport bridge, linking the north to the south, as depicted by no. 3 of the layout. Also I would like to hear the reasons by the committee as to why this was not thought about at the first discussion.	Comments noted – no change proposed A new road bridge is proposed as part of the Strategic Transport Corridor linking the A19 to the City Centre and the port.
J Fowler (Non statutory)	Low level footbridges across the River Wear must not be allowed to obstruct the movement of shipping up the river and especially up to the shipyard at Pallion!	Comments noted – no change proposed A condition that future bridges 'must be designed to allow the river Wear to remain navigable' included within paragraph 3.59.
B Rice (Non statutory)	The foot bridges must be constructed high above the river, so the Pallion shipyard can build ships again.	Comments noted – no change proposed A condition that future bridges 'must be designed to allow the river Wear to remain navigable' included within paragraph 3.59.
Joe (Non statutory)	Interesting document.	Comments noted – no change proposed
N Aslavn	I would like to see a change in	Comments noted – no change proposed

(Non statutory)	Sunderland please for the future.	
Taylor (Non statutory)	All well and good but when will they come to fruition – not in my lifetime I don't think.	Comments noted – no change proposed
Pattison (Non statutory)	Support	Comment noted – no change proposed
R McQuillan (Non statutory)	<p>The modus operandi and perverse priorities make the objectives unattainable</p> <p>PPG6,3 and 13 have for the past 30 years been ignored – especially relating to pollution</p>	<p>Comment noted – no change proposed</p> <p>Comments are not relevant to CAUDS</p>