

**STADIUM VILLAGE DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK – REPRESENTATIONS**

Reference	Respondent	FRDF Paragraph / Policy (where applicable)	Description	Proposed Action
SV1	Association of North East Councils		1. No Observations	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV2	Sunderland AFC		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals</li> <li>2. Excited by the prospects of an indoor ski slope.</li> <li>3. It is important that the indoor ski slope does not replicate the offering of the football club within its design i.e. weddings, conferences, concerts (large scale), banquets etc.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Comment Noted – No change</b> The Stadium Village Development Framework sets principles and parameters for development in line with the land use policies set out in UDP Alteration no. 2. A Ski Slope development would accord with the land use policy context for Stadium Village. However the Framework does not detail specific operational/commercial opportunities that may relate to this use.</p>
SV3	DPTAC		1. No Observations	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV4	TATA Communications		1. Proposal will not affect TATA communications.	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV5	Northumbria Police		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Current RVP and emergency access route to the Stadium is located on Keir Hardie Way to the north west of the site. Presently, the access route is surrounded by open land. The current proposal is for a development of this open land (Site A). Need to maintain the integrity of the emergency access route. The public cannot use the land to the south west of the access route due to the slope of the ground.</li> <li>2. The new pedestrian bridge should be suitable &amp; robust enough to allow emergency traffic access to the site, (limit to number of vehicles at one time). Would allow alternative RVP and emergency access route to be identified to the South of the site, could be used if main RVP was compromised. Negate the requirement for ambulances to have to negotiate bridge(s) to access nearest hospital when these would both become grid locked.</li> <li>3. Concerned with conflict re access to new uses (hotels, housing, other refreshment locations) as these are likely to be used during matches, in comparison present situation (industrial uses) which are primarily closed Saturdays/evenings when matches are on, especially at the end of game when large numbers making way from ground.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> There is no intention to remove the emergency access route via Keir Hardie Way.</p> <p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> Whilst an aspiration for a pedestrian footbridge is contained in the Framework, it is not intended to set detailed design specification for new development; rather to set principles and parameters to guide future detailed masterplans for the site. Notwithstanding the above any new bridge will need to conform to relevant access requirements</p> <p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> The mix of land uses has been established in the overarching policy for the site contained in UDP Alteration Number 2, which was adopted in 2007. The development framework sets principles and parameters for the development of the site. Ultimately it will be for the developer to bring forward proposals, which will be considered in the context of planning policy, the development framework and surrounding development proposals. The principle of a hotel and refreshment uses in close proximity to a football stadium is not considered incompatible and has been developed elsewhere in the</p>

			<p>4. At time of stadium pop concerts, Sheepfolds was virtually under vehicle lock down, the establishment of the premises under the development plan would not readily allow this in the future, and there would be a conflict between traffic, vehicular and foot to the other venues on the site and those using the stadium.</p> <p>5. At present the entire Sheepfolds site becomes a giant car park on match days, as the other premises on the site are mainly closed. The new development would change profile of the site, and car parking would not be available therefore consideration needs to be given to where traffic displacement.</p> <p>6. The development refers to using the Stadium car parking for the other premises. What happens with regard these vehicles when the car parks are being used for the stadium? During the pop concerts, the Stadium car parks were not available to the public using the Aqua Centre and this lead to difficulties. If even more venues were relying on the stadium car parks this would exasperate (sic) these problems.</p> <p>7. The development plans refers to people using public transport i.e. Metro. Current alignment of Metro in Sunderland does not make it readably available for use, and people would have to use an alternative form of transport to be able to access it, therefore less likely to swap to the Metro.</p> <p>8. Iconic premises could have a regional draw, i.e. the Indoor Ski Slope. It should be noted that over a million people live within thirty minutes of the site while over three and a half million live within two hours. The public transport infrastructure to Sunderland is such that a great number of people could be expected to travel by car annual air show is a prime example.</p>	<p>country. With regard to housing proposed on site E, the development framework encourages a mix of uses in which office development would provide a buffer between housing and football stadium.</p> <p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> Whilst it is recognised that development of the site would result in the need to re-assess the policing and management of the site on matchdays, the principle of development of the site has been established in the UDP Alteration No.2 since 2007.</p> <p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> With reference to car parking, please see Cabinet Report</p> <p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> With reference to car parking, please see Cabinet Report</p> <p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> Disagree. It is considered that the Metro network is readily available for use for a significant number of people both within and outside Sunderland who may access the site. Notwithstanding this the site is also accessible by bus and by foot from other areas of the city.</p> <p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> In accordance with planning policy, all planning applications for development will be accompanied by a Transport Assessment (see P.59 of Development framework). These will be expected to illustrate accessibility by all modes of transport and provide measures to improve accessibility by modes other than the private car. The Transport Assessment will investigate the travel needs of specific developments and balance parking needs with alternative modes. Travel plans for each development will be prepared.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

			<p>9. Currently coaches that bring away fans park in industrial area of Sheepfolds. When new development takes place, no longer possible. Sgt Hobson (football unit) stated they may have to return to dropping the fans at the ground then removing the coaches to the Seafront for parking. During the pop concerts the coaches, were parked on the site to be used for a hotel, there would be no suitable replacement.</p> <p>10. At present once an event is finished at the stadium there is nothing in the location to attract and retain those leaving the ground, thus crowd disperses reasonably quickly. The proposal for the site would create an environment that would be much more attractive for people to remain at, whilst also attracting others. This would require the maintenance of a police presence in the area with regard to match longer than is currently experienced. The venue could also become in its own right an attraction to the night time economy, and thus would require greater police resources to cover this as well as the currently established venues.</p> <p>11. There is a proposal for a development of the footpath system, including those leading to the riverside. Any development would require emergency vehicle access to the paths especially those leading down the steep ground to the riverside. The present road infrastructure is not suitable for the evacuation of any injured person from the riverside or slope leading to it.</p> <p>12. The inclusion of residential premises with in the development would give rise to complaints of anti social behaviour with regard to patrons leaving the stadium. This would increase should any more pop concerts be held as the 'high spirits' of the concert goers would be misconstrued by the residents.</p> <p>13. There is a proposal to provide access to the west platform at Monkwearmouth museum and the footbridge over the line. Whilst this would not appear to be problem at present, if we return to having derby games between Sunderland and Newcastle then this would be in ideal location for missiles to be thrown at metro train leaving St. Peters.</p> <p>14. During the concerts, it was noticeable that the building of the Aqua Centre has restricted the area for access around that side of the Ground, and this was where the crowds were more restricted. This should be considered with regard to any further developments abutting on the stadium land especially where the development for the stadium extension is to take place.</p>	<p><b>Comment Noted - No Change</b> Whilst it is recognised that development of the site would result in the need to re-assess the policing and management of the site on matchdays, the principle of development of the site has been established in the UDP Alteration No.2 since 2007</p> <p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> Whilst it is recognised that development of the site would result in the need to re-assess the policing and management of the site on matchdays, the principle of development of the site has been established in the UDP Alteration No.2 since 2007.</p> <p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> Whilst an aspiration for a footpath system down to the riverside is contained in the Framework, it is not intended to set detailed specification of these footpaths at this stage, rather to set principles and parameters to guide future detailed masterplans for the site.</p> <p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> With regard to housing proposed on site E, the development framework encourages a mix of uses in which office development would provide a buffer between housing and football stadium. The football stadium is an established use on the site. The impacts of associated activities will need to be considered by developers.</p> <p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> The Framework states that the opportunity to investigate reopening the footbridge over the railway line should be retained. Detailed Masterplan proposals for the site will be expected to investigate this opportunity (including the feasibility and viability of such a proposal) in more detail.</p> <p><b>Comment Noted</b></p>
--	--	--	---	---

SV6	Environment Agency		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the inclusion of a Sustainable Development section in Chapter 4 (p47). Instead of development proposals just considering SUD's as stated in SPD, should be aim to reduce flood risk on site and to adopt the most sustainable methods of urban drainage systems e.g. more sustainable methods include basins, ponds, filter strips, swales and permeable surfaces.</li> <li>2. Recommends green buffer zones are created to ensure that any development does not adversely affect the natural environment (p 47 s4.28) in line with PPS9.</li> <li>3. Sec4.22 (p45) Need to consider that tall buildings along watercourses can have a negative effect on river and green corridor due to shading. The ecological value of a the river corridor can be reduced by limiting light levels and temperatures, thus restricting plant growth and reproduction, and effecting the life-cycles of wildlife. Increase in artificial lighting negative impact on ecology of the river corridor. New development along river corridors should mitigate potential adverse effects i.e. set back tall buildings from watercourse, sympathetic design, increase green buffer zone width.</li> <li>4. Sec 6 (p57-60) supports requirement of preliminary risk assessment. As suggested in SA Tb 9-2 Sec4, developers should be required to submit Construction Environment Management Plan to reduce risk of pollution. Should include specific measures to be taken to control and manage environmental impacts such as noise, air quality, water resources and ecology. Description of planned works and general site arrangements should be included in construction environmental management plan. Should be noted in SPD.</li> <li>5. Appendix 1.0 Policy Context (p63-78) PPS9 (Biodiversity and Geological Conservation) and PPS23 (Planning and Pollution Control) should be listed.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Comment Noted - Amend</b>  <b>Amend paragraph 4.27 final bullet to read:</b>  Consider measures to reduce flood risk on the site through the adoption of the most sustainable methods of urban drainage systems. The use of basins and ponds, filter strips and swales and permeable surfaces are encouraged.</p> <p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b>  Development will only take place on previously developed land. A buffer zone also exists between the development site and the Wearmouth Colliery SNCI.</p> <p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b>  The development framework does not propose tall buildings on the water's edge. Development areas are set back from the riverbank. In addition, the river runs to the south and west of the site so overshadowing would be minimal.</p> <p><b>Comment Noted – Amend</b>  <b>Insert new section P.59 to read:</b>  Construction Environment Management Plan  Developers should submit a Construction Environment Management Plan to reduce the risk of pollution. The plan should include specific measures that will be taken to control and manage environmental impacts that may occur for noise, air quality, water resources and ecology. In addition a description of planned works and general site arrangements should be included in construction environmental management plan.</p> <p><b>Comment noted – Amend</b>  Insert PPS9 and PPS23 into Planning Policy Context section</p>
SV7	Natural England		<p><b>Development Framework</b></p> <p>We welcome the requirement for network of pedestrian and cycle links offering access to the site. These should link with the wider cycle public rights of way and trail network.</p>	<p><b>Comment Noted</b></p>

		<p>Design should seek to incorporate Biodiversity and geological conservation benefit as part of good design. Biodiversity and landscape enhancement should be integrated into developments, including the design, layout, programming and construction of development this should also be designed to contribute to the integration of multifunctional green infrastructure network.</p> <p><a href="#">A Natural Development</a> provides a link to related information on our website.</p> <p>We are concerned that these ecology is recognised only as a constraint in paragraphs 2.50 – 2.51. The natural environment should be recognised as an asset and issues including the opportunities for creation and enhancement of environmental assets, should be integrated in the Development Framework. Paragraph 2.51 recognises the possibility of bats being present in the Sheepfolds area. Maternity and other summer roosts are most likely in this area and summer survey should identify these roosts. The likelihood of Hibernation roosts should be identified and if relevant confirmed using appropriate methodology as set out in the bat workers manual <a href="http://www.jncc.gov.uk/page-2861">http://www.jncc.gov.uk/page-2861</a>. Where bats are found the goal should be to avoid adverse impacts. If this is not feasible, then an appropriate mitigation strategy will be required.</p> <p>Further details can be provided in Section 6 along the following lines: <i>Buildings within the Sheepfold may be used by roosting (summer roosts, maternity roosts etc ) and hibernating bats at relevant times of the year. Any proposals with the potential to adversely impact bats will therefore need to determine whether bats are present, and if so, how they make use of the site. If bats are present, the goal should be to avoid adverse impacts. If this is not feasible, then an appropriate mitigation strategy will need to be developed. In exceptional circumstances it may be possible to compensate for impacts which cannot be reasonably avoided or mitigated. Surveys, assessments and recommendations for mitigation measures should be undertaken by suitably qualified and experienced persons holding any licenses that may be required.</i></p> <p>Paragraph 3.2 We would look to see biodiversity and landscape enhancement embedded in the objectives and addressed in the development principles and parameters. This should deliver local Biodiversity Action Plan and Natural Character area objectives.</p> <p>Section 6 Delivery and implementation should also address natural environment this should be in line with circular ODPM 06/2005 which accompanies PPS9 and subsequent legislation see our website: <a href="http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/information_for/local_authority_and_policy_makers/default.aspx">http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/information_for/local_authority_and_policy_makers/default.aspx</a>.</p>	<p><b>Comment Noted – Amend</b>  <b>Add bullet para. 4.10 to read:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design should seek to incorporate Biodiversity and geological conservation benefit as part of good design. Biodiversity and landscape enhancement should be integrated into developments, to contribute to the integration of a multifunctional green infrastructure network.</li> </ul> <p><b>Insert new para 2.47 (P.25):</b>  Natural Environment: Opportunities for the creation and enhancement of environmental assets.</p> <p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b>  The Development Framework is intended to provide guidance on likely requirements for the submission of a planning application rather than necessary to explicate exact procedures. It is considered that paragraph 2.51 contains sufficient information on the presence of bats and necessary measures to be taken to ensure their protection.</p> <p><b>Comment noted – Amend</b>  <b>Amend penultimate bullet para. 3.2 to read:</b>  Enhance the River Wear Corridor, connecting the river to the urban fabric of the city; and generally improve the natural environment of Stadium Village.</p> <p><b>Comment noted – Amend</b>  The requirement to submit an EIA Screening Opinion is covered in section 6.6</p> <p>However insert new paragraph 6.13 and 6.14 to read:  <b>6.13 Environmental Statement</b>  Once the need and scope for EIA has been determined and the assessments carried out, developers should produce an Environmental Statement. The Environmental Statement should include:</p> <p>1.Description of the development including - physical</p>
--	--	---	--

				<p>characteristics of the whole development and the land use during construction/ operation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a Description of the main characteristics of the production process , for instance nature and quantity of the material used</li> <li>b An estimate, by type and quantity of expected residues and emissions (water air and soil pollution, noise vibration, light, heat, radiation, etc) resulting from the operation of the proposed development</li> </ol> <p>2. An outline of the main alternatives studied by the applicant or appellant and an indication of the main reasons for his choice, taking into account the environmental effects.</p> <p>3 A description of the aspects of the environment likely to be significantly affected by the development, including, in particular, population, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, including the architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the interrelationship between the above factors.</p> <p>4. A description of the likely significant effects of the development on the environment, which should cover the direct effects and any indirect, secondary, cumulative, short, medium and long-term, permanent and temporary, positive and negative effects of the development, resulting from:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. the existence of the development;</li> <li>b. the use of natural resources</li> <li>c. the emission of pollutants, the creation of nuisances and the elimination of waste, and the description by the applicant of the forecasting methods used to assess the effects on the environment.</li> </ol> <p>5. A description of the measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and where possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment.</p> <p>6. A non-technical summary</p> <p>7. An indication of any difficulties encountered by the applicant in compiling the required information.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>Appendix 1 Policy context should include PPS9 , Biodiversity and Geological Conservation, the related circular ODPM 06/2009 and Planning for Biodiversity and geological conservation: A good practice guide</p> <p><b>Appropriate Assessment (October 2009)</b></p> <p>My concern remains with the process and reporting of the assessment.</p> <p>This should be carried out under Regulation 85 of the Habitats Regulations as amended 2007 (not Reg 48).</p> <p>The Assessment process must record and report on the information relied on, and thus justify, a conclusion of no adverse effect on integrity. This is clearly set out in the EU guidance '<b>Assessment of plans and projects significantly affecting Natura 2000 sites. Methodological guidance on the provisions of Article 6(3) and (4) of the Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC</b>'  <a href="http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/management/docs/art6/natura_2000_assess_en.pdf">http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/management/docs/art6/natura_2000_assess_en.pdf</a></p> <p>3.2.1 The process is incorrectly reported, and as a consequence it is not clear if it has been carried out correctly. The first stage in the HRA process is screening which includes identification of Likely Significant Effect (LSE), alone or in combination with other plans and projects. The second stage is Appropriate Assessment of impacts on the integrity of European sites.</p> <p>The final paragraph refers to implementing mitigation measures, to address overall impacts As these impacts are not set out the report does not offer any justification to support the statement that these measures are not applicable to the European sites.</p> <p>Where any impacts are identified with LSE the HRA process requires these LSE to be considered under the Appropriate Assessment stage, and necessary mitigation</p>	<p><b>6.14 Ecological Survey and mitigation Report</b>  Development on Stadium Village may affect the Wearmouth Colliery Site of Nature Conservation Interest. (SNCI). Therefore an ecological survey assessment and mitigation report must be submitted alongside any planning application. The report should be undertaken by a suitably qualified professional, in accordance with good practice guidelines. <a href="http://www.ieem.org.uk/survey-sources/index.html">http://www.ieem.org.uk/survey-sources/index.html</a></p> <p><b>Comment Noted – Amend</b>  <i>Insert reference to PPS9, Appendix 1 p.65</i></p> <p><b>Comments Noted – Amend</b></p> <p><i>Appropriate Assessment report to be amended in accordance with Natural England Comments and agreed by Natural England</i></p>
--	--	--	---	--

		<p>identified and set out in stage 2. Any necessary mitigation must be embedded in the SPD to ensure no adverse effect on integrity will result.</p> <p>If adverse effects cannot be avoided, or overcome through mitigation, alternative solutions should be assessed in stage 3.</p> <p><b>Direct impacts</b></p> <p>Under 'Water Quality' the issue of contaminated soils is identified , along with impacts generated by the new bridge. These should be recognised as impacts and any reason why this would not result in significant effect justified – both could result in contaminated sediments being released into the River Wear. The report should recognise this and consider if contaminated soils and river sediments are likely to be carried downstream and contaminate coastal feeding / roosting sites of the important bird populations or habitats before determining if there will be LSE.</p> <p>Impacts are also mentioned under 'Air Quality' and 'Noise' but not specifically reported and recorded in the context of the Habitats Regulation Assessment.</p> <p><b>3.2.2 Indirect Impacts</b></p> <p>This should also consider if feeding and roosting sites for SPA criteria species are likely to be affected as these have functional importance to the integrity of the sites. Impacts might include disturbance to birds using these functional sites. The report indicates that there are 'no records' for Golden plover near the stadium village is this due to no survey/recording being carried out in the area or has the area been surveyed and no feeding or roost sites found? The LSE of any impact would consider the numbers of birds affected.</p> <p>The great cormorant and black-legged kittiwake are not criteria features of the SPA and thus need not be considered.</p> <p><b>3.2.3 Cumulative and in-combination impacts</b></p> <p>This indicates that increase in tourism could increase pressures on land use, but does not indicate how this might impact on European sites, thus any LSE cannot be determined.</p> <p>Cumulative and in-combination effects should not be confined to plans and projects in the immediate area. The in combination effect should also address both plans and projects in this and other authority areas.</p> <p>Procedurally it should not be concluded that as a higher level plan would not have an adverse effect other DPDs and SPDs within the same plan area or elsewhere will not have an in-combination effect it may be the greater detail in DPDs and SPDs which result in adverse effect which is not applicable at a more strategic level. Also in-combination effect should not focus on the conclusion of other Reg 85, or Reg 45, assessment but consider impacts identified in the screening stage which might have</p>	
--	--	---	--



			<p>no LSE alone but could contribute to a cumulative impact.</p> <p><b>4 Potential Effects on the Designated Site</b>  This effectively concludes there will be no impacts due to the geographical distance between the site and the Stadium Village. This reason is not robust nor justified in the preceding assessment .</p> <p>Table 4.1 records 'none' under Possible impacts. This does not reflect the preceding texts where a number of impacts are referred to, as discussed above, but not clearly described. These impacts should be included in the screening matrix, it should then be demonstrated that that likelihood of significant effect has been considered, and the conclusion justified .</p>	
SV8	Coal Authority		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fully supports the content of the amended SPD with regards to ground conditions and coal mining legacy.</li> </ol>	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV9	Highways Agency		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Agency considers the document satisfactorily aims to encourage sustainable development and improved accessibility to and within the area. The Agency is particularly supportive of the documents aim to ensure the development is not reliant on the private car and that access should be sought by other modes of transport, particularly through the enhancement of existing public transport. The Agency, however, would like to see reference given to the impact of any potential development on the Strategic Road Network (A19 (regional), A1(national), A194 (regional)).</li> <li>2. The Agency supports council's vision and objectives for SV, but could benefit from detailing the need to reduce dependency on private car as a key theme.</li> <li>3. The Agency would request that the document makes specific reference to the need to consult the Agency in relation to the impacts at the Strategic Road Network within the appropriate section in chapter 6. Subsequent reference to the Agency in relation to pre-application discussions would also be appropriate</li> </ol>	<p><b>Comment noted - Amend</b>  <i>Insert new paragraph 6.10 to read:</i>  Consideration will be given to the impact of developments on the Strategic Road Network (SRN). If appropriate, proposals which create significant impact will be subject to consultation with the Highway's Agency.</p> <p><b>Comment Noted – Amend</b>  <i>Paragraph 3.1 bullet 7 insert at end:</i>  ..to reduce dependency on the private car.</p> <p>In addition to above it is considered that paragraphs 4.11 to 4.19 already give significant weight to delivering development where higher priority is given to forms of transport other than the private car.</p> <p><b>Comment Noted – Amend</b>  <i>Insert new paragraph 6.12 to read:</i>  Developers should consider pre-application consultations with other relevant stakeholders such as English Heritage and the Highways Agency.</p>
SV10	OneNorthEast		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Agency welcomes the revised document's reference (paragraph 4.33) to the need for all development proposals within the area covered by the SPD to assess any potential effect upon the Candidate World Heritage Site at St Peter's Church.</li> <li>2. One North East is supportive of the inclusion of leisure facilities within the regeneration proposals for Stadium Village.</li> <li>3. The proposal (indoor ski slope) has a significant opportunity to attract a large number of people from both within and outside the region to</li> </ol>	<b>Comments Noted – No Change</b>

			<p>Sunderland and to a city which currently has few major visitor attractors.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. The attraction of people to Sunderland will increase visitor spend within the City with the associated 'spin offs' that this brings in terms of employment and income. The Agency considers that the facility has the potential to attract out of region visitors as well as retaining in region visits. A large indoor attraction will also help address seasonality, extending the tourism season by offering a significant alternative activity for visitors when the weather is poor.</li> <li>5. The location of the indoor ski centre will offer a connection from the City Centre, via the Wearmouth Bridge, to the Stadium of Light and the Aquatic Centre. This area currently does not offer an appropriate linkage. The indoor ski centre will ensure that a high quality development sits in the area and will also ensure that a significant part of the 'Way of Light', the pedestrian spine that will lead from the Stadium to the river, is delivered.</li> <li>6. In addition to the regenerative benefits outlined above, the Agency recognises that it is difficult to find a site for a facility of this size/nature in such a central location. The Stadium Village site is an edge of city centre site well served by public transport and has the added benefit of effectively creating a sport and leisure hub together with the other facilities in the area.</li> <li>7. Clearly there will be issues relating to sustainability given the energy intensive nature of the indoor ski facility and this will need to be considered in the context of the Council's aspirations for Sunderland's development towards a low carbon economy.</li> </ol>	
SV11	English Heritage		<p>Comments from earlier consultation not fully addressed.</p> <p><b>Introduction</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Para 1.10 and 1.11 contradictory with each other, 1.10 states details not until masterplan, 1.11 scope of framework is to establish principles and objectives that will address relationship with surrounding areas. Avoiding considerations until masterplanning stage (as in Para 1.10) undermine value and purpose of this masterplanning exercise – this would be seen as a weakness within the SA.</li> </ol> <p><b>Site Context</b></p> <p>No significant above ground remains of hugely important local mining activity on SV site. Concerted efforts to readdress this omission should be expected of further development proposals.</p> <p>Para 2.4 - SOL may no longer dominate area, due to proposed building</p>	<p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b></p> <p>1. Policy EC5A of UDP Alteration number 2 establishes that the City Council will provide a broad Framework for the Stadium Park and Sheepfolds sites, setting out key development principles to be reflected in comprehensive masterplans for the site. The document is not intended to be a detailed masterplanning exercise in itself. Notwithstanding this it does consider the relationship of the Stadium Village site with the key surrounding sites as well as specific buildings/structures to which developers should have regard during the masterplanning process.</p> <p><b>Comment Noted - No Change</b></p> <p><b>Comment Noted - No Change</b></p>

			<p>overtopping it and hide it from view. Figure 3 – puzzling that only two existing buildings are shown aside from LB's. LB Grade's should be Roman Numerals.</p> <p>Para 2.7 – describes historic development axis from railway line to river. True of former residential NE-SW, but remainder of area not so obvious alignment.</p> <p>Para 2.8 visual impact of SOL on adj development must be considered. So too must operational impact.</p> <p>Para 2.9-2.11 – Hebron Church and Museum identified as 'interesting local landmarks.' Improvements in east-west connections to feature these important buildings.</p> <p>Para 2.15 – Area C split into two parts by railway line access. This helps to reinforce the historic development axis. Perverse that this access is considered of little value and could/should be dispensed with.</p> <p>Para 2.23-2.25 Urban landscaped 'denuded and fractured.' It is a challenge of the SVDF to knit the area back together in a way which brings those remaining heritage assets into full contention and use.</p> <p>Welcomes Para 2.46 which regards heritage of the area as an opportunity to provide a greater understanding of its history and to increase visitors to museum and cWHS.</p> <p>Para 2.47-2.52 (Constraints). Para 1.10, 1.11 and 2.8 all refer to need for development to have regard to its context, but this is not set out clearly as a constraint in 2.47-2.52. Neither listed river crossings identified as constraints in Figure 5.</p>	<p><b>Comment Noted – Amend</b> <b>Figure 3 - Remove reference to existing buildings and amend LB Grades to Roman numerals</b></p> <p><b>Comment noted - No Change</b> Paragraph 2.7 clearly refers to Sheepfolds only, not the remainder of the site. It is at Sheepfolds where the historic development has resulted in a strong axis from the railway to the river.</p> <p><b>Comment noted – observation</b></p> <p><b>Comment noted - observation</b></p> <p><b>Comment noted – No change</b> As the maps demonstrate (p.17), historically the railway line access road did not exist and therefore did not contribute to forming the strong pattern of the development described in paragraph 2.7. Therefore it is considered that this access could be removed.</p> <p><b>Comment noted – observation</b></p> <p><b>Comment noted</b></p> <p><b>Comment noted - Amend</b> <b>Include Listed Bridges in figure 5</b> <b>Insert new paragraph 2.52:</b> Listed Buildings: As has been established earlier in this section, a number of listed buildings and structures lie in close proximity to and within the Stadium Village Site. Proposals for new development must have regard to these listed structures and the need to respond to their presence must be central to the design process - from initial concept stages to detailed design work. Consideration will be given to the site and setting, density and scale of the proposal, its built form and use of materials. As a minimum a Heritage Statement will need to be submitted as part of all applications for development that involve the alteration of the setting of a listed building. Further information on the requirements for a Heritage Statement can be found on page 58,</p>
--	--	--	---	---

			<p><b>Vision and Objectives</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Para 3.1 – no overt statement of intent regarding high design quality and environmental protection, reliance instead on objectives.</li>   <li>2. <b>Area C</b> – Way of Light identified as being enclosed along length, ‘lined’ would be better term – enclosed and covered street would not be appropriate.</li>   <li>3. Disappointed direct access either platform of museum will only be pursued if ski slope not go ahead. Does not see why such a devt. Should preclude direct connection.</li>   <li>4. Figure 6 shows indicative solution for Area C would sever link and access from, railway to river. Fails to show planned extension to South Stand and implication for Area E contrary to Para 1.10, 1.11 and 2.8.</li>   <li>5. <b>Area F</b> – SVDF too restrictive in relation to LB. Could be converted to compatible use with adj residential. Welcomes retention of historic gangway. New development in association with LB regard to their setting in terms of scale, massing, height, design and materials.</li> </ol>	<p>paragraph 6.8.</p> <p><b>Comment Noted – No change</b> The Vision clearly aspires to the development of high quality facilities. It is considered that this aspiration sets the standard for the delivery of a high calibre of design and as this is reflected in the objectives, which promote the delivery of a range of high quality development proposals within an enhanced environment, which connects the site to the rest of the City. The need to improve the natural environment is also to be included as an objective. Notwithstanding the above, paragraphs 4.21- 4.34 provide further detail and guidance on the aspirations for high quality design, which are to be reflected in the detailed masterplans</p> <p><b>Comment noted – Amend</b> <i>Re-word final sentence paragraph 3.7bullet 6 to read:</i> Leisure commercial and residential development along the length of the Way of Light will create a sense of enclosure, with active frontages encouraged at the ground floor of the leisure and commercial development.</p> <p><b>Comment Noted – No change</b> The Final sentence in Paragraph 3.7 of the development Framework states that the opportunity to gain public or managed access to the west platform via <b>any new development</b> should be considered...’</p> <p><b>Comment Noted – No change</b> It is not considered that there is any direct linkage between the railway and the river via site C either currently or historically. The development of site c would not compromise any important linkages in this case.</p> <p>It is not the purpose of figure 6 – an indicative masterplan - to show existing planning permissions on the site. Nevertheless, the Football Club have been consulted as part of the process of developing the framework, and are satisfied that the proposals will not constrain their plans.</p> <p><b>Comment Noted – Amend</b> <i>Re-title Figure 7 – Indicative Land Use Framework</i> The text in relation to the Listed building on site F does not restrict suggested uses.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

			<p><b>Development Principle and Parameters</b></p> <p>Para 4.4 <i>viability</i> not to be confused with <i>acceptability</i> in planning terms (Area C ski slope). At recent meeting with arc raised benefits of exploring possibility of NE corner of SV comprising Area's B, A and H. See no evidence that this was followed up.</p> <p>Para 4.7 Area C could provide hotel irrespective of whether ski slope is delivered. Area C capable of accommodating wide variety of uses contributing to regeneration.</p> <p>Para 4.10 reword point 6 to 'Surviving historic buildings will be retained and refurbished to contribute to the area's sense of place.'</p> <p>Para 4.11-4.19 possibility/desirability of providing direct access from museum to SV should at least be acknowledged.</p> <p>Figure 8 – Need to be management solution (even if no design solution exists) for pedestrians travelling across new bridge from Vaux filtering through residential area to get to football ground.</p>	<p>The development Framework recognises the need for buildings to respond to their context and emphasises the need for a Heritage statement to form part of any Design and Access Statement submitted at the detailed masterplanning stage.</p> <p><b>Comment Noted – No change</b> A detailed site options analysis was undertaken to identify the most appropriate area for an indoor ski slope within the Stadium Village site. Site C was identified as being the best site in terms of both deliverability and physical impact on its surroundings.</p> <p>The options analysis included modelling of the broad scale and massing for a variety of options on site C. Of the various layouts considered the indicative layout shown in the Development Framework provides a commercially viable option with active ground floor frontages on Hay Street, which mitigates the potential impact on the listed buildings by keeping the highest part to the North.</p> <p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> The Land use-plan and Masterplan (figures 6 &amp; 7) are both Indicative and are intended to provide a broad framework setting out principles for development. Policy NA3A.2 establishes that a hotel use would be an acceptable use on the site and furthermore paragraph 3.7 recognises that Site C could accommodate a range of land uses – not just a ski slope.</p> <p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> Whilst it is recognised that there is a need to protect listed buildings in particular, this does not mean that all historic buildings on the site are of architectural value or are viable or suitable for retention and refurbishment. The assessment of buildings on site and their suitability for retention and re-use will be carried out at the detailed masterplanning stages.</p> <p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> This is acknowledged in paragraph 3.7; bullet 7</p> <p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> Whilst it is recognised that development of the site would result in the need to re-assess the policing and management of the site on matchdays, the principle of development of the site has been established in the UDP</p>
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>Para 4.19 urges utilisation of football ground car park for new leisure and sporting uses. Unclear why confined to these uses.</p> <p>Para 4.21</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Tall building design should pay due regard to CABE-English Heritage guidance (2007).</li> <li>ii.</li> <li>iii. Windows and other 'features' do not necessarily animate a street frontage. Many messages regarding permeability and legibility articulated well enough by 'By Design' by CABE and PPS1.</li> <li>iv. Facades of all buildings should be of high design standard not just those of large scale.</li> </ul> <p>Para 4.22 Area E – high density residential env called for but area earmarked for other uses besides residential.</p> <p>Para 4.22 point 4, EH fundamentally disagree with the statement that the orientation of the ski slope proposal with highest end to north 'mitigates negative impacts on the setting of the Grade II* listed Monkwearmouth Station...' (detailed comments on pre-application for ski slope to follow).</p> <p>Unclear how single storey car dealership (proposed to be retained) on Area B responds to the scale of development on Area C.</p> <p>There are numerous other issues regarding building heights How do building heights Area D relate to those at southern end of Area C. How do building heights in Area D on either side of proposed river crossing relate in townscape terms.</p>	<p>Alteration No.2 since 2007</p> <p><b>Comment noted – Amend</b> <i>Replace 'leisure and sporting developments' with 'other new developments'</i></p> <p><b>Comment Noted – Amend</b> <i>Insert reference in Appendix 1</i></p> <p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> This point is acknowledged; however the inclusion of these features in the right way together with appropriate uses, public realm and detailing can serve to animate the street. These and other aspects are covered elsewhere in the Framework.</p> <p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> This point is emphasised in bullet 1 of the same paragraph. A high standard of design is sought across all buildings</p> <p><b>Noted</b></p> <p><b>Comment noted – No Change</b> A detailed Options analysis for the Ski Slope was carried out, which included 3-D modelling of the broad scale and massing of such a development for a variety of options on site C. Of the various layouts considered the indicative layout shown in the Development Framework provides a commercially viable option with active ground floor frontages on Hay Street, which mitigates the potential impact on the listed buildings by keeping the highest part to the North.</p> <p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> Area B is identified as a suitable site for a landmark hotel as discussed in paragraph 3.6 of the development framework</p> <p><b>Comment noted – No Change</b> Building heights reflect those considered a suitable form of development. However the detailed Masterplans will be expected to demonstrate that the scale and massing</p>
--	--	--	---	---

			<p>Are building heights on Area G not overly prescriptive.</p> <p>How does development of potentially six storeys on Area F relate to the LB's within it.</p> <p>SVDF contradicts Urban Design Strategy (UDS) SPD. The UDS sets out that other than hotel (15-20 storeys) the scale and height of the rest of the devt. On SV will respond to SOL. Proposals up to 6 storeys acceptable so that SOL remains dominant. However SVDF apparent that cross river approach to SV from Central Sunderland, stadium completely hidden by development on Area's C and D.</p> <p>Not clear from SVDF how much modelling/visual analysis has taken place.</p> <p>Unsure of term 'broad domed roofline,' bullet 5 Para 4.22.</p> <p>Para 4.23 – words 'wherever possible' are unhelpful, providing no clarity where rule might be waived.</p> <p>Para 4.25 – how many landmarks does one area need? Is the Sol not already a landmark (Para. 2.4). River crossings (Para 2.9), MWSM, Hebron Church (Para. 2.11) plus Area A, G and C – total of 8., such a fixation implies a focus on individual buildings to the exclusion of wider urban design issues and consideration of how buildings and uses relate</p>	<p>of developments are suitable in relation to their surroundings.</p> <p><b>Comment Noted Amend</b> <i>Reduce suggested building height on area F to 16m; to better reflect the setting of the Listed building.</i></p> <p><b>Comment Noted – No change</b> It is considered that the Stadium of Light would remain the dominant building on the Stadium Village Site despite new development around it even if proposals exceeded 6 storeys. The Ski Slope building would step down and away from the Stadium, to a height of 14metres at the Southern end of site C. Development on site D is proposed to be 24 metres. The Stadium of Light is 37 metres in height. Therefore it not considered that the Stadium would be completely hidden when viewed from the South - rather it would retain its strong presence. Notwithstanding this, from an Urban Design perspective; the development of the land around the Stadium would - with the right design solution - result in a more complete development, stitching the Stadium into the surrounding built form of the city as opposed to the current open site with a somewhat isolated structure in the centre.</p> <p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> An indicative model of the proposed Stadium Village development has been built. In addition more detailed 3-D modelling has taken place as part of the Options Analysis for site C.</p> <p><b>Comment Noted – Amend</b> <i>Paragraph 4.22 bullet 5: Remove broad dome roofline and replace with broad roofscape</i></p> <p><b>Comment Noted – Amend</b> <i>Amend paragraph 4.23 bullet 1 to read:</i> The feasibility and viability of retaining the existing grid pattern of development in area E should be explored.</p> <p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> The identification of landmarks includes potential individual landmark buildings (for example Ski Slope) but also include those which have been selected due to their relationship with the wider urban context for example</p>
--	--	--	---	---

			<p>to each other and the built form of the city.</p> <p>Para 4.28 – Focusing on ‘Way of Light,’ will further diminish importance of North Bridge Street and harm future regeneration of this historic route – potential townscape failure.</p> <p>Para. 4.28 point 3, Para 3.4 no mention of continued use of Areas A, B and H for car parking, yet Para 4.19 calls for more intensive use of football ground car parking on non match days, 4.28 use of Area H as location for events space and potential parking. Area H on one hand space for lively events but on other to serve as car parking facility. Intentions for ‘Way of Light’ and Area H not shown on Figure 10.</p>	<p>those which may serve to enhance and support pedestrian routes through the site. Notwithstanding this, significant consideration has been given to the wider urban design and context issues elsewhere in the Framework (see page 49)</p> <p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> North Bridge Street is likely to remain as the key pedestrian and vehicle route connecting the south side of the river to northern areas such as Southwick and Roker. The Way of Light is intended to be a pedestrian route to connect the City centre with Stadium Village and its associated facilities.</p> <p><b>Comment noted – No Change</b> There are no areas of football ground parking on site A Developments on sites A and B will be subject to parking requirements contained with the UDP Alteration No. 2.</p> <p><b>Comment Noted – Amend</b> <b>Amend Paragraph 3.12 to read:</b> Parking is to be retained on this site; however this area will also double up as a new events space sitting to the east of the Stadium providing opportunity for sports and leisure based events outside the Stadium of Light</p> <p><b>Insert new Paragraph 3.13 to read:</b> Site I has an important relationship with both the Stadium and the River: As with site H, this site will serve a dual use as car parking and also an events space providing the opportunity for events outside the Stadium of Light which would benefit from the site’s elevated position overlooking the River Wear, with views to the South west of the City. The site is overlooked by the more animated façade of the Stadium and development to the south on site G should also be designed to provide an active frontage to the site.</p> <p><b>Insert New Bullet paragraph 4.28 to read:</b> A pedestrian connection focussed around a mixed use lively street known as the Way of Light will provide a direct Link between the Stadium and the Aquatic centre with the City Centre via the proposed high level pedestrian bridge crossing to Vaux</p> <p><b>Amend Figure 10. to reflect proposals for site H</b></p>
--	--	--	--	---



			<p>Para 4.33 – Important to understand just because development can be seen from (candidate) World Heritage Site, does not necessarily make unacceptable. The test is whether or not proposal impacts upon, and adversely affects, its Outstanding Universal Value. As a candidate site, yet to determine whether St Peter’s are possesses universal value.</p> <p>Para 4.34 – Landmark or otherwise buildings should present visual interest to all elevations. Take issue with extent to which massive unrelieved wall of development of ski slope proposal would provide ‘significant visual interest,’ when viewed from east. Arresting but not positive.</p> <p><b>Phasing</b> Para 5.1 indicates Area C does not require land assembly.</p> <p><b>Delivery and Implementation</b> 1. Pre-application discussion should involve statutory consultees.</p> <p><b>Appendix 1.0 Policy Context</b> 1. Draft PPS15 should be referenced to replace PPG15 and PPG16. 2. RSS also contains Policy 8 Protecting and Enhancing the Environment and Policy 32 Historic Environment, both are pertinent to SVDF. 3. North East Tourism Strategy 2005-2010 acknowledges the value of the region’s cultural heritage. Consultation update draft recently issued.</p> <p><b>Appendix 2.0 Guidance note for Indoor Ski Slope Proposals</b> 1. Para. 5.8, impacts should include those on the fabric and setting of heritage assets within or in the vicinity thereof.</p>	<p><b>Amend Figure 7 to show dual car park/events space function on sites I and H</b></p> <p><b>Comment Noted</b></p> <p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> The illustrative material is intended to be illustrative and is based on block massing drawings. The Framework does however make clear that significant work is required to ensure that all facades on large scale buildings should be designed to a high standard to lessen their impacts upon surroundings.</p> <p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> Paragraph 5.1 does not state that there are no land assembly issues. These issues are much more difficult on the areas B, D, E and F. Site C has 82% of the freehold owned by the public sector</p> <p><b>Comment Noted – Amend</b> <b>Insert new paragraph 6.12:</b> Developers should consider pre-application consultations with other relevant stakeholders such as English heritage and the Highways Agency.</p> <p><b>Comment Noted – Amend</b> <b>Update the policy context section where required</b></p> <p><b>Comment noted – No Change</b> This section refers to Sequential Testing of sites, which does not take into account issues such as the historic setting of a site (see PPS4)</p>
SV11A	English Heritage Sustainability Appraisal		<p><b>Sustainability Appraisal</b> <b>1 Non Technical Summary</b></p> <p>Appraisal Methodology – Should acknowledge the Station building is Grade</p>	<p><b>Comment Noted – Amend</b></p>

			<p>II* LB and therefore of national/international significance.</p> <p>The SA should take greater cognisance of the Council’s adopted Urban Design Strategy.</p> <p>Appraisal of Strategic Options – 3 options include ‘do nothing,’ showed few differences but preferred option many benefits, supporting sustainable development and communities. Implication is other options not supports sustainable development and communities, but other options so similar that if preferred options has these qualities then so do the others. Key negatives should but do not include possible adverse impacts on nationally important heritage assets.</p> <p><b>3 Project background</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is not clear who within the team, if anyone, is specialist in heritage matters.</li> </ol> <p><b>6 Sustainability Objectives, Baseline and Context</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sec 6.2.2 site context – Figure 6.1 is selective in its identification of heritage assets (only showing sites of archaeological importance along the river bank).</li> <li>2. Sec (viii) Cultural Heritage and Archaeology – reference here but nowhere else to brightly painted pigeon lofts in Sheepfolds. No indication of their future and possible loss is given in SA or the SVDF.</li> <li>3. Sec 6.5 – Objective 11 point 2 archaeological remains. Should be some</li> </ol>	<p>P13. Baseline Conditions and key issues amend 6<sup>th</sup> bullet point to read:  <i>“The Grade II* listed Monkwearmouth Station Museum is located just east of the site.”</i></p> <p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b>  The Sustainability Appraisal Framework makes specific reference to policy documents and not Supplementary Planning Documents. Consequently it is not considered that such reference to the Urban Design Strategy needs to be made at this point.</p> <p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b>  Section 1.3 Appraisal of Strategic Options (p.14) makes reference to a key negative effect being possible townscape and visual effects from the height of the proposed ski slope. It is not considered that possible adverse effects on nationally important heritage assets should be listed as a key negative as there are potentially key positive effects including the restoration of the Grade II listed coach house and historic gangway.</p> <p><b>Comment Noted</b>  The Mott MacDonald sustainability team have a general knowledge of environmental topics including heritage. In the original Environmental Options Appraisal for Stadium Village produced by Mott MacDonald and EDAW heritage was considered by Mott MacDonald specialists and this information has been used to inform the SA/SEA. As part of the SA/SEA a Mott MacDonald landscape architect was consulted.</p> <p><b>Comment Noted - Amend</b>  Figure 6.1 amend to include Listed Buildings.</p> <p><b>Comment Noted – Amend</b>  Development Framework (para 2.19 Area F) insert sentence to read <i>“Allotment gardens/pigeon lofts can be found to the southern boundary of the site.”</i>  Development framework (para 3.10 Area F) insert point 16. <i>“Development on site F should take account of the presence of allotment gardens/pigeon lofts on the southern boundary of the site.”</i></p> <p><b>Comment Noted – Amend</b></p>
--	--	--	---	---

			<p>measure of the archaeological remains in situ. Point 3 – adverse effects on cWHS – the test is whether or not there is impact upon the Outstanding Universal Value of a World Heritage Site, acknowledging that until such time as the bid is successful the issue of universal value has yet to be accepted.</p> <p>4. Heritage of the area has the ability to meet Objective 8 – to enhance the river Wear corridor connecting the river to the urban fabric of the city.</p> <p><b>8 Development of SPD Options</b></p> <p>1. Reference to Areas in the text identify them alphabetically, but plans refer to them numerically.</p> <p>2. Para 8.12 advise preferred option is No. 2, it does, however, look equally unlike any one of the other three options.</p> <p>3. Figure 8.5 option of ski slope in north east corner not looked at or evaluated.</p> <p><b>9 Appraisal of Strategic Options</b></p> <p>1. Para. 9.2/Table 9.1 Objective 6 short term impacts equally likely to be dependent on implementation. Individually and not just cumulatively, development schemes could have significant effects on this objective.</p> <p>2. Para 9.3/Table 9.2 English Heritage fundamentally disagrees that</p>	<p>Section 6.5.2 Table 6-4 Objective 11 Point 2 alter sentence to read <i>“Number of archaeological remains found and recorded in situ as a result of development at Stadium Village.”</i></p> <p>Section 6.5.2 Table 6-4 Objective 11 Point 3 alter sentence to read <i>“Impact on Outstanding Universal Value of a World Heritage Site, should cWHS be successful in being awarded status as WHS.”</i></p> <p><b>Comment Noted</b></p> <p><b>Comment Noted – Amend</b></p> <p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> The Council considers that the positioning of land uses set out within Figure 8-4 correspond to those set out within Figure 8-2 and as such no change is needed.</p> <p><b>Comment noted – No Change</b> Sites B&amp;H were not considered because the amount of land available was insufficient to accommodate a ski slope. In addition land ownership issues prevented these from being a realistic option. Site H was also required to be retained for car parking to satisfy planning criteria related to the Stadium</p> <p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> Short term effects are primarily those relating to construction. Although effects may be dependent on implementation, it is more likely that they would be neutral. This is because an EIA should have been carried out for the scheme dealing with detailed heritage issues and mitigation. Also best practice construction methods are likely to be employed reducing any adverse effects on heritage. Construction effects are likely to temporary.</p> <p><b>Comment Noted –No Change</b></p>
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>orientation and design will mitigate any impacts on setting of museum. One may be less harmful than the other but any building of scale and massing currently proposed would still be wholly damaging.</p> <p><b>10 SA/SEA Recommendations and Mitigation</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Welcome shift towards recognition of positive and constructive message associated with heritage-led regeneration.</li> </ol> <p><b>12 Implementing and Monitoring</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Table 12.1 – should be some measure of archaeological remains preserved whilst development proceeds.</li> <li>2. With regard to the cWHS measure should relate to effects upon what is perceived to be universal value.</li> <li>3. A further indicator might relate to the quality and quantity of interpretive material provided by developers in respect of the heritage of the area.</li> </ol> <p><b>Appendix A Review of Relevant Plans and Programmes</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Local Plans – reference to Urban Design Strategy but no commentary referring to its contention that SOL should remain dominant element and that building heights elsewhere on the site should be restricted accordingly.</li> </ol> <p><b>Appendix B Alignment Matrix – development of SA/SEA Objectives</b></p>	<p>With regards to impact on the Grade II* listed Monkwearmouth Station Museum, please see main body of the Cabinet Report.</p> <p><b>Comment Noted</b></p> <p><b>Comment Noted – Amend</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alter sentence Table 12-1 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology to read <i>“Number of archaeological remains found, recorded and preserved as a result of development at Stadium Village.”</i></li> <li>2. Alter sentence Table 12-1 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology to read <i>“Impact on Outstanding Universal Value of a World Heritage Site, should cWHS be successful in its nomination as WHS.”</i></li> <li>3. Table 12-1 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology insert new point <i>“Quality and quantity of material provided by developers in respect of the heritage of the area.”</i></li> </ol> <p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b></p> <p>It is considered that the Stadium of Light would remain the dominant building on the Stadium Village Site despite new development around it even if proposals exceeded 6 storeys. The Ski Slope building would step down and away from the Stadium, to a height of 14metres at the Southern end of site C. Development on site D is proposed to be 24 metres. The Stadium of Light is 37 metres in height. Therefore it not considered that the Stadium would be completely hidden when viewed from the South - rather it would retain its strong presence. Notwithstanding this, from an Urban Design perspective the development of the land around the Stadium would - with the right design solution - result in a more complete development, stitching the Stadium into the surrounding built form of the city as opposed to the current open site with a somewhat isolated structure in the centre.</p> <p><b>Comment Noted – Amend</b></p>
--	--	--	--	--

			Baseline and key issues for Cultural Heritage make no reference to setting of Grade II* Monkwearmouth station.	Appendix B, Development of SA/SEA Objectives Ref 11, Cultural Heritage, Baseline/Key Issues amend first sentence to read: <i>"The site contains the Grade II* listed Monkwearmouth Station Museum, Grade II listed building(coach house) and historic gangway, and is close to a World Heritage Site."</i>
SV12	Barratt Homes		<p><b>Housing Mix and density</b> Paragraph 4.5 identifies that 'any proposals for housing in this location should be fully cognisant of any up-to-date housing needs assessment'</p> <p>In considering housing densities, flats are unsuitable – family housing more appropriate for location. Need for confirmation that the housing mix and density levels will be based on today's market rather than pre-judging potential mix in a future market.</p> <p><b>Access and Movement</b> Paragraph 4.10 identifies that a new high level bridge will link pedestrian access from the Vaux site top Stadium village. Please can you confirm if funding is in place to deliver such infrastructure? Please could you also confirm that the location of the bridge has been finalised?</p>	<p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> Policy NA3A.2 of Unitary Development Plan Alteration No.2 states that housing is a required use on the site; however this is outside the timescale of the Alteration No.2 document, which covers the period to 2012. Therefore no specific housing allocation for the Stadium Village site currently exists. At this stage any proposal for housing development brought forward would be considered on its own merits and in the context of the Development Framework, surrounding development proposals and the emerging Local Development Framework for the city.</p> <p>However, it is important to be aware that the Regional Spatial Strategy sets housing targets for each local authority area including Sunderland up to 2021. Due to the large scale housing renewal programmes taking place within Sunderland which has led to high numbers of properties being demolished Sunderland is struggling to meet its targets and as such additional housing is required. The forthcoming Allocations Development Plan Document within the Local Development Framework supported by evidence from the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment will set out specific housing numbers and types for each area of the city including Stadium Village.</p> <p><b>Comment Noted</b> The high level bridge is identified as an aspiration in the Framework; however at this stage a project construction cost is yet to be determined and there is no firm funding package in place to deliver this scheme. The exact location of the bridge is yet to be finalised.</p>
SV13	Mr J E Milburn		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals.</li> <li>2. Hotel essential due to current lack of supply, not much benefit if people accommodated out of town.</li> <li>3. Car Parking.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Comment Noted</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The Development Framework provides the opportunity for one or more hotels on Stadium Village. Furthermore, Unitary Development Plan Alteration Number 2. policies NA3A.1 and NA3A.2</li> </ol>

				<p>set out that hotel uses (Use Class C1) are acceptable in principle on Stadium Village. Ultimately however, the delivery will depend upon market conditions. A recent study by Hotel Solutions recognised that there is a shortage of hotel provision within the Sunderland Central Area. Given the significance of existing facilities including the Stadium of Light and the Aquatics Centre on the site and the potential development of a large leisure use such as an indoor ski slope, together with the site's edge of centre accessible location an opportunity is provided for at least one hotel to accommodate a likely increase in demand.</p> <p>3. Please see main body of the Cabinet Report in relation to parking.</p>
SV14	Mrs M Nixon		1. Supports the proposals.	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV15	Mr & Mrs Smith		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals</li> <li>2. Would like a park with secure play facilities.</li> <li>3. Would like to see shops.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Paragraph 4.28 dictates that there is a need for high quality public realm and open space as part of the development of Stadium Village. It should be acknowledged that there is a requirement for children's play space as part of the residential environment. Future masterplans for the site will need to demonstrate how this will be delivered.</li> <li>3. The development framework encourages ancillary and specialist retail along the Way of Light in meeting the needs of the local community and supporting the specialist sporting uses on the site. Policy NA3A.2 of the Unitary Development Plan Alteration No. 2 upon which the development framework is supported sets out that shops are considered to be an acceptable use within the Sheepfolds area of Stadium Village. However, given the site's edge of centre location it is important that such facilities are small in scale and are aimed at serving the</li> </ol>

				day-to-day needs of local workers and residents, with floorspace not exceeding 250 square metres.
SV16	Mr K Appleby		1. Supports the proposals	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV17	Ms A Blackman		1. Supports the proposals	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV18	Mr M Gardiner		1. Supports the proposals	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV19	Ms I Hutchinson		1. Supports the proposals provided more car parking is provided and facilities are accessible. 2. Considers there to be too few parking spaces at Aquatic Centre.	<b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> 1. Please see main body of the Cabinet Report in relation to parking.
SV20	Ms Burdis		1. Supports the proposals 2. Parking situation needs to be addressed due to heavy congestion and illegal parking on match days in surrounding streets.	<b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> 2. Please see main body of the cabinet report in relation to parking.
SV21	Ms A Scrafton		1. Supports the proposals – regeneration needed. 2. Leisure facilities are a plus.	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV22	Mr K Warremer		1. Supports the proposals	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV23	Mr J & Mrs V Coates		1. Supports the proposals including the ski slope 2. Would also like to see a cycle track (velodrome), good skate boarding facilities and canoeing.	<b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> 2. All of the suggested proposals would be considered acceptable land uses in principle on the site. However, each proposal would need to be determined on its own merits paying due regard to existing developments on the site as and when they come forward as well as any other relevant material considerations. It is also important to note that it is not the role of the Development Framework to prescribe specific facilities for the site; but to provide parameters and principles to guide developers when preparing a masterplan for the site. Ultimately it is for the developer to determine the exact nature of the facilities to be provided.
SV24	Mr & Mrs Shaw		1. Supports the proposals 2. Parking needs to be addressed, particularly around Howard Street on match days.	<b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> 2. Please see main body of the cabinet report in relation to parking in and around residential streets on match days.
SV25	Mr Mooney		1. Supports the proposals 2. Need for additional parking possibly multi-storey 3. Not enough parking on match days, need for traffic calming to alleviate congestion.	<b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> 2. Please see main body of the Cabinet Report in relation to parking.
SV26	Mr J Tulip		1. Supports the proposals. 2. Additional parking required.	<b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> 2. Please see main body of the Cabinet Report in relation to parking.
SV27	Mr A Amin		1. Supports the proposals – will bring in job opportunities and help businesses.	<b>Comment Noted</b>

SV28	Mr T Rutherford		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals.</li> <li>2. What provisions will there be for people with disabilities - wheelchair and non-wheelchair users.</li> <li>3. Centre of excellence for the disabled would be a beacon for the region.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. All development proposals will be required to accord with current legislation in relation to the Disability Discrimination Act (2005) and any relevant future amendments. Furthermore, many applications now require the submission of a Design and Access Statement in order to accord with validation procedures, as part of this statement the developer is required to demonstrate how they have considered access for the disabled within the design of their proposal ensuring an inclusive approach.</li> <li>3. The development of a centre for excellence for the disabled would need to be considered on its own merits against the parameters for the site set out within the development framework. However, the development framework prescribes the principle of leisure and sporting land uses to be acceptable. Nevertheless, it would be for a developer/organisation to bring this proposal forward.</li> </ol>
SV29	Mr L Patrickson		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Objects to the proposals.</li> <li>2. No mention of parking for the Aquatic Centre.</li> <li>3. Too many houses and hotels, one hotel is enough.</li> <li>4. Ski slope is a good idea.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. With regards to parking see main body of the Cabinet Report.</li> <li>3. Policy NA3A.2 of Unitary Development Plan Alteration No.2 states that housing is a required use on the site; however this is outside the timescale of the Alteration No.2 document, which covers the period to 2012. Therefore no specific housing allocation for the Stadium Village site currently exists. At this stage any proposal for housing development brought forward would be considered on its own merits and in the context of the Development Framework, surrounding development proposals and the emerging Local Development Framework for the city.</li> </ol> <p>However, it is important to be aware that the Regional Spatial Strategy sets housing targets for each local authority area including Sunderland up to 2021. Due to the large scale housing renewal</p>



				<p>programmes taking place within Sunderland which has led to high numbers of properties being demolished Sunderland is struggling to meet its targets and as such additional housing is required. The forthcoming Allocations Development Plan Document within the Local Development Framework supported by evidence from the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment will set out specific housing numbers and types for each area of the city including Stadium Village.</p> <p>The Development Framework provides the opportunity for one or more hotels on Stadium Village. Furthermore, Furthermore, Unitary Development Plan Alteration Number 2. policies NA3A.1 and NA3A.2 set out that hotel uses (Use Class C1) are acceptable in principle on Stadium Village. Ultimately however, the delivery will depend upon market conditions. A recent study by Hotel Solutions recognised that there is a shortage of hotel provision within the Sunderland Central Area. Given the significance of existing facilities including the Stadium of Light and the Aquatics Centre on the site and the potential development of a large leisure use such as an indoor ski slope, together with the site's edge of centre accessible location an opportunity is provided for at least one hotel to accommodate a likely increase in demand.</p>
SV30	Mr J Taylor		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Objects to the proposals.</li> <li>2. Nobody wants to come when football match is on - need parking for Aquatic Centre.</li> <li>3. Lack of facilities for food and drink.</li> <li>4. Good idea, wrong location.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. With regards to parking please see main body of the Cabinet Report.</li> <li>3. Policy NA3A.1 of the Unitary Development Plan Alteration No. 2 provides for the future development of food and drink uses (Use Classes A3 and A4) within Stadium Park. In addition policy NA3A.2 prescribes that such facilities will be determined on their own merits having regard to other policies of the Unitary Development Plan. The development framework envisages that the Way of Light will be enclosed along its</li> </ol>

				length with active leisure and commercial developments along its ground floor frontage.
SV31	Mr D Harcus		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals - important to continue developing area so stadium and Aquatic Centre are not isolated developments.</li> <li>2. Indoor ski slope good idea.</li> </ol>	<b>Comment Noted – No Change</b>
SV32	Mr Dixon		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals</li> <li>2. Ski slope may be under-used but still good idea.</li> <li>3. Would like a sauna/steam room.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Comment Noted - No Change</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The success of the ski slope will depend on market factors. However, it is important to acknowledge the scale of the facility with no other provision within the region. Consequently it is anticipated that visitors will be drawn in from far beyond the boundaries of the city, increasing the number of tourists attracted to Sunderland. Research has been carried out and it has become apparent that significant demand for such facility exists within the region. Notwithstanding this, the profitability of a ski slope is a business decision to be made by the developer and is outside of the scope of the development framework.</li> <li>3. Sauna/steam room facilities could be potentially accommodated within a large indoor leisure facility, which is consistent with the parameters set out for uses on sites A and C of Stadium Village. However it is for a developer to determine the different uses that may be included within an indoor leisure facility. The purpose of the Development Framework is to provide a guide on development principles and parameters to be taken into account when preparing a detailed masterplan for the site.</li> </ol>
SV33	Ms L Mowbray		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals – would attract visitors.</li> <li>2. Supports indoor real snow ski slope will put Sunderland on map.</li> </ol>	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV34	Mr S Maddison		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals.</li> </ol>	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV35	Mr I Rayner		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals.</li> <li>2. More parking required particularly match days.</li> <li>3. Do not charge so much for the swimming club to have galas at the Aquatic Centre.</li> <li>4. More events to promote facilities to people outside the area.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Comment Noted - No Change</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. With regards to match day parking see main body of the Cabinet Report.</li> <li>3. In connection with the cost of facilities including holding galas at the Aquatic Centre it should be noted that this is a management issue and not a planning consideration and as such is outside of the</li> </ol>

				<p>remit of the development framework.</p> <p>4. The Development Framework envisages site H becoming an events space to the east of the Stadium of Light, providing the opportunity for improved large scale sports and leisure events taking place. However, it is not for the development framework to prescribe the exact nature of such events.</p>
SV36	Mr C Bradford		1. Supports the proposals.	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV37	Ms H Clemson		1. Supports the proposals.	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV38	Mr M Pounder		1. Supports the proposals.	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV39	Mr N Hutchinson		1. Supports the proposals.	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV40	Ms S Mulinda		1. Supports the proposals.	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV41	Mr S Bonallie		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals.</li> <li>2. Real snow indoor ski slope will be a big advantage for the people of Sunderland and beyond.</li> <li>3. Offices, hotels and homes will kick-start regeneration.</li> <li>4. Sheepfolds need to be developed as soon as possible as it currently blights the area.</li> <li>5. Need for multi-storey car park to improve parking situation in residential streets and around the area.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b></p> <p>5. With regards to parking please see main body of the Cabinet Report.</p>
SV42	Mrs C Swinburne		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals</li> <li>2. Ski slope good idea - would like to see an ice rink.</li> <li>3. No need for additional offices.</li> <li>4. Is there a need for housing in this area.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. An ice rink would be considered an acceptable use on the site in principle. However it is not the role of the Development Framework to prescribe specific facilities for the site; but to provide parameters and principles to guide developers when preparing a masterplan for the site. Ultimately it is for the developer to determine the exact nature of the facilities to be provided.</li> <li>3. The development of a Prosperous city forms one of the four strategic priorities outlined in the Sunderland Strategy. The development of new high quality office space within Central Sunderland will assist in achieving this aim.</li> </ol> <p>The comprehensive redevelopment of Stadium Village (the Sheepfolds and Stadium Park sites) is considered a crucial part of the City Council's and Sunderland arc's vision for the regeneration of</p>

				<p>Sunderland.</p> <p>The vision for the site is to create a high quality 'mixed-use' village and it is envisaged that small-scale office space would form part of this mixed-use development on the Sheepfolds site to the south of Stadium Park.</p> <p>In this respect policy NA3A.2 of Unitary Development Plan Alteration No.2 states that offices are a required use on the Sheepfolds site as part of the mixed use approach to development. The development framework for Stadium Village must respond to the requirements of this overarching policy context and accordingly proposes office space to meet the needs of small/medium sized firms, which would support and complement office development proposed elsewhere in the City Centre - notably The Vaux and Farringdon Row.</p> <p>Despite the policy requirement for office uses at Sheepfolds, the development of offices at the site will nevertheless need to be given careful consideration in order that it does not unduly affect the prospect of securing the development of the City Centre office market.</p> <p>Office development is defined as a 'Town-centre' use and current planning guidance requires that wherever possible such uses be located in existing centres. The areas of the Sheepfolds site identified for office uses (sites E and D on the indicative masterplan) are considered 'edge of centre'. In accordance with National Planning Policy Statement 4 and Alteration No. 2 policies S2A and NA3A.2, proposals for town-centre uses not in a centre (such as Sheepfolds) are required to be subject to a sequential test. The sequential test will be required for any office development at Sheepfolds of over 2500sqm and would be necessary to demonstrate that:</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Sites have been assessed for their availability suitability and viability</li><li>- All in-centre site options have been thoroughly assessed before less central sites are considered</li><li>- Sites on the edge of centres will be of an appropriate scale and format</li></ul> <p>In addition any proposal for office uses at Sheepfolds would need to be assessed against the impact on the existing centres in terms of the impact on investment in the existing centre, the impact on the existing town centre viability and vitality and the potential impact of the scale of the proposed development.</p> <p>It is worth noting that should no suitable in-centre sites be found, PPS4 identifies edge-of-centre locations which are well-connected to the centre as being the next alternative choice. It is considered that the Sheepfolds site – as an edge of centre site with good public transport and road links to the centre - would be considered the next best alternative location for office uses.</p> <p>4. Policy NA3A.2 of Unitary Development Plan Alteration No.2 states that housing is a required use on the site; however this is outside the timescale of the Alteration No.2 document, which covers the period to 2012. Therefore no specific housing allocation for the Stadium Village site currently exists. At this stage any proposal for housing development brought forward would be considered on its own merits and in the context of the Development Framework, surrounding development proposals and the emerging Local Development Framework for the city.</p> <p>However, it is important to be aware that the Regional Spatial Strategy sets housing targets for each local authority area including Sunderland up to 2021. Due to the large scale housing renewal</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				programmes taking place within Sunderland which has led to high numbers of properties being demolished Sunderland is struggling to meet its targets and as such additional housing is required. The forthcoming Allocations Development Plan Document within the Local Development Framework supported by evidence from the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment will set out specific housing numbers and types for each area of the city including Stadium Village.
SV43	Ms J Pollard		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals</li> <li>2. Car parking is an issue including match day conflict between football club and Aquatic Centre.</li> <li>3. Will extra parking be provided or is it intended to accommodate within city centre via footbridge.</li> <li>4. Need realistic and balanced approach between environment and visitors in relation to parking especially those travelling over a larger distance.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. With regards to parking please see main body of the Cabinet Report.</li> </ol>
SV44	Ms Y Moore		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals.</li> <li>2. Parking is an issue especially on residential streets near Stadium of Light.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. See main body of Cabinet Report in relation to match day parking on residential streets.</li> </ol>
SV45	Mr R Hutchinson		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals.</li> <li>2. Vaux site needs attention.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The Vaux site falls outside of the boundary of Stadium Village and as such it is not the purpose of the Development Framework to cover regeneration visions and objectives for the Vaux site.</li> </ol>
SV46	Mr P White		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals.</li> <li>2. Try to avoid bleak corners or areas which often appear with a large collection of buildings.</li> <li>3. Avoid wind tunnels created by exposed passageways.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b></p> <p>2&amp;3 Good design is considered to be essential at all stages of the development. Section 4 of the Stadium Village Development Framework concerns design principles that are expected of developers. These principles will need to be further detailed through the respective masterplan for each site. In addition with regards to the proposed indoor ski slope, a detailed design code has been prepared. Developers interested in building a ski slope will need to demonstrate how they have accorded with this guidance. The ability to meet the set criteria will influence the council's determination of the preferred developer.</p>
SV47	Ms M Donnelly		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals.</li> <li>2. Clean and repair surrounding areas up to a better standard as well.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Whilst the Development Framework can</li> </ol>

				only directly influence development proposals within the boundaries of Stadium Village, it aspires to have knock on benefits in indirectly driving forward regeneration of adjacent areas.
SV48	Mr J Williams		1. Supports the proposals.	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV49	Ms Harker		1. Supports the proposals. 2. Cafes and food outlets are required for users of this facility.	<b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> 2. Policy NA3A.1 of the Unitary Development Plan Alteration No. 2 provides for the future development of food and drink uses (Use Classes A3 and A4) within Stadium Park. In addition policy NA3A.2 prescribes that such facilities will be determined on their own merits having regard to other policies of the Unitary Development Plan. The development framework envisages that the Way of Light will be enclosed along its length with active leisure and commercial developments along its ground floor frontage.
SV50	Ms H Limon		1. Supports the proposals.	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV51	Ms J Galley		1. Supports the proposals provided an ice rink is also included as it will add to the ski centre and one is needed to replace the Crowtree.	<b>Comment Noted</b> 1. An ice rink would be considered an acceptable use on the site in principle. However it is not the role of the Development Framework to prescribe specific facilities for the site; but to provide parameters and principles to guide developers when preparing a masterplan for the site. Ultimately it is for the developer to determine the exact nature of the facilities to be provided.
SV52	Mr A Stephenson		1. Supports the proposals. 2. Why the 15 year plan, why not 5 years after all Tesco do not own the land. People want to see bricks and mortar. 3. Arc's failure to deliver.	<b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> 2. The regeneration of complex large-scale Brownfield regeneration sites inevitably have long lead-in times especially where site assembly is required, feasibility work, site remediation as well as securing necessary statutory permissions. There are a variety of landowners at Stadium Village and negotiation is ongoing with these parties to secure the land necessary to deliver the projects and therefore it is not easy to predict how long it will take to complete all of the pre-development activities. However the current project programme anticipates that the first stages

				of development may start on site in 2013
SV53	Ms A Hills		1. Supports the proposals.	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV54	Ms B Snowdon		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals.</li> <li>2. Car parking and access needs to be considered (currently a nightmare for swimmers on match days).</li> <li>3. Sunderland is well overdue for an ice rink, this is more important than a ski slope, however both would be fantastic.</li> <li>4. Help children keep occupied at a 'lower cost' should help to reduce children 'on the street.'</li> </ol>	<b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. With regards to parking please see main body of the Cabinet Report.</li> <li>3. An ice rink would be considered an acceptable use on the site in principle. However it is not the role of the Development Framework to prescribe specific facilities for the site; but to provide parameters and principles to guide developers when preparing a masterplan for the site. Ultimately it is for the developer to determine the exact nature of the facilities to be provided.</li> <li>4. It is not the purpose of the Development Framework to set out the affordability of facilities at the site. Whilst it is the aspiration that facilities will be accessible for all, the framework does not have the ability to control the price of facilities.</li> </ol>
SV55	Mrs Welsh		1. Supports the proposals – it is good for Sunderland and the north east.	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV56	Mrs S Taylor		1. Supports the proposals – it will benefit the community.	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV57	Mr & Mrs Waschniewski		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals – bring people into Sunderland, bring revenue to the area.</li> <li>2. Problem with parking outside house (Ross Street SR5).</li> </ol>	<b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. With regards to parking please see response to main body of the Cabinet Report.</li> </ol>
SV58	Mr Moore		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Objects to the proposals.</li> <li>2. The events space should be a car park for the Aquatic Centre, the walk from the present car park is too far especially in bad weather.</li> </ol>	<b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. With regards to parking please see main body of the Cabinet Report.</li> </ol>
SV59	Mr Summers		1. Supports the proposals it will ensure and bring the World Cup to Sunderland and make the River Wear a better place to visit.	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV60	Mrs A Bowden		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals – good for the city.</li> <li>2. Sunderland needs to offer more to people so it can be put on the map.</li> <li>3. Hopes that facilities won't be overpriced and unaffordable.</li> </ol>	<b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. It is not the purpose of the Development Framework to set out the affordability of facilities at the site. Whilst it is the aspiration that facilities will be accessible for all, the framework does not have the ability to control the price of facilities.</li> </ol>
SV61	Ms S Younger		1. Supports the proposals – it will bring pleasure to the people of Sunderland.	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV62	J Blandford		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Objects to the proposals.</li> <li>2. Not enough parking especially on match days.</li> </ol>	<b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. With regards to parking please see main body of the Cabinet Report.</li> </ol>
SV63	Mrs D Lawson		1. Supports the proposals.	<b>Comment Noted – No Change</b>



			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Hopes there is access to parking, problems with matchday traffic on residential streets.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. With regards to parking please see main body of the Cabinet Report.</li> </ol>
SV64	Mrs A Tyson		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals.</li> <li>2. There are other priorities i.e. Vaux, city centre.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Other sites such as the Vaux fall outside of the boundary of Stadium Village and as such it is not the purpose of the Development Framework to cover regeneration visions and objectives for other priority areas.</li> </ol>
SV65	Mrs B Hope		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals will bring jobs to the city and put Sunderland on the map.</li> <li>2. Worried about rubbish left from people visiting the area as is the case with the football.</li> <li>3. Parking is an issue.</li> <li>4. Wheatsheaf area needs to be cleaned up and empty shops done something with.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. It is recognised that the management of litter can have a significant impact upon the success of regeneration schemes, as such as part of the public realm it will be necessary to implement measures which aid in minimising the level of rubbish. However, it is the role of the masterplan for each site to set this out in detail rather than the overarching development framework.</li> <li>3. With regards to parking see main body of the Cabinet report.</li> <li>4. The purpose of the Development Framework is to provide planning and design principles for the Stadium Village site only. It is not intended to provide a regeneration strategy for the wider area. Any improvements to the area around the Wheatsheaf junction fall outside of the remit of the Development Framework.</li> </ol> <p>Notwithstanding this, it is envisaged that new development at Stadium Village will enhance the surrounding area and have a regenerative effect on surrounding streets.</p>
SV66	Mr A Brack		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals – will modernise the area and create jobs and facilities for the people of Sunderland.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Comment Noted</b></p>
SV67	Ms R Hull		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals – attract people from other cities to Sunderland.</li> <li>2. Ski slope is a good idea.</li> <li>3. Would like to see an ice rink – would be in popular demand.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. An ice rink would be considered an acceptable use on the site in principle. However it is not the role of the Development Framework to prescribe specific facilities for the site; but to provide parameters and principles to guide</li> </ol>

				<p>developers when preparing a masterplan for the site. Ultimately it is for the developer to determine the exact nature of the facilities to be provided.</p>
SV68	Mr T Cavanagh		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Objects to the proposals.</li> <li>2. Multi-storey car park wanted on site first.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. With regards to parking please see main body of the Cabinet Report.</li> </ol>
SV69	S Burdess		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals.</li> <li>2. Parking is a huge problem – Aquatic Centre, match days, concerts.</li> <li>3. People come from all over county for swimming so public transport not an option.</li> <li>4. Office buildings are not needed in this area.</li> <li>5. Shops, bars, bistros, coffee shops, restaurants and hotels should be main priority.</li> <li>6. More 4 star hotels needed in Sunderland would bring more tourism, Sunderland only city in north east with no inner city hotels currently lose out to Durham and Newcastle.</li> <li>7. The Coach House would make a fantastic small hotel and restaurant.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Comment Noted</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. &amp; 3. With Regards to parking please see main body of the Cabinet Report.</li> <li>4. The development of a Prosperous city forms one of the four strategic priorities outlined in the Sunderland Strategy. The development of new high quality office space within Central Sunderland will assist in achieving this aim.</li> </ol> <p>The comprehensive redevelopment of Stadium Village (the Sheepfolds and Stadium Park sites) is considered a crucial part of the City Council's and Sunderland arc's vision for the regeneration of Sunderland.</p> <p>The vision for the site is to create a high quality 'mixed-use' village and it is envisaged that small-scale office space would form part of this mixed-use development on the Sheepfolds site to the south of Stadium Park.</p> <p>In this respect policy NA3A.2 of Unitary Development Plan Alteration No.2 states that offices are a required use on the Sheepfolds site as part of the mixed use approach to development. The development framework for Stadium Village must respond to the requirements of this overarching policy context and accordingly proposes office space to meet the needs of small/medium sized firms, which would support and complement office development proposed elsewhere in the City Centre - notably The Vaux and Farringdon Row.</p> <p>Despite the policy requirement for office</p>

				<p>uses at Sheepfolds, the development of offices at the site will nevertheless need to be given careful consideration in order that it does not unduly affect the prospect of securing the development of the City Centre office market.</p> <p>Office development is defined as a 'Town-centre' use and current planning guidance requires that wherever possible such uses be located in existing centres. The areas of the Sheepfolds site identified for office uses (sites E and D on the indicative masterplan) are considered 'edge of centre'. In accordance with National Planning Policy Statement 4 and Alteration No. 2 policies S2A and NA3A.2, proposals for town-centre uses not in a centre (such as Sheepfolds) are required to be subject to a sequential test. The sequential test will be required for any office development at Sheepfolds of over 2500sqm and would be necessary to demonstrate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sites have been assessed for their availability suitability and viability</li> <li>- All in-centre site options have been thoroughly assessed before less central sites are considered</li> <li>- Sites on the edge of centres will be of an appropriate scale and format</li> </ul> <p>In addition any proposal for office uses at Sheepfolds would need to be assessed against the impact on the existing centres in terms of the impact on investment in the existing centre, the impact on the existing town centre viability and vitality and the potential impact of the scale of the proposed development.</p> <p>It is worth noting that should no suitable in-centre sites be found, PPS4 identifies edge-of-centre locations which are well-connected to the centre as being the next alternative choice. It is considered that the Sheepfolds site – as an edge of centre site with good public transport and road links to</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>the centre - would be considered the next best alternative location for office uses.</p> <p>5. Small-scale ancillary retail units, bars, bistros, coffee shops, restaurants and hotels would be considered acceptable uses on the site as part of a mixed use development and this is reflected in planning policy for the site. However it is not the role of the Development Framework to prescribe specific facilities for the site; but to provide parameters and principles to guide developers when preparing a masterplan for the site. Ultimately it is for the developer to determine the exact mix and nature of the uses to be provided.</p> <p>6. The Development Framework provides the opportunity for one or more hotels on Stadium Village. Furthermore, Furthermore, Unitary Development Plan Alteration Number 2. policies NA3A.1 and NA3A.2 set out that hotel uses (Use Class C1) are acceptable in principle on Stadium Village. Ultimately however, the delivery will depend upon market conditions. A recent study by Hotel Solutions recognised that there is a shortage of hotel provision within the Sunderland Central Area. Given the significance of existing facilities including the Stadium of Light and the Aquatics Centre on the site and the potential development of a large leisure use such as an indoor ski slope, together with the site's edge of centre accessible location an opportunity is provided for at least one hotel to accommodate a likely increase in demand.</p> <p>7. The Development framework establishes the need to restore the Listed coach House as part of the redevelopment of the site. The development of this as a restaurant or hotel would be considered acceptable in principle; however ultimately this would be for a developer to determine the proposed use for the building in the context of the framework, planning policy and commercial</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				viability.
SV70	Ms S Hewitt		1. Supports the proposals – Stadium of Light and Aquatic Centre are a good foundation to start a Stadium Village – a fitting monument to Wearmouth.	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV71	Mrs S Eden		1. Supports the proposals – create new jobs, good for the area, not leave site derelict.	<b>Comment Noted</b>
Sv72	Mr K McBride		1. Supports the proposals – will improve an eyesore.	
Sv73	Mr A R Wilkinson		1. Supports the proposals. 2. Is it a good idea to build housing on site when surrounding streets suffer parking problems when football matches are taking place. 3. Problem with supporters coaches parked on residential streets (40 coaches on Aston Villa match)	<b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> 2. Any residential development on the site will be required to provide 1 off street parking space per unit in accordance with planning policy. Furthermore, whilst it is acknowledged that there will be high demand to park on streets within the Stadium Village site on match days, it is considered that this will need to be managed sustainably through encouraging greater use of public transport and a comprehensive approach to match day parking. 3. With regards to matchday parking please see main body of the Cabinet Report.
Sv74	Mr G Dorward		1. Objects to the proposals. 2. No development until parking is sorted out in relation to Stadium of Light match days parking on residential streets.	<b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> 2. See main body of the cabinet report in relation to parking.
Sv75	Mr D Ellis		1. Objects to the proposals – no reasons given.	<b>Comment Noted</b>
Sv76	Mr L Copeland		1. Supports the proposals – good for the city, bring money in, 2. Get schools involved.	<b>Comment Noted</b>
Sv77	Mr G Binns		1. Objects to the proposals – Just hope its better for the future	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV78	Mr P Garside		1. Supports the proposals.	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV79	Mr S Walker		1. Supports the proposals. 2. Indoor ski slope great idea – put Sunderland on the map. 3. Hotel of real quality is necessary. 4. Events area would allow range of performances.	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV80	Mr K Hockridge		1. Supports the proposals- good for Sunderland, bring work in.	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV81	Mr O Garside		1. Objects to the proposals – what good will it do for our future?	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV82	Ms S Binns		1. Objects to the proposals – hopes its better than the others.	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV83	Mr A Binns		1. Objects to the proposals – hopes its better than the other baths.	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV84	Jade		1. Supports the proposals.	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV85	Ms D Turner		1. Supports the proposals – will bring employment and improve families. 2. Better public transport should be provided from the coalfield areas as the buses from Hetton & Houghton mainly stop at Park Lane.	<b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> 2. Accessibility by public transport is considered paramount as part of the development of Stadium Village as set out

				within the framework. Consequently, in line with policy T2A of the Unitary Development Plan Alteration Number 2, Transport Assessments should accompany all planning applications on the site, illustrating accessibility by all modes of transport, and provide details of measures to improve accessibility by public transport, walking and cycling.
Sv86	Mr N Gibson		1. Supports the proposals - Sunderland should have something instead of everything in the north east going to Newcastle.	<b>Comment Noted</b>
Sv87	Ms T Nichols		1. Supports the proposals – promote Sunderland, good tourist attraction.	<b>Comment Noted</b>
Sv88	Ms A Connelly		1. Supports the proposals – need to develop Sunderland more, will bring city forward.	<b>Comment Noted</b>
Sv89	Ms V Raine		1. Supports the proposals. 2. Parking may be a problem – will there be certain areas the customers will be able to park in or will they be forced to park in residential streets i.e. match days.	<b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> 2. With regards to parking please see the main body of the Cabinet Report.
Sv90	Ms S Bhoneli		1. Supports the proposals. 2. More hotels and ski slope with other leisure facilities will increase tourism and jobs. 3. Better and safer parking needed for Aquatic centre, was recently attacked on way back to car on dark night.	<b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> 3. Paragraph 4.26 of the framework sets out security measures for developments within Stadium Village, including the use of natural surveillance and a high quality lighting strategy. External lighting should be designed as an integral part of the public realm with key sporting and leisure uses, including the stadium, having specific lighting strategies that enhance the vitality of the building and space.
Sv91	Ms B Clark		1. Supports the proposals. 2. More for locals and youth of tomorrow. 3. Focus on training.	<b>Comment Noted - No Change</b> 3. Educational facilities form part of the vision for the regeneration of the Stadium Village. Section 4.8 indicates that the site is well positioned to accommodate further or adult educational facilities, which will complement the mix in uses on Stadium Village. Sites A, E and G have been identified as suitable sites, providing activity at key nodes.
Sv92	Mr G Smith		1. Supports the proposals – modernising a derelict area with sports sv93buildings.	<b>Comment Noted</b>
Sv94	Ms S Carlton		1. Supports the proposals, the development will enable local access to a wide range of facilities. 2. Hopes plans for ski slope are approved – no longer have to travel to Leeds for this type of facility, can't happen soon enough.	<b>Comment Noted</b>
Sv95	Mrs J Ross		1. Supports the proposals.	<b>Comment Noted</b>

Sv96	R Smith		1. More disabled parking would make visits easier.	<b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> 1. See main body of the Cabinet Report in relation to parking.
Sv97	Ms C Ball		1. Supports the proposals. 2. Other cities in the region more willing to invest in the future. Sunderland needs this development to bring it into the 21 <sup>st</sup> century.	<b>Comment Noted</b>
Sv98	P McArdle		1. Supports the proposals – exciting, just what the area needs.	<b>Comment Noted</b>
Sv99	Mr I Laws		1. Supports the proposals. 2. Hopes they become more than an impressive model.	<b>Comment Noted</b>
Sv100	No name supplied		1. These plans are useless without road access in and out. 2. A footbridge will not substitute a road bridge.	<b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> 1. Access and egress from Stadium Village for private car exists at Sheepfolds North, Millennium Way and Stadium Way. Furthermore as part of the regeneration of the area, a new signalised junction will replace the existing roundabout creating a new gateway into the site. 2. As part of the Sunderland Strategic Transport Corridor, a planning application for a new bridge across the River Wear between Claxheugh Rock and Wessington Way has been submitted for planning approval. Given the site's immediate proximity to the Wearmouth Bridge, it is considered unnecessary for a further road bridge to be constructed linking Stadium Village to the south bank of the River Wear. Nevertheless, the need for a pedestrian bridge has been identified in the city Council's Central Area Urban Design Strategy and is considered an important part of a safe, wide pedestrian and cycle link between key sites in the city centre and the Stadium of Light.
Sv101	Mr A Jameson		1. Objects to the proposals. 2. Some good ideas but not addressing the current parking issues with the Aquatic Centre, it will get worse.	<b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> 2. With regards to parking please see main body of the Cabinet Report.
Sv102	Mr N Thompson		1. Supports the proposals. 2. Indoor ski slope would be great facility and fills gap between Manchester/Leeds slopes and one in Glasgow.	<b>Comment Noted – No Change</b>
Sv103	Miss N Leers		1. Supports the proposals - good idea to improve area. 2. Parking facilities need to be a priority as there are problems in the area now.	<b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> 2. With regards to parking please see main body of the Cabinet Report.
Sv104	Mr S Bowers		1. Supports the proposals. 2. The proposals would enhance this part of the city significantly. 3. The area needs quality architecture to compete with other cities and bring business in.	<b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> 3. Chapter 4 of the Stadium Village Development Framework recognises the importance of high quality design across

			4. Use Sunderland based architects to keep work in the city.	<p>the site and sets out general principles and standards to be expected of developers bringing forward proposals. In addition with regards to the proposed indoor ski slope, a detailed design code has been prepared. Developers interested in building a ski slope will need to demonstrate how they have accorded with this guidance. The ability to meet the set criteria will influence the council's determination of the preferred developer.</p> <p>4. The Local Authority does not have control over private sector developers in their choice of architects. Any public sector funded projects where architects are required as part of the development will be subject to regulations set out within Sunderland City Council Procurement Strategy 2009-2012.</p>
Sv105	Ms R Anderson		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals – will attract good jobs and development.</li> <li>2. Questions the allocation of housing in the scheme, is this conducive to holding large events in and around stadium.</li> <li>3. Better to devote more of development to industrial space.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policy NA3A.2 of Unitary Development Plan Alteration No.2 states that housing is a required use on the site; however this is outside the timescale of the Alteration No.2 document, which covers the period to 2012. Therefore no specific housing allocation for the Stadium Village site currently exists. At this stage any proposal for housing development brought forward would be considered on its own merits and in the context of the Development Framework, surrounding development proposals and the emerging Local Development Framework for the city.</li> </ol> <p>However, it is important to be aware that the Regional Spatial Strategy sets housing targets for each local authority area including Sunderland up to 2021. Due to the large scale housing renewal programmes taking place within Sunderland which has led to high numbers of properties being demolished Sunderland is struggling to meet its targets and as such additional housing is required. The forthcoming Allocations Development Plan Document within the Local Development</p>



				<p>Framework supported by evidence from the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment will set out specific housing numbers and types for each area of the city including Stadium Village.</p> <p>It is important to be aware that when considering proposals for housing issues such as noise and visual disturbance will be taken into consideration in the determination of any future application.</p> <p>2. Use classes B2 (General Industry) and B8 (Storage and distribution) are not considered to be compatible with the regeneration objectives of Stadium Village as an area for mixed leisure use and as such have been classed as unacceptable uses within policies NA3A.1 and NA3A.2 of the Unitary Development Plan Alteration Number 2.</p> <p>However, in line with Policy NA3A.2 and supported by guidance within the development framework, Sunderland arc in partnership with the council will support a phased relocation of the scrap yards and other nonconforming uses to improved facilities elsewhere within the city in order to achieve the comprehensive redevelopment of Stadium Village.</p>
Sv106	Mr T Seymour		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals.</li> <li>2. Proposed Core Strategy development so far seems quite logical and feasible although complex.</li> </ol>	<b>Comment Noted</b>
Sv107	Bill Etherington MP		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Content noted – no comments.</li> </ol>	<b>Comment Noted</b>
Sv108	No Name Supplied		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals – although doubts their delivery.</li> <li>2. Would like to see indoor tennis courts.</li> <li>3. Misses the ice rink at Crowtree.</li> <li>4. No need for hotel – Seaburn/ town centre not full.</li> <li>5. Cannot see proposals B, D, E and F coming off in his/her lifetime.</li> <li>6. Sunderland will never develop market driven forces.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b></p> <p>2+3. An indoor tennis courts and ice rink would be acceptable land uses in principle and would contribute to the vision of the site as a high quality sports led mixed use area. However it is not the role of the Development Framework to prescribe specific facilities for the site; but to provide parameters and principles to guide developers when preparing a masterplan for the site. Should a developer come forward it is for them to determine the exact nature of the facilities proposed.</p>

				<p>4. The Development Framework provides the opportunity for one or more hotels on Stadium Village. Furthermore, Furthermore, Unitary Development Plan Alteration Number 2. policies NA3A.1 and NA3A.2 set out that hotel uses (Use Class C1) are acceptable in principle on Stadium Village. Ultimately however, the delivery will depend upon market conditions. A recent study by Hotel Solutions recognised that there is a shortage of hotel provision within the Sunderland Central Area. Given the significance of existing facilities including the Stadium of Light and the Aquatics Centre on the site and the potential development of a large leisure use such as an indoor ski slope, together with the site's edge of centre accessible location an opportunity is provided for at least one hotel to accommodate a likely increase in demand.</p> <p>6. The regeneration of complex large-scale Brownfield regeneration sites inevitably have long lead-in times especially where site assembly is required, feasibility work, site remediation as well as securing necessary statutory permissions. There are a variety of landowners at Stadium Village and negotiation is ongoing with these parties to secure the land necessary to deliver the projects and therefore it is not easy to predict how long it will take to complete all of the pre-development activities. In spite of current market conditions there has been significant interest shown by developers in constructing an indoor ski slope at Stadium Village, which has been identified as a development priority. The current project programme anticipates that the first stages of development may start on site in 2013</p>
Sv109	Mr G Burnett		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support the proposals – city currently lacks these kind of sports facilities.</li> <li>2. Why are housing and offices needed?</li> <li>3. Is parking sufficient if all sports facilities occupied at once.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. <u>Housing</u> Policy NA3A.2 of Unitary Development Plan Alteration No.2 states that housing is a</li> </ol>

				<p>required use on the site; however this is outside the timescale of the Alteration No.2 document, which covers the period to 2012. Therefore no specific housing allocation for the Stadium Village site currently exists. At this stage any proposal for housing development brought forward would be considered on its own merits and in the context of the Development Framework, surrounding development proposals and the emerging Local Development Framework for the city.</p> <p>However, it is important to be aware that the Regional Spatial Strategy sets housing targets for each local authority area including Sunderland up to 2021. Due to the large scale housing renewal programmes taking place within Sunderland which has led to high numbers of properties being demolished Sunderland is struggling to meet its targets and as such additional housing is required. The forthcoming Allocations Development Plan Document within the Local Development Framework supported by evidence from the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment will set out specific housing numbers and types for each area of the city including Stadium Village.</p> <p>When considering proposals for housing issues such as noise and visual disturbance will be taken into consideration in the determination of any future planning applications.</p> <p>2. <u>Offices</u> The development of a Prosperous city forms one of the four strategic priorities outlined in the Sunderland Strategy. The development of new high quality office space within Central Sunderland will assist in achieving this aim.</p> <p>The comprehensive redevelopment of Stadium Village (the Sheepfolds and Stadium Park sites) is considered a crucial</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>part of the City Council's and Sunderland arc's vision for the regeneration of Sunderland.</p> <p>The vision for the site is to create a high quality 'mixed-use' village and it is envisaged that small-scale office space would form part of this mixed-use development on the Sheepfolds site to the south of Stadium Park.</p> <p>In this respect policy NA3A.2 of Unitary Development Plan Alteration No.2 states that offices are a required use on the Sheepfolds site as part of the mixed use approach to development. The development framework for Stadium Village must respond to the requirements of this overarching policy context and accordingly proposes office space to meet the needs of small/medium sized firms, which would support and complement office development proposed elsewhere in the City Centre - notably The Vaux and Farringdon Row.</p> <p>Despite the policy requirement for office uses at Sheepfolds, the development of offices at the site will nevertheless need to be given careful consideration in order that it does not unduly affect the prospect of securing the development of the City Centre office market.</p> <p>Office development is defined as a 'Town-centre' use and current planning guidance requires that wherever possible such uses be located in existing centres. The areas of the Sheepfolds site identified for office uses (sites E and D on the indicative masterplan) are considered 'edge of centre'. In accordance with National Planning Policy Statement 4 and Alteration No. 2 policies S2A and NA3A.2, proposals for town-centre uses not in a centre (such as Sheepfolds) are required to be subject to a sequential test. The sequential test will be required for any office development at Sheepfolds of</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>over 2500sqm and would be necessary to demonstrate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sites have been assessed for their availability suitability and viability</li> <li>- All in-centre site options have been thoroughly assessed before less central sites are considered</li> <li>- Sites on the edge of centres will be of an appropriate scale and format</li> </ul> <p>In addition any proposal for office uses at Sheepfolds would need to be assessed against the impact on the existing centres in terms of the impact on investment in the existing centre, the impact on the existing town centre viability and vitality and the potential impact of the scale of the proposed development.</p> <p>It is worth noting that should no suitable in-centre sites be found, PPS4 identifies edge-of-centre locations which are well-connected to the centre as being the next alternative choice. It is considered that the Sheepfolds site – as an edge of centre site with good public transport and road links to the centre - would be considered the next best alternative location for office uses.</p> <p>3. See response to parking in the body of the Cabinet report</p>
Sv110	No name supplied		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Concern over the need for such facilities in Sunderland.</li> <li>2. Doubts over council's ability to deliver.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Comment Noted</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Facilities proposed such as ski slope have been subject to soft market testing. Ultimately the delivery of the facilities will be subject to demand.</li> <li>2. The regeneration of complex large-scale Brownfield regeneration sites inevitably have long lead-in times especially where site assembly is required, feasibility work, site remediation as well as securing necessary statutory permissions. There are a variety of landowners at Stadium Village and negotiation is ongoing with these parties to secure the land necessary to deliver the projects and therefore it is not easy to predict how long it will take to</li> </ol>

				complete all of the pre-development activities. However the current project programme anticipates that the first stages of development may start on site in 2013.
Sv111	Mr I Riches		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals.</li> <li>2. The ski slope is a good idea – have to travel too far at present (Castleford).</li> <li>3. Wants an ice rink as currently has to travel to Whitley Bay.</li> <li>4. Hope to see project in his lifetime (age 74).</li> </ol>	<p><b>Comment Noted</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. An ice rink would be considered an acceptable use on the site in principle. However it is not the role of the Development Framework to prescribe specific facilities for the site; but to provide parameters and principles to guide developers when preparing a masterplan for the site. Ultimately it is for the developer to determine the exact nature of the facilities to be provided.</li> </ol> <p>Development of Stadium Village is likely to take place over a 10-15 year period; however this will be phased over time. Currently the ski slope is identified as a development priority. the current project programme anticipates that the first stages of development may start on site in 2013</p>
Sv112	Mr A K Baker		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals.</li> <li>2. Supports the ski slope.</li> </ol>	<b>Comment Noted</b>
Sv113	Mr C Parkin		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals.</li> <li>2. Supports the ski slope.</li> </ol>	<b>Comment Noted</b>
Sv114	Mr Craig		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals – wants action now, waited too long.</li> <li>2. Currently travels to Whitley Bay ice rink and Xscape Castleford.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The regeneration of complex large-scale Brownfield regeneration sites inevitably have long lead-in times especially where site assembly is required, feasibility work, site remediation as well as securing necessary statutory permissions. There are a variety of landowners at Stadium Village and negotiation is ongoing with these parties to secure the land necessary to deliver the projects and therefore it is not easy to predict how long it will take to complete all of the pre-development activities. However the current project programme anticipates that the first stages of development may start on site in 2013.</li> </ol>

Sv115	Mr Davidson		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals – wants action soon.</li> <li>2. Supports the ski slope – currently travels to Castleford.</li> </ol>	<b>Comment Noted</b>
Sv116	Mr J Lloyd		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Site has considerable potential, greatest natural asset is river frontage and south/south western aspects, not been fully exploited. Improve riverside walk as a quick win project. In order to promote walking needs to be greater interest than “sporting events/participation.”</li> <li>2. Need for good landscaping, existing mature trees and gully to the south of the landmark site need incorporation into possible linear park along river and into site.</li> <li>3. Site of proposed ski slope not related to topography of site to keep highest point in scale with museum have maximum visual impact from road and rail. Could the building form zone between sports and housing and run east/west with high point having backdrop to Stadium of Light.</li> <li>4. Most of the housing does not make use of outstanding views or aspects.</li> <li>5. Mention of solar energy but noow how exploited. Is there acceptance that wind turbines may be viable because of topography?</li> <li>6. Need to consider better road access for housing and hotel and to start system to discourage fly parking for matches and special events on southern part of the site.</li> <li>7. Quality of existing Listed Building on the site does not compare favourably with the station and its façade faces the wrong way.</li> <li>8. Hotels have been mentioned on many redevelopment sites. Has point been reached to list all and express some form of order of priority, availability and degree of help (e.g. low rental on land lease).</li> <li>9. Could there in future be formal presentation on consultations by representatives of the Council, its officers in setting such as the Council Chamber.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. &amp; 2. The development framework establishes the need for a high quality public realm and recognises that this is key in connecting the site to the City Centre. The City Council will be requiring further details and landscape plans to be submitted as part of more detailed masterplans for each site. This includes enhancing the natural environment along the river corridor.</li> <li>3. The location of the Ski slope was informed by a feasibility study to determine the best location for the Ski Slope building. A number of options were considered; however it was concluded that Site C on the Stadium Village Indicative Masterplan was the only site capable of accommodating the ski slope building.</li> <li>4. The development Framework is intended to set principles and parameters for development and the indicative Masterplan is not intended to stipulate the exact location of certain uses. Whilst the development Framework identifies site E as the main site for housing, it does not preclude the development of residential buildings on sites G, F and D. Ultimately it is for the developer to determine the exact nature of the uses proposed and these will be assessed on their own merits and against the criteria of the development Framework and Policy NA3A.2 of Unitary Development Plan Alteration No.2. Notwithstanding this, it is considered that other uses in addition to housing (e.g. a hotel development) may also take advantage of and benefit from the views afforded by the site.</li> <li>5. The development Framework is intended to set principles and parameters for development and not set detailed specification for buildings. The feasibility of</li> </ol>

				<p>the various technologies will be dependent on the type of development that comes forward and therefore the Framework sets out sustainable development principles to be explored by developers when preparing detailed Masterplans for the site.</p> <p>Developers will be expected to provide a sustainability statement providing details of and justification for the sustainability measures proposed at each site. In addition the Design Code for the Ski slope requires developers to consider the feasibility of transferring waste heat to the Aquatic Centre in their energy strategies. Further information on sustainability issues can be found in the main body of the cabinet report.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>6. Whilst access and movement into and around Stadium village will utilise existing infrastructure, the development framework proposes a new junction alignment off Kier Hardie Way, in order to provide a clearer gateway to Stadium Village and to ensure efficient access and egress at peak times. Alternative measures to improve the movement network focus on maximising accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists and avoiding the creation of environment that is dominated by parked cars.</li><li>7. Regardless of the perceived quality of the Listed Coach House, the City Council has a legal obligation to protect all Listed Buildings. The Stadium Village Framework reflects this by identifying the coach House building for restoration and improvement.</li><li>8. The Development Framework provides the opportunity for one or more hotels on Stadium Village. Furthermore, Furthermore, Unitary Development Plan Alteration Number 2. policies NA3A.1 and NA3A.2 set out that hotel uses (Use Class C1) are acceptable in principle on Stadium Village. Ultimately however, the delivery will depend upon market conditions. A recent study by Hotel Solutions recognised that there is a shortage of hotel provision</li></ol>
--	--	--	--	---



				<p>within the Sunderland Central Area. Given the significance of existing facilities including the Stadium of Light and the Aquatics Centre on the site and the potential development of a large leisure use such as an indoor ski slope, together with the site's edge of centre accessible location an opportunity is provided for at least one hotel to accommodate a likely increase in demand.</p> <p>9. Officers were on hand during normal office hours at the Civic Centre to speak one to one and answer any queries from members of the general public. In order to actively engage with members of the community officers were also present at a number of exhibitions at the Aquatic Centre and the Hetton Centre.</p>
Sv117	Mr Hutchinson		1. Supports the proposals.	<b>Comment Noted</b>
Sv118	Mrs Burn		<p>1. Supports the proposals – will improve the city's image.</p> <p>2. In favour of hotel but what about budget accommodation for young ordinary visitors i.e. a youth hostel.</p>	<p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b></p> <p>2. A hostel use is classified as Sui Generis (i.e. in a class of its own) and does not fall into any of the land use classes set out within planning policies for Stadium Village. Consequently should a developer come forward with a proposal for such a development it would need to be determined on its own merits having regard to other policies within the Unitary Development Plan, the development parameters set out within the development framework and existing developments as and when they come forward as well as any other relevant material considerations.</p>
SV119	Mr Sean Harrison		<p>1. Supports the proposals – already uses the Aquatic Centre.</p> <p>2. The idea of an indoor ski slope is fantastic – existing ones are always busy, will be used by those who use slopes in Alston.</p>	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV120	Ms Beverley Fox		1. Supports the proposals - excellent idea and facility.	<b>Comment Noted</b>

SV121	No name supplied		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals.</li> <li>2. Supports the ski slope knows 15 people who currently travel to Xscape at Castleford. Provision of a facility between Yorkshire and Scotland will be welcomed by many skiers and boarders in the North East.</li> </ol>	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV122	Mr Eric Grimes		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals.</li> <li>2. Supports the ski slope – unique development for the region, people have to travel to Castleford at present, no longer uses dry ski slope in Sunderland since one at Castleford built.</li> </ol>	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV123	Mr Gareth Carr		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals.</li> <li>2. As a keen snowboarder would love to see indoor ski slope. Would allow people to pursue skiing/snowboarding all year round. Helping to tackle childhood obesity and petty crime.</li> </ol>	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV124	Mr Colin Irvine		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals.</li> <li>2. Supports the ski slope (at present travel to Castleford).</li> <li>3. Would love to see ice rink.</li> <li>4. Missed opportunity of having snow facilities adjacent to swimming so could use heat pump to cool one and heat the other.</li> </ol>	<b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. An ice rink would be considered an acceptable use on the site in principle. However it is not the role of the Development Framework to prescribe specific facilities for the site; but to provide parameters and principles to guide developers when preparing a masterplan for the site. Ultimately it is for the developer to determine the exact nature of the facilities to be provided.</li> <li>4. With regards to energy efficiency please see main body of the Cabinet report.</li> </ol>
SV125	Ms Janet Hall		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals.</li> <li>2. Ski slope is fantastic – save trip to Manchester or Glasgow.</li> </ol>	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV126	Ms Lynda Kouache		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals although concerned for Crowtree Leisure Centre.</li> <li>2. What will happen to Crowtree Leisure Centre – will the clubs be accommodated somewhere?</li> <li>3. When will the clubs hear about the plans for the Crowtree Leisure Centre and clubs hiring facilities?</li> <li>4. What use will be attributed to the 20 court sports hall.</li> </ol>	<b>Comment Noted</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1-3 There are currently no proposals over the future of the Crowtree Leisure Centre and it will remain operational for the foreseeable future.</li> <li>4. It is not the role of the Development Framework to prescribe specific facilities for the site; but to provide parameters and principles to guide developers when preparing a masterplan for the site. Ultimately it is for the developer to determine the exact nature of the facilities to be provided.</li> </ol>
SV127	Mr Nigel Jones		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals in general jobs and investment.</li> <li>2. Thinks that wrong location for centre – road network unsuitable new facilities won't be used on match days or concert days.</li> <li>3. Not sufficient parking for all facilities proposed.</li> <li>4. The centre would be better located in City Centre – i.e. Vaux – better for</li> </ol>	<b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Whilst access and movement into and around Stadium village will utilise existing infrastructure, the development framework proposes a new junction alignment off Kier</li> </ol>

business, and road system better able to cope - understands Tesco own Vaux land makes difficult to develop.  
5. Hopes energy used to cool ski slope is used in heating the pool.

Hardie Way, in order to provide a clearer gateway to Stadium Village and to ensure efficient access and egress at peak times. Alternative measures to improve the movement network focus on maximising accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists and avoiding the creation of environment that is dominated by parked cars.

3. With regards to parking please see main body of the Cabinet Report.
4. Current planning guidance set out within policy S2A of the UDP Alteration Number 2 and Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 4: Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth requires that wherever possible “main town uses” are to be located in existing centres, any proposals for such uses outside of existing centres will be subject to a sequential test. Paragraph 6.23q of Alteration Number 2 and PPS4 indicate that leisure, retail and office uses are “main town centre uses.”

Parts of the Stadium Village, including site C (the proposed location of an indoor ski slope) are located within 300m of the primary retail core and as such are considered edge-of-centre locations. Whilst it is recognised that policy NA3A.1 requires D2 uses within Stadium Park, due to its edge-of-centre location such uses will still be subject to a sequential test, which will need to demonstrate:

- Sites have been assessed for their availability suitability and viability
- All in-centre site options have been thoroughly assessed before less central sites are considered
- Sites on the edge of centres will be of an appropriate scale and format

In addition any proposals for “main town centre uses” on Stadium Village would need to be assessed against the impact on the existing centres in terms of the impact on investment in the existing centre, the impact on the existing town centre viability

				<p>and vitality and the potential impact of the scale of the proposed development.</p> <p>It is worth noting that should no suitable in-centre sites be found, PPS4 identifies edge-of-centre locations which are well-connected to the centre as being the next alternative choice. It is considered that the Stadium Village site – as an edge-of centre-location with good public transport and road links to the centre - would be considered the next best alternative for such uses.</p> <p>5. The feasibility of the various technologies will be dependent on the type of development that comes forward and therefore the Framework sets out sustainable development principles to be explored by developers when preparing detailed Masterplans for the site. Developers will be expected to provide a sustainability statement providing details of and justification for the sustainability measures proposed at each site. In addition the Design Code for the Ski slope requires developers to consider the feasibility of transferring waste heat to the Aquatic Centre in their energy strategies. Further information on sustainability issues can be found in the main body of the cabinet report.</p>
SV128	Mr Paul Macintosh		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals.</li> <li>2. Supports indoor ski slope.</li> <li>3. Doubts Sunderland arc's ability to deliver.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. The regeneration of complex large-scale Brownfield regeneration sites inevitably have long lead-in times especially where site assembly is required, which may necessitate the use of compulsory purchase powers, site remediation as well as securing necessary statutory permissions. There are a variety of landowners at Stadium Village and negotiation is ongoing with these parties to secure the land necessary to deliver the projects and therefore it is not easy to predict how long it will take to complete all</li> </ol>

				of the pre-development activities. However the current project programme anticipates that the first stages of development may start on site in 2013.
SV129	M E Barlow		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Objects to the proposals.</li> <li>2. Parking difficult on match days especially for the disabled.</li> <li>3. Access to/from Southwick and Stadium is difficult.</li> <li>4. Noise created from match days is bad enough at present.</li> <li>5. Notices are up in street about parking on match days not adhered to.</li> <li>6. Access for emergency services difficult.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Whilst access and movement into and around Stadium village will utilise existing infrastructure, the development framework proposes a new junction alignment off Kier Hardie Way, in order to provide a clearer gateway to Stadium Village and to ensure efficient access and egress at peak times. Alternative measures to improve the movement network focus on maximising accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists and avoiding the creation of environment that is dominated by parked cars.</li> <li>3. With regards to parking please see main body of the Cabinet report.</li> <li>4. The development framework sets out parameters that In line with national planning policy specifically PPG24 (Planning and Noise), developments which are considered to be noise sensitive, wherever practicable will be separated from major sources of noise. Careful assessment will be required when the local planning authority considers individual applications for development. Where it is not possible to achieve a suitable separation of land uses, local planning authorities should consider whether it is practicable to control or reduce noise levels, or to mitigate the impact of noise, through the use of conditions or planning obligations.</li> <li>5. With regards to parking please see main body of the Cabinet report.</li> <li>6. It is envisaged that the current emergency access for emergency vehicles off Kier Hardie Way will remain. Notwithstanding this, proposals for development on the site will need to consider emergency access during the more detailed masterplanning stages.</li> </ol>

SV130	No name supplied		1. Supports the proposals.	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV131	Mr Steve Thompson		1. Supports the proposals. 2. Supports ski slope – currently visit Xscape in Castleford – snowboarding year round hobby/sport not just warm-up for winter holiday.	<b>Comment noted</b>
SV132	Mr Paul Tindle		1. Supports the proposals. 2. Part of snow sports industry – spends time travelling to indoor ski slope's – excited about Sunderland's proposals – put the city on the map.	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV133	Mr John Chilton		1. Supports the proposals. 2. Indoor ski slope essential to develop kids ski and snowboarding.	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV134	Mr Jim Dunn		1. Supports the proposals. 2. Currently approach to Stadium Village via Keir Hardie Way gives terrible first impression. 3. Unused or unkempt allotments at back of Halfway House PH need removing as part of plan.	<b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> 2. It is important to acknowledge that all development proposals will be subject to design guidance set out within paragraph 4.21 of the development framework. The creation of a strong gateway from the west along Keir Hardie Way with landmark buildings and active frontages forms one of the key principles set out within this design guidance. Area B is identified as a potential location for a hotel that will meet the current shortage of provision within the central area and will need to be of a high design standard. Changes to the infrastructure at the junction with Keir Hardie Way replacing the existing roundabout with a signalised junction will also assist in creating an enhanced entrance into Stadium Village.  3. The purpose of the Development Framework is to provide planning and design principles for the Stadium Village site only. It is not intended to provide a regeneration strategy for the wider area. Any improvements to the allotments along Queens Road fall outside of the remit of the Development Framework.

SV135	Mr John Broomfield		1. Supports the proposals - fantastic huge asset for Sunderland.	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV136	Mr Lee Daymond		1. Supports the proposals - will help make site nationally recognised. 2. Excited about indoor ski slope – great alternative to Silksworth, will attract boarders/skiers to the area.	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV137	Mr Jim Tulip		1. Supports the proposals. 2. Project of this scale need multi-storey car park – problems with match day parking. 3. Only Olympic size swimming pool without adjacent car park.	<b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> 2&3. With regards to parking please see main body of the Cabinet report.
SV138	Ms K Potts		1. Supports the proposals. 2. Indoor ski slope needed in north east would be huge benefit and support from surrounding and local areas – regular interest to family and friends.	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV139	Mrs E M Graham		1. Supports the proposals - SOL and Aquatic Centre should only be the start, whole area ready for a 'new look.'	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV140	Mr Gary Huntley		1. Supports the proposals. 2. Indoor ski slope – excellent idea currently travels to Castleford – my and my family use it and other facilities every week.	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV141	Mr Graeme Houghton		1. Supports the proposals – benefit Sunderland and whole region. 2. Supports indoor ski slope – currently travels to Castleford – would be able to attend slope more regularly as would reduce travel costs. 3. Would use associated equipment shops. 4. Ski slope would attract students from Durham, Newcastle (income from neighbouring cities) and Sunderland.	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV142	Mr Peter White		1. Supports the proposals. 2. Supports far sighted approach of ski slope needs associated cafes and eating places which similar schemes across the country lack enough of.	<b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> 2. Policy NA3A.1 of the Unitary Development Plan Alteration No. 2 provides for the future development of food and drink uses (Use Classes A3 and A4) within Stadium Park. In addition policy NA3A.2 prescribes that such facilities will be determined on their own merits having regard to other policies of the Unitary Development Plan. The development framework envisages that leisure and commercial developments will create a sense of enclosure the Way of Light and animate this pedestrian route.

SV143	Ms Zoe Moore		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals – bring much needed enhancement of current leisure facilities.</li> <li>2. Ski slope major asset to city.</li> </ol>	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV144	No name supplied		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Objects to the proposals – no reason given.</li> </ol>	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV145	Mr Steven Hall		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals</li> <li>2. Ski slope needed – will bring in money from surrounding areas i.e. Newcastle, Durham, young people will enjoy the facility.</li> </ol>	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV146	No name supplied		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals.</li> <li>2. Ski slope good idea – would save having to make visits to Glasgow/Leeds/Manchester. Bad weather prevents visits to Silksworth.</li> </ol>	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV147	Ms Roxy Frame		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals.</li> </ol>	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV148	Ms Rebecca Grant		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals.</li> <li>2. Supports ski slope – excellent opportunity for snow sport supporters. Normally travels to Leeds – Sunderland ski slope means less travelling and will help bring business into area.</li> </ol>	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV149	Mr Chris Grant		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals.</li> <li>2. Ski slope good idea – currently travels to Leeds, but due to 4 hour round trip doesn't go as much as would like. People from Scotland and North east who use facility in Leeds would prefer to travel to Sunderland.</li> </ol>	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV150	Mr Ged Peters		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals.</li> <li>2. Ski slope good idea – regularly uses Castleford/Manchester. European Ski Federation held first international indoor ski slalom in Nov 2009 in Amneville, France. Building a longer than normal slope may help to attract international indoor snow races.</li> </ol>	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV151	Ms Jill Lorentsen-Bright		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals.</li> <li>2. Ski slope great idea.</li> <li>3. Is there a need for additional flats.</li> <li>4. Do something to put Sunderland on the map.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Comment Noted</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Policy NA3A.2 of Unitary Development Plan Alteration No.2 states that housing is a required use on the site; however this is outside the timescale of the Alteration No.2 document, which covers the period to 2012. Therefore no specific housing allocation for the Stadium Village site currently exists. At this stage any proposal for housing development brought forward would be considered on its own merits and in the context of the Development Framework, surrounding development proposals and the emerging Local Development</li> </ol>



				<p>Framework for the city.</p> <p>However, it is important to be aware that the Regional Spatial Strategy sets housing targets for each local authority area including Sunderland up to 2021. Due to the large scale housing renewal programmes taking place within Sunderland which has led to high numbers of properties being demolished Sunderland is struggling to meet its targets and as such additional housing is required. The forthcoming Allocations Development Plan Document within the Local Development Framework supported by evidence from the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment will set out specific housing numbers and types for each area of the city including Stadium Village.</p>
SV152	Mr Andrew Harrison		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals will put Sunderland on the map, bring people in, generate opportunity.</li> <li>2. Strong focal centre for sporting activities.</li> <li>3. All developments should take advantage of available green technology to ensure that they deliver technologically advanced, high quality facilities.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. With regards to energy efficiency please see main body of the Cabinet report.</li> </ol>
SV153	Mr Gerard Lundie		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals – great opportunity for the city.</li> <li>2. Will definitely lead to a pedestrian bridge.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Comment Noted</b></p>
SV154	Mr M Charlton		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals.</li> <li>2. Build indoor football pitches.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Indoor football pitches would be considered acceptable uses at the site in relation to land use principles. However, such a proposal would need to be determined on its own merits paying due regard to existing developments on the site as and when they come forward as well as any other relevant material considerations. However, it is not the role for the Development Framework to prescribe specific facilities for the site; but to provide parameters and principles to guide developers when preparing a masterplan for the site. Ultimately it is for the developer to determine the exact nature of the facilities to be provided.</li> </ol>

SV155	Mr Denis Morrision		1. Supports the proposals – potentially great area for jobs, homes, leisure.	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV156	Mr Russ Cogdon		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals.</li> <li>2. Ski slope good excellent addition.</li> <li>3. Would like to see Velodrome built on the site.</li> </ol>	<b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. A velodrome would be considered acceptable uses in terms of land use principles on the site. However, such a proposal would need to be determined on its own merits paying due regard to existing developments on the site as and when they come forward as well as any other relevant material considerations. However it is not the role of the Development Framework to prescribe specific facilities for the site; but to provide parameters and principles to guide developers when preparing a masterplan for the site. Ultimately it is for the developer to determine the exact nature of the facilities to be provided.</li> </ol>
SV157	Mr Daniel Krzyszczyk		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals.</li> <li>2. A venue for conferences and meetings is required as current offer in Sunderland is very poor.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Conference facilities currently exist at the Stadium of Light. Any proposals for new facilities would be complementary to the existing offer. However it is not the role of the Development Framework to prescribe specific facilities for the site; but to provide parameters and principles to guide developers when preparing a masterplan for the site. Ultimately it is for the developer to determine the exact nature of the facilities to be provided.</li> </ol>
SV158	Mrs E Longstaff		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Objects to the proposals.</li> <li>2. Reservations over the height of a building necessary to house a ski slope, very difficult to make such a building look attractive will block view of new areas as will run alongside the road.</li> <li>3. Questions volume of demand for ski slope.</li> <li>4. Ice rink would be better, able to stage professional ice shows and competitions - would be more widely used and great asset for the city, shows would generate tourist revenue.</li> </ol>	<b>Comment Noted – No Change</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. With regard to scale and massing please refer to response in the body of the Cabinet report</li> <li>3. The success of the ski slope will depend on market factors. However, it is important to acknowledge that the facility is of a regional scale and will draw in visitors far beyond the boundaries of the city and as such will also play a major role in bringing additional visitors to Sunderland. Extensive research has been carried out and it has become apparent that significant demand for such facility exists within the region. Notwithstanding this, the profitability of a ski slope is a business decision to be made by the developer and is outside of the</li> </ol>

				<p>scope of the development framework.</p> <p>4. An ice rink would be considered an acceptable use on the site in principle. However it is not the role of the Development Framework to prescribe specific facilities for the site; but to provide parameters and principles to guide developers when preparing a masterplan for the site. Ultimately it is for the developer to determine the exact nature of the facilities to be provided.</p>
SV159	Mr David Pounder		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals.</li> <li>2. Please build the ski slope – regularly uses facility in Leeds, money saved petrol able to spend in local area.</li> </ol>	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV160	No name supplied		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals.</li> </ol>	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV161	No name supplied		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals.</li> </ol>	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV162	Mr A Wilson		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals – exciting and attract people from outside area.</li> <li>2. Concerned that pedestrian bridge may not come to fruition due to situation at Vaux.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Comment Noted – No Change</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. As part of the Sunderland Strategic Transport Corridor, a planning application for a new bridge across the River Wear between Claxheugh Rock and Wessington Way has been submitted for planning approval. Given the site's immediate proximity to the Wearmouth Bridge, it is considered unnecessary for a further road bridge to be constructed linking Stadium Village to the south bank of the River Wear. Nevertheless, the need for a pedestrian bridge has been identified in the city Council's Central Area Urban Design Strategy and is considered an important part of a safe, wide pedestrian and cycle link between key sites in the city centre and the Stadium of Light.</li> </ol>
SV163	Mr John Wright		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals city needs redevelopment.</li> <li>2. Do it as a whole plan and include the Vaux.</li> <li>3. Where is the new road bridge.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The Vaux site falls outside of the boundary of Stadium Village and as such it is not the purpose of the Development Framework to cover regeneration visions and objectives for the Vaux site.</li> <li>3. A new Wear road crossing is already</li> </ol>

				proposed between Claxheugh rock and Wessington Way.
SV164	Mr John Heppel		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals – excellent idea with all facilities and accommodation on site</li> <li>2. Travellers would have easy road and metro access</li> </ol>	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV165	Debra Hassan		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals. More sports offer is needed in Sunderland</li> </ol>	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV166	Chris McGrory		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals. Need to enhance sports available in Sunderland</li> </ol>	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV167	Leeann Collings		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals</li> </ol>	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV168	No name supplied		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Adequate car parking required (see other stadiums e.g. Manchester cycling)</li> </ol>	<b>Comment Noted</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. See response in main body of the Cabinet report.</li> </ol>
SV169	Julie Pugh		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals. Snow slope will be a fantastic facility to complement the aquatic centre</li> <li>2. However adequate parking for all facilities required especially on match days</li> </ol>	<b>Comment Noted</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. See response in main body of the Cabinet report.</li> </ol>
SV170	Jamie Taylor		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Objects to the proposals</li> <li>2. No place to park when match is on</li> </ol>	<b>Comment Noted</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. See response in main body of the Cabinet report</li> </ol>
SV171	Megan McGrory		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals. An improvement on Silksworth</li> <li>2. More options for sports in the future</li> </ol>	<b>Comment Noted</b>
SV172	Bethan McGrory		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals. Would enable improvement and increased enjoyment of sports</li> <li>2. Good for Sunderland</li> </ol>	<b>Comment Noted</b>

SV173	Mr D.M. Caslaw		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supports the proposals</li> <li>2. Would be a boost to Sunderland</li> <li>3. Supports renovation of the Coach House</li> <li>4. Top name hotel would be beneficial</li> </ol>	<p><b>Comment Noted</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. The Development Framework provides the opportunity for one or more hotels on Stadium Village. Furthermore, Furthermore, Unitary Development Plan Alteration Number 2. policies NA3A.1 and NA3A.2 set out that hotel uses (Use Class C1) are acceptable in principle on Stadium Village. Ultimately however, the delivery will depend upon market conditions. A recent study by Hotel Solutions recognised that there is a shortage of hotel provision within the Sunderland Central Area. Given the significance of existing facilities including the Stadium of Light and the Aquatics Centre on the site and the potential development of a large leisure use such as an indoor ski slope, together with the site's edge of centre accessible location an opportunity is provided for at least one hotel to accommodate a likely increase in demand.</li> </ol>
-------	----------------	--	--	---

