

ENVIRONMENT AND ATTRACTIVE CITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

AGENDA

Meeting to be held in the Civic Centre, Committee Room No. 1, on
Monday 15th February, 2010 at 6.00 p.m.

ITEM	PAGE
1. Apologies for Absence	
2. Minutes of the last meeting of the Environment and Attractive City Scrutiny Committee held on 18th January, 2010 (Copy attached)	1
3. Declarations of Interest (including Whipping Declarations)	
4. Review Of Accessible Bus Network - Consultation Scrutiny Item Report Of The Director General Of Nexus (Copy attached)	13
5. Local Area Agreement Delivery Plans Scrutiny (Performance) Item Report of the Attractive and Inclusive Delivery Partnership (Copy attached)	16

- | | | |
|----|---|----|
| 6. | Stadium Village Development Framework | 35 |
| | Scrutiny Item | |
| | Report Of The Deputy Chief Executive | |
| | (Copy attached) | |
| 7. | Policy Development & Review 2009/10 – Task And Finish Group Update | 43 |
| | Scrutiny Item | |
| | Report of the Chief Executive | |
| | (Copy attached) | |
| 8. | Forward Plan – Key Decisions For The Period 1 January 2010 – 30 April 2010 | 46 |
| | Committee Business Item | |
| | Report of the Chief Executive | |
| | (Copy attached) | |
| 9. | Work Programme 2009-10 | 50 |
| | Committee Business Item | |
| | Report of the Chief Executive | |
| | (Copy attached) | |

R.C. RAYNER,
Chief Solicitor.

Civic Centre,
SUNDERLAND.

5th February, 2010

At a meeting of the ENVIRONMENT AND ATTRACTIVE CITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE held in the CIVIC CENTRE on MONDAY, 11TH APRIL, 2011 at 6.00 p.m.

Present:-

Councillor Miller in the Chair

Councillors Bonallie, E. Gibson, Padgett, Tye, Wakefield and A. Wright

Also Present:-

Councillor Tate - Chair of Management Scrutiny Committee
Councillor Snowdon

Apologies for Absence

Apologies for Absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Ball, Kelly, L. Walton and Wood

Minutes of the Last Meeting of the Environment and Attractive City Scrutiny Committee held on 14th March, 2011

Councillor Wakefield stated that with regard to the Draft Final Report he had not raised the Low Carbon City Villages as an issue; he had referred to his concerns regarding the chairmanship of the Attractive and Inclusive Delivery Partnership and that the Scrutiny Committee had not known where the information behind the Low Carbon City Villages had come from.

Councillor Bonallie asked that his apologies be included.

1. RESOLVED that the minutes of the last meeting of the Committee held on 14th March, 2011 be confirmed and signed as a correct record subject to the inclusion of Councillor Bonallie's apologies and subject to the above amendment from Councillor Wakefield.

Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

Sunderland 'the Place' Policy Review 2010/11: Final Report

The Chief Executive submitted a report (copy circulated) which presented to the Committee the final report for the Policy Review for 2010/11 into Sunderland 'the Place'.

(For Copy report – see original minutes)

Helen Lancaster, Scrutiny Officer, presented the report and advised the Committee that this was the final draft copy of the report which would be forwarded to Cabinet should the Members agree the report.

The Chairman commented that this was an excellent report.

2. RESOLVED that the final report be agreed and be presented to Cabinet for approval.

Performance Report Quarter 3 (April – December 2010)

The Deputy Chief Executive and the Director of City Services presented a report (copy circulated) which provided the Committee with a performance update relating to the period April to December 2010.

(For copy report – see original minutes)

Mike Lowe, Assistant Head of Performance Improvement, presented the performance report and advised that overall there had been a positive response from residents. Consultation was undertaken with the Community Spirit Panel and the top priorities identified were recycling and refuse collection; roads and footways; and clean streets. The performance report also covered planning and transport and road safety.

Councillor Wakefield commented that it was disappointing that there had been such a small number of respondents; he doubted the value of the report given the low response. Mr Lowe advised that the panel was made up of 1700 volunteers from around the city.

The Chairman stated that he felt the Community Spirit volunteers did excellent work. It was pleasing to see that residents felt that the Council was performing so well in a variety of areas. That 67 percent of people felt that waste services were improving was a fantastic response. It was good to see that the condition of the city's roads had been identified as a problem; the government had awarded £600,000 for repairs however at this stage it was not known whether further investment would be required. It was also highly pleasing to see that the number of people Killed or Seriously Injured on the roads had reduced.

3. RESOLVED that consideration be given to the performance report for quarter 3 of 2010/11.

Project Update: Street Lighting and Highway Signs PFI Contract

The Executive Director of City Services submitted a report (copy circulated) which updated Members on the progress made on the Street Lighting and Highway Signs PFI and introduced the report of Aurora (Sunderland Streetlighting Limited), the Council's PFI partner.

(For copy report – see original minutes)

Michael Curry, Assistant Contract Monitoring Officer, presented the report and introduced Phillip Jordan, Aurora General Manager, who would be presenting the report from Aurora.

Mr Curry advised that the contract was for 25 years and had moved from the initial phase which saw large investment in the replacement of lighting into the second phase which was focused on maintenance. He also advised the Committee of the six Performance Standards which were set out in the report. There were deductions made if any of the standards were not met, these deductions had been reducing and were at the lowest level they had ever been.

Councillor E. Gibson advised that there had been a lot of problems in Doxford where the regeneration work was being undertaken; issues had been rectified more quickly this year than in previous years.

Councillor Wakefield advised that there were a significant number of the lamps along the A690 at Houghton which were not operational. Mr Curry advised that on high speed roads there was a twice yearly programme of repair works and any repairs to street lighting was left until this time unless there was a serious or dangerous fault. If an entire section of lighting had failed then the programme of works would be rescheduled to enable the repairs to be completed quickly.

Councillor Wakefield then referred to the lamps which had been installed in Newbottle Conservation Area. Modern lighting columns had been installed outside of Grade 2 listed buildings and he felt that it would have been more appropriate to have installed period style lights which would have been more in keeping with the area. Mr Jordan agreed to look into this.

The Chairman commented that it was good to see that the issues with vandalism had reduced. The map contained in the report showed a hotspot for vandalism in Washington; this was an underpass at The Galleries which was known to have consistent issues. There should be a strategy implemented to deal with repeat problem sites; there were regular complaints regarding issues at this underpass. It was obvious that Aurora were doing good work as the deductions had been reducing significantly, a sign that they were meeting more of the required targets.

4. RESOLVED that the report be received and noted.

Waste Management and Recycling Update

The Executive Director of City Services submitted a report (copy circulated) which informed the Committee of the position reached in the procurement of a PFI supported contract for the treatment of residual waste.

(For copy report – see original minutes)

Peter High, Strategic Waste Project Director, presented the report and advised Members of the significant increase in recycling by residents. There had been 71.62 percent of municipal waste was consigned to landfill in 2009/10. The introduction of the new blue recycling bins had led to increased recycling. There had also been a reduction in the amount of waste produced. There had not been any complaints from residents regarding the change to the new blue bins.

Councillor Wakefield commented that he felt that the blue bins had been a success. The waste disposal contract with Alex Smiles Ltd had resulted in a reduction in the amount of waste being sent to the landfill site at Houghton Quarry as the majority of the waste they handled was being sent to Gateshead to be autoclaved. He was however concerned about the reduction in the re-use of packaging materials; for example beer bottles which previously had been available in crates and were able to be reused while now they were destroyed after use.

Mr High stated that the decline in the pub trade and the overall reduction in the consumption of alcohol had led to a reduction in the amount of bottles being recycled. The majority of the waste handled by Alex Smiles Ltd would not find its way to landfill however the recovery of waste in other ways was still in the early stages.

Councillor E. Gibson commented that there had been excellent reports from residents regarding the blue bins; there was less paper being recycled as a result of the reduction in the sales of newspapers. The information leaflet which was circulated to residents informing them of the introduction of the blue bins was excellent; it had been easy to understand and had educated residents as to what they could put in the blue bins.

The Chairman referred to the number of 'bring sites' throughout the city and asked whether there were any plans to review this.

Mr High stated that a number of the sites were at locations such as high-rise apartment blocks and schools and as such had restricted access. There was a need to review the number of containers available at each site to enable an increase in the recycling facilities available.

The Chairman then stated that there was a bring site located within his Ward which was regularly used and was well maintained. He felt that the sites needed to be reviewed as it was possible that there would be some sites which were underused and possibly not fit for purpose.

5. RESOLVED that consideration be given to the update on the measures being taken to improve recycling levels and the position reached with the PFI supported procurement of a strategic residual waste facility.

Forward Plan – Key Decisions for the Period 1 April 2011 – 31 July 2011

The Chief Executive submitted a report (copy circulated) to provide Members with an opportunity to consider those items on the Executive's Forward Plan for the period 1 April 2011 – 31 July 2011 which related to the Environment and Attractive City Scrutiny Committee.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

Helen Lancaster, Scrutiny Officer, presented the Forward Plan.

The Chairman having thanked Ms. Lancaster for her report it was:

6. RESOLVED that the contents of the Forward Plan be noted.

Work Programme 2010-11

The Chief Executive submitted a report (copy circulated) which attached for Members' information, the current Work Programme for the Committee's work during the 2010-11 Council year.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

Helen Lancaster, Scrutiny Officer, presented the work programme.

The Chairman commented that there had been a huge amount of work carried out by the Committee over the year. He thanked Members for all of their hard work over the course of the year and stated that he felt that spreading the workload over the course of the year had helped the Committee to achieve more.

7. RESOLVED that the contents of the report be received and noted.

The Chairman thanked Members and Officers for their attendance and closed the meeting.

(Signed) G. MILLER,
Chairman.

ANNUAL WORK PROGRAMME AND POLICY REVIEW 2011-12

REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

Strategic Priorities: SP5 Attractive and Inclusive City

**Corporate Priorities: CIO1: Delivering Customer Focused Services, CIO4:
Improving partnership working to deliver 'One City'**

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 For members to determine the Annual Work Programme for the Scrutiny Committee during 2011-12 and the main theme for a detailed policy review.

2. Background

- 2.1 The Scrutiny Committee is responsible for setting its own work programme within the following remit:

General Scope: To consider issues relating to environment, neighbourhoods and sense of place

Remit: Place shaping; Building Control; Unitary Development Plan and the documents comprising the development plan; Local Transport Plan; Coast protection; Cemeteries and Crematorium; Grounds Maintenance; Flood Risk; Highways services and Streetscene; Waste and Recycling; Allotments

- 2.2 The council's Scrutiny Committees are aligned to the relevant priorities of the Sunderland Strategy. This allows each Scrutiny Committee to focus on the priority areas and targets in the Sunderland Strategy and for the work of all Scrutiny Committees to consistently address those areas of performance requiring detailed examination.
- 2.3 This approach, linked to strategic priorities, is proposed to allow a clear themed focus on the outcomes for the people of Sunderland, and allow for cross-cutting examination of issues, with potential for linking areas of knowledge and expertise that would not ordinarily be brought together, so increasing the likelihood of the committees identifying novel approaches and solutions to the issues they consider.

- 2.4 The most relevant Sunderland Strategy priority for this committee is:

Attractive and Accessible City - creating a city that celebrates and protects its natural and built environment, a place that is recognised inside and outside the city as an attractive and accessible place to live, work, study and visit. The physical environment will support everyone in the city to achieve their aspirations, now and in the future.

- 2.5 All Scrutiny Committees will take a role in the scrutiny of partnership and area issues and have a role in engaging with partners, external scrutiny, community and public engagement, engaging with media and area scrutiny.

3. Policy Review

- 3.1 Policy review is the process of maintaining an overview of council policies and will usually examine whether the council and its partners intended policy outcomes have been achieved. The process will also explore issues such as the perspective of residents affected by the policy.

- 3.2 Policy reviews are project planned with appropriate methodology applied to investigate the chosen topic. This may include meetings, site visits, surveys, public meetings or analysis of comparative practice in other local authorities.

- 3.3 Previous reviews carried out by this Scrutiny Committee have included:

Sunderland 'the Place'; Traffic Issues (with a focus on parking issues); Highway and Network Management (with a focus on 20mph zones); Allotment Provision; Public Realm and Streetscene; Carbon Management; Child Pedestrian Accidents and Road Safety; Development of Cycling within the city; City Centre Traffic Management and Recycling.

All previous reviews are available at:-

<http://www.sunderland.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=3420>

- 3.4 Following the selection of a topic for review, the Committee will receive a report setting out a possible approach to the review. This will include the terms of reference, definitions, links to corporate goals, partnerships, the national and local context, and proposals for gathering evidence.
- 3.5 The shortlist of topics for 2011-12 is listed below. The Committee is recommended to select one topic from this shortlist for an in-depth review. The list includes topics suggested as priorities at the discussions between

members, officers and partners at the Annual Scrutiny Conference on 19 May 2011.

Suggested Topics for Policy Review		
	Brief Description	Objective
1.	Sustainable Council Transport	To explore sustainable modes of council transport in delivering services, how services are currently delivered and should be delivered in the future and look at the potential benefits to adopting more sustainable modes of transport, linking with the city's aim of being a 'Low Carbon' city.
2.	The Management of Coastal Areas	To explore the different services currently deployed across the council to maintain the coast line and ensure the coastal areas are developed to their full potential.
3.	Accessible City	To explore the issues around how disabled people move around the city and how accessible buildings, shops and public transport are for disabled people.
4.	Land Management	To explore environmental arrangements and better working arrangements with land owner partners, to include the issues that occur when there are several land owners on one site.

3.6 Two further scrutiny topics suggested included the Coast and River and 'Selling Sunderland' have been passed to the Prosperity and Economic Development Scrutiny Committee as those issues pertaining to tourism falls within the remit of that Committee.

4. Work Programme

4.1 A draft work programme for 2011-12 is attached as Appendix A. The work programme will be populated with items agreed by members at this meeting and submitted to the July meeting.

4.2 The work programme can be amended during the year. Any member of the Committee can add an item of business to an agenda (see Protocol 1 Overview & Scrutiny Handbook).

5. Conclusion & Recommendation

5.1 The Committee is asked to

(a) Consider the draft Annual Work Programme for 2011-12 and indicate any additions or amendments

(b) Consider the list of suggestions for policy review and determine one topic for review.

5.2 Subject to any amendment at this meeting, the work programme will be submitted to the Management Scrutiny Committee in its coordinating role.

6 Background Papers

None

Contact Officer : Helen Lancaster 0191 561 1233
Helen.Lancaster@sunderland.gov.uk

ENVIRONMENT AND ATTRACTIVE CITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2011/2012

REASON FOR INCLUSION	JUNE 13.06.11	JULY 25.07.11	SEPTEMBER 12.9.10	OCTOBER 24.10.10	DECEMBER 12.12.10	JANUARY 16.01.11	FEBRUARY 27.02.11	APRIL 11.04.11
Cabinet-Referrals and Responses			Response to the 10/11 Policy Review – Sunderland ‘the Place’					
Policy Review	Annual Work Programme and Policy Review (HL)	Scoping Report and Setting the Scene (HL)			Policy Review Progress Report (HL)		Policy Review Progress Report (HL)	Policy Review: Draft Final Report (HL)
Performance			Performance Q1 (Mike Lowe)		Performance Q2/ Policy Review Progress (Mike Lowe/HL)			Performance Q3/ (Mike Lowe)
Scrutiny	Seaburn Masterplan and Design Code (Keith Lowes) Forward Plan (SA)	Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (Neil Cole) Employment Land Review (Neil Cole) Public Conveniences (Les Clark) Work Programme (SA) Forward Plan (SA)	LDF Core Strategy (Neil Cole) Highways Maintenance (Graham Carr) Feedback from the Annual CfPS Scrutiny Conference (HL) Work Programme (SA) Forward Plan (SA)	Flood Planning (TBC) Work Programme (SA) Forward Plan (SA)	Local Development Framework – Annual Update (Neil Cole) Work Programme (SA) Forward Plan (SA)	Work Programme (SA) Forward Plan (SA)	Work Programme (SA) Forward Plan (SA)	Draft Scrutiny Annual Report (HL) Street Lighting Annual Update (Graham Carr/Aurora) Waste Management (TBC) Work Programme (SA) Forward Plan (SA)
CCFA/Members items/Petitions	Request for Inclusion of an Item - Planning Applications (HL)							

SEABURN MASTERPLAN AND DESIGN CODE

REPORT OF THE DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE

1.0 Purpose of Report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to advise Committee of the responses received following public consultation on the Seaburn Masterplan and Design Code and to seek Committee's comments on the revised document.
- 1.2 The Committee's comments will be reported to Cabinet on 06 July 2011 when agreement will be sought to approve the Seaburn Masterplan and Design Code as a Supplementary Planning Document.

2.0 Background

- 2.1 The Seafront Regeneration Strategy was adopted in February 2010. This provides an overarching framework to guide future development at the seafront and identifies a vision for both Seaburn and Roker. Building upon this vision the strategy identifies a series of 'Character Areas' and sets out key development principles for each.
- 2.2 The Seafront Regeneration Strategy also establishes the need for a suite of delivery documents, designed to expand upon the ambitions of the strategy and provide detailed design guidance for the Character Areas identified. For example a Masterplan for Marine Walk was produced alongside the Seafront Regeneration Strategy to provide specific design guidance for this area of Roker. This was adopted as Supplementary Planning Document in February 2010 and now forms part of the Local Development Framework.
- 2.3 A masterplan has now been prepared for Seaburn to provide specific development guidance and planning principles for the Seaburn Promenade and Ocean Park areas of the Seafront Regeneration Strategy. The vision for Seaburn is for a family focused resort offering high quality indoor and outdoor facilities for both residents and visitors. Accordingly a leisure-led development is advocated, featuring a mix of uses that will be available all year round.

- 2.4 Based on an assessment of the Seaburn area; including consideration of the physical characteristics of the site, market conditions, land ownership and planning issues the masterplan concludes that the delivery of the vision for Seaburn will best be achieved by taking a comprehensive approach to development.
- 2.5 In line with this approach a series of character areas at Seaburn and broad principles for each are identified:
- Ocean Park is identified as a 'Leisure and entertainment core' which will be the heart of the masterplan area. A mix of tourism leisure-led uses will be encouraged which will be open during the day and into evening and will be available throughout the year. This area is to incorporate a pedestrian boulevard through the centre of the site and open plaza across Whitburn Road in order to maximise pedestrian movement through the area.
 - A low density residential development is directed towards a 'Residential Park' to the west of the area on vacant and underused land comprising the public car park and former miniature golf course. This development will serve as a transition between the 'Leisure and entertainment core' and existing areas of housing. A linear park through the residential area will link with the seafront area through a series of green routes. The quality of the new linear park will compensate for any loss of existing green space in the area.
 - Land to the south of the Masterplan area is identified as the 'Cut Throat Dene' character area and will incorporate the former boating lake and land to the south of Seafields. This area will be retained as open space; however will benefit from enhancements focused on improving the biodiversity value Seaburn. Measures will also encourage safe pedestrian and cycle routes and future proof against the impacts of climate change; particularly in relation to flood risk associated with Cut Throat Dene. The masterplan also identifies this area as a suitable site for a new equipped play area to replace the current Pirate Play Park.
 - The 'Seaburn Promenade' character area to the east and overlooking Whitburn Bay will be retained as promenade with the focus on protecting the panoramic views across the seafront. Interventions will primarily include upgrading of the public realm.
 - Existing businesses in the area to be retained as part of the masterplan include the Marriott Hotel, businesses at Queen's Parade, Martino's amusements and arcade and Morrisons supermarket. No redevelopment of these areas is proposed; however opportunities for enhancements to the public realm will be sought.
- 2.6 A design code for Seaburn has been prepared to accompany a spatial masterplan for the area to ensure the quality of proposals will reflect the Council's ambition for the site. The code will offer greater detail on the

urban design principles guiding the masterplan and will cover matters relating to: block principles, building height and density, gateways and landmarks, building types and frontages, street types, access arrangements; and landscape and public realm.

- 2.7 Copies of the Seaburn Masterplan and supporting documents (Appropriate Assessment Scoping Report for the Seaburn Masterplan and Sustainability Appraisal of the Seaburn Masterplan) are available in the Member's Library. The indicative masterplan drawing can be found attached in the appendices to this report.

3.0 Consultations on the draft Seaburn Masterplan and Design Code

- 3.1 Cabinet approved a draft Seaburn Masterplan and Design Code for the purposes of consultation at its October 2010 meeting. Subsequently, the document and accompanying Sustainability Appraisal and Appropriate Assessment were subject to a statutory public consultation between 19 October and 29 November 2010.

- 3.2 During this period all information relating to the consultation, including the draft Seaburn Masterplan and Design Code was made available online at www.sunderland.gov.uk/seaburn.

- 3.3 Letters were delivered to all households and businesses within the Seaburn study area and its immediate surroundings. The letter notified recipients of the consultation period and the online link to view the relevant documents.

- 3.4 A leaflet enclosed with every letter provided a summary of key proposals and invited recipients to view the main proposals plan at exhibitions displayed at the Sunderland Civic Centre 3rd floor reception, the City Library at Fawcett Street, Sunderland Aquatic Centre, Seaburn Centre, the Hetton Centre and Washington Leisure Centre. The leaflet notified that officers from the City Council would be on hand to discuss the proposals at:

- Seaburn Centre (26th October and 18th November)
- Sunderland Aquatic Centre (2nd November and 25th November)
- Hetton Centre (28th October and 8th November)
- Washington Leisure Centre (4th November and 16th November)
- Sunderland Civic Centre 3rd floor reception by appointment during normal office hours

- 3.5 Comments slips were also enclosed with every letter, which could be returned by freepost. Responses could also be made by email or by completing an online consultation form at www.sunderland.gov.uk/seaburn.

- 3.6 The relevant documents, summary leaflets and comments slips were available at all venues as well as all local libraries across the city.
- 3.7 Statutory and formal consultees including a range of businesses, organisations and other individuals were consulted by letter.

4.0 Consultation responses and changes to the development framework

- 4.1 In total 196 responses were received, 95 (52%) expressing support, 46 (25%) objecting, 42 (23%) expressing neither support or objection and 2 stating that they support some elements of the plan and object to others.
- 4.2 Sixteen responses were received from statutory and non-statutory consultees. These were generally supportive of the draft Seaburn masterplan and Design Code. Consideration of representations submitted by the Environment Agency, Natural England, Nexus, Homes and Communities Agency, Disability Alliance Sunderland and ONE North East have resulted in minor changes to sections of the masterplan and design code.
- 4.3 The itemised representations received, together with the City Council's response to them and details of any necessary changes can be found in the appendices of this report.

5.0 Key Consultation Issues

Although the majority of responses supported the proposals set out in the Seaburn masterplan, it is possible to identify a number of key areas of concern amongst those consulted. These were the identification of housing as a use to the west of the site, the future of the Seaburn Centre, the standard of toilet provision in the area and potential future problems with car parking. These issues are dealt with in more detail below.

5.1 Housing and loss of Green Space

The identification of housing as a potential use for land to the west of the masterplan study area caused concern as well as the resulting loss of open green space. In total 17 respondents expressed concern with this element of the plan.

5.2 Council response

The key aspiration for Seaburn largely supported by consultation response is a family focused resort offering high quality indoor and outdoor facilities which can be enjoyed all year round. In developing a masterplan for Seaburn which will deliver a successful leisure-led development a comprehensive approach has been taken to addressing fundamental issues in the area such as access, movement, building type and form, public realm and green space. There are a number of reasons for the

development of housing and for the development of this housing on some elements of green space as part of this comprehensive approach. These reasons are set out below.

5.3 a) Why housing?

The council is committed to delivering the vision for Seaburn. However it is recognised through market testing that to make a leisure-led scheme viable and to ensure the development has a sustainable mix of uses to ensure its long term success, it will be necessary to incorporate housing development into the scheme. Consequently the masterplan allows for the inclusion of housing in the form of apartments on upper floors above commercial uses within Ocean Park and family-sized higher value houses on land to the west of the masterplan area.

5.4 As well as viability considerations, the development of housing of this type would also play a role in addressing key housing supply and demand issues affecting the Seaburn area and Sunderland as a whole.

5.5 Research carried out as part of the 2010 Sunderland Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) has indicated that in North Sunderland there is pressure on the existing housing stock. Firstly, there is a limited availability of land for housing in the north area, which is a key constraint to development. Secondly, and more specifically for Fulwell ward within which Seaburn sits, demand exceeds supply for larger family homes and smaller 1 bedroom apartments. This trend is partly representative of the shortage of upper Council Tax band housing in Sunderland generally but also as a consequence of an aging population in Seaburn. Currently there is little purpose built accommodation for elderly people who wish to continue living in Seaburn and – as a result - many elderly households continue to live in large semi-detached or detached former family homes. The knock on effect of this has been to restrict further the availability of larger family-sized or upper council tax-band homes available. There is clearly a need to address both pressures in this instance.

5.6 This need to meet local demand is recognised in overarching strategic policy. Sunderland's Economic Masterplan, the Sunderland Strategy 2008-2025 and Housing Strategy for Sunderland set out a clear aspiration to improve the choice, type, location and price of housing, which meets the needs demands and aspirations of Sunderland's population and reverses the current trend of out migration. The emerging Core Strategy also recognises the need in particular to address issues in the North area, despite the shortfall of available land. In addition, policy H1 of the Unitary Development Plan seeks to promote housing where this maximises choice caters for reduced out migration and assists in the regeneration of existing residential areas.

- 5.7 In the context of the above evidence and policy, it is considered that the development of apartments as part of the scheme at Ocean Park could potentially provide suitable accommodation for elderly people who do not wish to move from the Seaburn area. For example extra care housing could be accommodated at Ocean Park and could help older households move out of larger family homes into accommodation specially designed to support independent living and well-being. Likewise the provision of new family sized, higher value dwellings on land to the west of the study area would play a role in easing the city wide under supply of higher value family homes and reduce pressure on the demand for existing stock.
- 5.8 **b) Why development on green space?**
In response to the above housing issues, the masterplan has introduced the opportunity to develop certain elements of housing on existing areas of green space within the Seaburn masterplan study area.
- 5.9 **Quality of green space**
Whilst the considerable amount of green space at Seaburn is clearly an asset to the Seaburn area, the council has identified that land to the west of the Morrison's and public car park including the former pitch and putt green is of poor quality. Given its proximity to existing residential areas, the masterplan identifies the site as potentially suitable for housing in future as part of the wider regeneration of the Seaburn Masterplan study area.
- 5.10 It has been identified that this green space to the west of the area does not function as intended and suffers from problems associated with under-use. The site is a somewhat isolated space away from the major areas of footfall and with no apparent use to draw people to the area. This gives rise to a 'backland' feel which is insecure and intimidating.
- 5.11 Northumbria Police have confirmed that whilst the Seaburn area does not suffer from particularly high levels of crime generally, the western side of the masterplan area around the former pitch and putt site does attract most anti-social behaviour. Site visits have also shown evidence of drinking and vandalism in the area. The City Council's parks services have also indicated that the pitch and putt area and the derelict worm garden have become maintenance liabilities due to the ongoing cost of replacing or repairing vandalised street furniture. It has become clear that these areas of green space are most in need of intervention.
- 5.12 **Planning policy including need to meet strategic issues (replacement of greenspace)**
The potential selective development of residential dwellings in the area of low quality amenity space to the west of the public car park is considered a potential solution to issues in the area as part of a wider masterplanning approach.

5.13 Whilst the land in question is allocated as open amenity space, any alternative development would therefore be considered as a departure from planning policy and would need to be referred to the Secretary of State. Furthermore, planning policies L1, L7 and B3 in the UDP make it clear that continuing provision of amenity open space will be a priority for the City. There is a general presumption to resist proposals which would result in the loss of amenity space - particularly in areas of deficiency, which would adversely affect open space areas or would detract from the character of the locality. However it is also the case that this approach needs to be balanced against the wider regeneration needs of the City.

5.14 **c) High quality design**

In the context described above it is considered that a carefully composed comprehensive approach in the Seaburn Masterplan provides a regeneration solution to the poorer quality areas of greenspace, and plays a role in meeting the wider strategic aims of the City through the provision of housing.

5.15 In setting out clear design parameters for a comprehensive approach to development, the masterplan seeks to tightly control how much open space is lost by setting out criteria requiring high levels of open space, larger size houses with large gardens or a landscaped setting. As a consequence, the council expects the number of houses thought to be appropriate for the site to be driven by these criteria. It is made very clear in the document and through the indicative layout that any scheme which is not well designed and proposes a significant loss of green space will not be permitted.

5.16 However in taking a comprehensive approach, the masterplan also takes steps to ensure that replacement areas of open space will be designed to the highest standard or be of superior quality to those areas of underused open space currently in place. The masterplan sets out design criteria for new open spaces to ensure that these new green spaces will be centrally located, incorporate new pedestrian routes and be well over-looked from surrounding buildings. Careful planting and landscaping to improve the quality of the open space further is also promoted. In addition to this, the masterplan sets out green space and biodiversity improvements for the area, which will be funded specifically from the proposed housing development.

5.17 **Seaburn Centre**

The indicative comprehensive masterplan shows the removal of the Seaburn Centre building. This caused concern among a number of respondents, mainly with regard to the future of the facilities and events that take place within the building. In total 22 respondents expressed concern with this element of the plan.

5.18 Council Response:

The Masterplan is clear in stating that the document represents a long term 10-15 year plan for Seaburn (although proposals may well come forward before then). As such there are no immediate plans to close the Seaburn Centre. The Seaburn Centre will continue to operate, providing leisure facilities to the surrounding areas.

5.19 Nevertheless it is considered that the Seaburn Centre building in its current form is somewhat underused, lacks architectural merit and adds very little aesthetic value to the seafront. The masterplan seeks to provide an attractive and coherent frontage along the seafront with Ocean Park, providing a gateway and focus point to the masterplan area. Currently the positioning and relationship of the Seaburn Centre with surrounding buildings contributes to a fragmented development. In addition, as a large building, the Seaburn Centre's location at the heart of the Ocean Park development site constrains opportunities for a comprehensive regeneration of the entire area.

5.20 However, it is also recognised that facilities within the building such as the Wellness Centre are valued by the local community. The Council will therefore seek to encourage any new developments to include appropriate sport and leisure provision as part of the wider redevelopment of the Seaburn masterplan area.

5.21 Toilets

A total of 16 respondees expressed concern over the quality, quantity and availability of toilets at Seaburn.

5.22 Council Response:

The Council recognises need for increased provision of toilets open all year round and for increased provision of accessible toilets.

5.23 An assessment of toilet provision at the seafront has been carried out and as a consequence a number of improvements are being planned including: the refurbishment of the Cat and Dog Steps toilet block; and new toilet facilities as part of the redevelopment of the Seaburn seating shelter which is identified in the masterplan.

5.24 The proposed redevelopment of the Seaburn Shelter on the promenade subject to offer and the grant of planning permission will incorporate new public toilets facilities, including disabled facilities and baby changing. The City Council is also seeking to incorporate Changing Places toilets, which provide additional features to standard disabled facilities, including more space for a disabled person and up to two carers, a privacy screen, hoist and height adjustable adult sized changing bench.

5.25 In future it is anticipated that the public toilets provided by the Council will be supplemented by additional customer toilets provided by private operators as new leisure proposals come forward at Ocean Park. The Council also will continue to provide temporary toilets during key events such as the Air Show to accommodate high numbers of visitors.

5.26 Parking

Parking problems relating to the increase in development were highlighted particularly due to the perceived removal of the public car park to the rear of the Seaburn Centre on the masterplan drawing. Impacts such as increased parking on residential streets surrounding Ocean Park were of particular concern. A total of 15 respondees expressed concern with this element of the plan.

5.27 Council Response:

When preparing the masterplan, car parking and congestion was a recognised constraint, particularly on event days such as the air show. The need to accommodate potentially significant numbers of car-borne visitors has influenced design considerations. However it has also been necessary to balance this with the aspiration to encourage alternative modes of transport and deliver an attractive seafront destination, which will not be dominated by swathes of surface car parking during off-peak times. Access and servicing is therefore dealt with in some detail in section 9.8 of the masterplan.

5.28 a) Public car parking

The masterplan is clear in stating that there is a need to provide sufficient public parking for those visiting the seafront and new facilities that will come forward. It is emphasised that throughout the development of the site, the council will ensure that appropriate levels of public car parking is provided at all times, either through the retention of existing parking spaces in the short term, or the construction of new public car parking facilities in the longer term as development proposals emerge.

5.29 As part of the comprehensive approach, the masterplan does indicate the re-location of the existing surface public car park. The relocation of public parking would enable the redevelopment of the land to the west of the masterplan zone as part of a coherent, landscaped linear park. Furthermore, to rationalise provision, it is envisaged that there may be scope to share public parking with commercial uses, particularly when the peak use times of these businesses differ (for example shops, open during the day may be able to share parking spaces with evening uses such as restaurants). This would ensure the efficient use of parking facilities and minimise the land given over to surface parking.

5.30 Specific numbers of public parking spaces are to be determined during the delivery stages of the masterplan.

5.31 b) Private Parking (non-residential)

It is acknowledged that the increase in development needs to provide for an appropriate level of parking. In all cases, new commercial developments at Seaburn will need to provide sufficient on-site parking to meet reasonable demands.

5.32 The masterplan requires that at the planning submission stages, developers will be expected to provide parking in line with provisions set out in Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 13: Transport. Where a developer proposes a lower provision of parking than that advocated in policy, the onus will be on the developer to demonstrate that the proposal provides appropriate parking provision.

5.33 As with public parking, the masterplan advocates the potential to rationalise parking numbers through the sharing of parking spaces by non-residential uses that operate at different times of the day/night. This approach seeks to ensure sufficient spaces are provided for the scale of development coming forward, yet minimises the amount of space devoted to car parking spaces.

5.34 c) Encouraging alternative modes and relieving congestion

Whilst the masterplan sets out a clear approach as to how appropriate levels of parking will be provided as development progresses, it is also necessary to minimise reliance on the car and encourage a modal shift towards more sustainable forms of transport. The masterplan proposes a number of measures to encourage this:

5.35 Improving cycle and pedestrian links

The aim to provide improved cycle and pedestrian links, which connect to existing pathways outside the masterplan area, is set out. Mechanisms for the delivery of these schemes through developer contributions towards public realm are set out in the document and will be developed further during the site disposal process

5.36 Cycle parking

The masterplan seeks to improve facilities for cyclists further by requiring that new developments provide a mix of short stay and long stay cycle parking facilities in addition to car parking.

5.37 Bus improvements

Whilst the provision of additional bus services is dependent upon independent operators, the Seaburn Masterplan and Design Code seeks to encourage public transport by requiring contributions to be sought from developers towards infrastructure such as bus stops and a seasonal shuttle bus service between Seaburn and the City Centre to supplement existing public transport.

- 5.38 To cater for the potential increase in numbers to the seafront the Seaburn Masterplan and Design Code acknowledges the need to ensure that roads will be able to accommodate potential increases in traffic. Therefore the masterplan indicates the reconfiguration of Lowry Road. This includes improving traffic junctions, improving the access to the Morrison's Foodstore, taking out tight bends and widening roads to better accommodate a potential increase in capacity. Details of the delivery of this through developer contributions are set out in the masterplan and will be developed further as development progresses.
- 5.39 The measures set out above are intended to reduce demand along the seafront itself (Whitburn Road) and allow for this section of road to be remodelled to make it easier for pedestrians to cross and create a more pleasant and relaxing environment
- 5.40 As set out in the masterplan, the City Council will seek to prepare an outline Travel Plan for Seaburn, which will set out the broad principals to be addressed through the redevelopment of the site. Developers will be expected to funding towards a travel plan coordinator and submit a robust travel plan in line with the principles set out in the Travel Plan.

6.0 Reasons for Decision

- 6.1 The adoption of the Seaburn Masterplan and Design Code as a Supplementary Planning Document will help facilitate the planning and regeneration of the Seaburn area in accordance with the aspirations of the Sunderland Strategy and overarching Seafront Regeneration Strategy. The masterplan and design code will be used by developers as a basis for preparing detailed proposals for this area of Seaburn and would be afforded weight as a material consideration when determining future planning applications.

7.0 Alternative Options

- 7.1 The alternative option is not to prepare a masterplan for Seaburn. The consequences of this would be not to have clear guidance on appropriate forms of development for Seaburn. This would weaken the council's ability to control the type of development and design quality at the seafront leaving the area to be developed on an ad-hoc basis. Not having an approved masterplan would result in a lower standard of development than would otherwise be achieved, failing to make the best use of Seaburn's potential as a main attraction in the City for residents visitors and investors

8.0 Recommendation

- 8.1 Committee is recommended to consider the amended Seaburn Masterplan and Design Code and refer its comments to Cabinet for consideration

9.0 Relevant consultations

- 9.1 Financial implications - there are no direct financial implications for the Council arising from the adoption of the amended Supplementary Planning Document.
- 9.2 Legal Implications - The adoption process for the Masterplan and Design Code has been carried out in accordance with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004. Following adoption as a Supplementary Planning Document, the Masterplan and Design Code will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications for new development in the Seaburn area."??

10.0 List of appendices

Appendix 1: Indicative Seaburn Masterplan drawing

Appendix 2: Schedule of representations received from statutory and formal stakeholders during public consultation and the City Council's response.

Appendix 3: Schedule of representations received from members of the public during the consultation and the City Council's response.

11.0 Background Papers

- a) Amended Seaburn Masterplan and Design Code Supplementary Planning Document, 2011
- b) Amended Seaburn Masterplan and Design Code Supplementary Planning Document Sustainability Appraisal Report, 2011
- c) Seaburn Masterplan and Design Code Supplementary Planning Document Task 1 Appropriate Assessment, Regulation 48 of the Conservation (Natural Habitats & c) Regulations 1994, 2009
- d) Schedule of representations received from statutory and formal stakeholders during public consultation and the City Council's response.
- e) Schedule of representations received from members of the public during the consultation and the City Council's response.

Seaburn Masterplan



Block A Residential

Block B Morrison's Foodstore

Block J Residential

Block C Leisure-led mixed use

Linear Park

Central Boulevard

Block E Leisure

Block K Residential

Block I Residential

Block D Leisure-led mixed use

Public Car Park

Cut Throat Dene

Linear Park

Block F Leisure-led mixed use

Dykelands Road

Block G Queens Parade Shops

Block H Marriot Hotel

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	Commission			
	Sunderland Civic Society	General Comments	Concerned over the loss of the Seaburn Centre. As a sports venue it is underused but it also plays a role in hosting other events such as fairs. The centre should therefore be enhanced.	<p>RESPONSE - It is acknowledged that the Seaburn centre provides facilities to the local community; However its, scale and central position means that potentially retaining the building could compromise the longer-term comprehensive regeneration plans for the area. In addition the building is considered to have very little architectural merit, adding little aesthetic value to the wider seafront.</p> <p>The Masterplan is a 10-15 year plan and therefore acknowledges that development proposals for Seaburn come forward the building in its current form could well disappear.</p> <p>However, it is acknowledged that facilities (such as the wellness centre) are valued by the local community, and the council would therefore welcome and encourage any new developments on the site to include such a facility within any future developments</p>
			Seaburn funfair site could be transformed into a major attraction. Suggested a Pirate theme Water Fun pool - A unique family attraction that could be linked to the Seaburn centre.	<p>RESPONSE - The vision of the Seaburn Masterplan ascertains that Seaburn will be a family friendly resort offering indoor and outdoor facilities all year round. Accordingly the indicative masterplan and design code identifies suitable land uses and establishes design criteria for the entire site. The suggested attraction could be compatible with the masterplan and design code. However the development of detailed proposals will be private sector-led. It would be inappropriate in this case for the masterplan to stipulate specific proposals and operational details of potential facilities</p>
			The area of the Burn behind Jet amusements could be a site for a major attraction e.g. Sealife centre – a marine conservation and educational resource rather than a zoo.	<p>RESPONSE - As above. The suggested site for a Sealife centre is also identified as Strategic Floodplain in the Sunderland Strategic Floodrisk Assessment 2010. The site is therefore unsuitable for major development and will be retained as open space in order to mitigate the impact of flooding and climate change.</p>
			Major attractions are needed	<p>RESPONSE - The masterplan identifies the Council's vision as to how development of leisure-led schemes at Seaburn may best be delivered. Proposals will be considered on their merits and in the context of the Masterplan and Design criteria for the site</p>
			Seaburn should include an adventure golf	<p>RESPONSE - The suggestion would be compatible with the uses identified in the Masterplan and Design Code. However the development of such attractions will be private sector-led. It would be inappropriate in this case for the masterplan to stipulate detailed proposals and operational details of potential facilities</p>
			Small street for a couple of small attractions is a dead loss Major attractions are required. There are too many restaurants	<p>RESPONSE - The Masterplan and design Code represents a vision for how the site should come forward. A key element of the Masterplan and design code is the creation of a 'multi-user boulevard through the centre of the Ocean Park site to aid increased movement through the area of both pedestrians and cyclists. This approach would also increase scope for an active frontage for leisure/commercial uses within the area Whilst providing guidance on building heights, scale and massing of new development the masterplan does not stipulate the detailed function and scale of potential proposals to be brought forward by the private sector. The City Council will work with developers and assess their proposals based on the planning and design criteria set out in the masterplan and Design Code</p>
			Residential Park would result in a loss of valuable parking for visitors (including coaches for match days/visitors to the World heritage site). It would also lose valuable land should a major attraction become available. The loss of the parking would impact upon events such	<p>RESPONSE - To make leisure led development viable, and to ensure any development has a sustainable mix of uses, there is a need to incorporate housing into the scheme. This approach has been supported through market testing and would also address</p>

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

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

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

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

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

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

Reference	Respondent	Objects/support	Description	Proposed Action
RSM1	Mr R Marsden	Non given	What are the plans for Seaburn Leisure Centre, which doesn't seem to be on plans	<p>RESPONSE - It is acknowledged that the Seaburn Centre provides facilities to the local community; However its scale and central position means that retaining the building could potentially compromise the longer-term comprehensive regeneration plans for the area. In addition the building is considered to have very little architectural merit, adding little aesthetic value to the wider seafront.</p> <p>The Masterplan is a 10-15 year plan and therefore acknowledges that as development proposals for Seaburn come forward, the building in its current form could well disappear.</p> <p>However, it is acknowledged that facilities (such as the wellness centre) are valued by the local community, and the council would therefore welcome and encourage any new developments on the site to include such a facility within future developments</p>
RSM2	Delny Fenis	Supports	More leisure facilities without signing expensive monthly contract.	<p>RESPONSE - Currently the council run leisure facilities within the Seaburn Centre and at the Aquatics Centre which offer the ability for residents to pay per visit (and at a discounted rate for those with a Sunderland Life Card). The objective of the Seaburn Masterplan and Design Code (MDC) is to facilitate private sector led redevelopment and as such whilst the council desires to ensure that facilities are inclusive to all, pricing strategies of privately operated facilities would be outside of the council's control.</p>
			A local swimming pool would generate massive interest to all ages.	<p>RESPONSE - The specified use is compatible with the acceptable land uses identified within the MDC (Use Class D2). Should a private developer propose to bring forward such a facility, proposals would need to be considered in the context of principles and parameters set out in the MDC as well as other relevant planning policy and guidance.</p>
RSM3	R Franklin	Object	No reasons given	<p>RESPONSE - Comment Noted</p>
RSM4	Mr Mrs Parkinson	Non given	More male and female toilets.	<p>RESPONSE - An assessment of toilet provision on the seafront has recently been undertaken by the council. The outcomes of this assessment resulted in a recognised need for toilets to be of a higher quality, open all year round and for increased provision of accessible toilets.</p> <p>As a consequence a number of measures are/have been undertaken to improve toilet provision on the seafront.</p> <p>The majority of toilets are now open all year round including winter months.</p> <p>Funding of £120,000 has also been secured for the proposed redevelopment of the toilets at Cat & Dog steps.</p> <p>Furthermore, the redeveloped Seaburn Shelter site will incorporate new accessible public toilets facilities.</p> <p>In addition as leisure proposals come forward customer toilets will be provided. Temporary toilets are also provided on key events days such as the Air Show to accommodate high level of visitors.</p>
			Bigger and more bins.	<p>RESPONSE - Seaburn promenade is currently the subject of public realm improvements including high quality litter bins. In addition the Seaburn MDC identifies that as further development comes forward a Litter Management Plan covering both events and daily requirements will be needed.</p>
			Leisure Centre – more seating/tables, a place for drinks when weather is bad. Where old fun fair located, convert to shrubs/flowers able to sit and have snacks/toilets.	<p>RESPONSE - The MDC recognises the importance of wet weather facilities i.e. cafes/restaurants particularly in the leisure and entertainment core (site of the existing vacant fairground). These are considered important in providing animation at the seafront.</p> <p>Whilst the MDC identifies the fairground site for redevelopment, in the short to medium term the council are looking for temporary uses for the site to maximise its potential. The masterplan promotes high quality public realm throughout Seaburn recognising its value in contributing to regeneration.</p>

RSM5	V Sharp	Supports	More car parking for residents on seafront – elderly like to drive to seafront for stroll but find parking difficult, maybe residents passes to show in windscreen.	RESPONSE - Chapter 9.8 Access and Servicing - the existing public car park located to the west of the site at the rear of the Seaburn Centre is to be relocated closer to the seafront (to the south of the proposed leisure and entertainment core). However, the council seeks to encourage visitors to the seafront and as a consequence at the present time does not propose to introduce parking charges.
RSM6	Mr G Young	Supports	Any development would be a great improvement to the seafront area, i.e. South Shields. More police to deter young boy racing drivers needed.	RESPONSE - Comment Noted RESPONSE - In order to calm traffic within the MDC area, a more pedestrian friendly environment will be created including the narrowing of carriageways along Whitburn Road, a shared surface plaza linking the Promenade with the leisure and entertainment core. This will require a new/widened vehicular route along the alignment of Lowry Road. The council has also introduced vehicle activated signs along Whitburn Road and Roker Terrace to raise speed awareness.
RSM7	Mr & Mrs J E Stewart	Supports	Seafront must be upgraded so at least on par with South Shields. The derelict fair land should be compulsory purchased and developed to provide a water world activity area to complement the Aquatics Centre. The skate park (if it stays) should be supervised and fenced in and locked after 9pm. Litter must be a priority. Wheelie bins should be banned from front of properties as look awful.	RESPONSE - Comment Noted RESPONSE - The council is actively seeking opportunities for temporary uses for the fairground site to maximise its potential as a prime seafront location. The MDC identifies the fairground site for a range of leisure-led uses. A water based activity centre may be compatible with these principles. However it is not the role of the MDC to prescribe specific uses for the site; but instead to provide broad parameters and principles to guide developers when preparing their proposals. Ultimately it is for developers to determine the exact nature of facilities to be provided. RESPONSE - The skate park will be retained as an important facility for younger people and it is anticipated that new residential dwellings within close proximity will provide a greater level of natural surveillance. RESPONSE - The council recognises the need for carefully planned refuse areas at both residential and commercial properties as part of the design process. The MDC requires servicing of commercial properties to be to the rear of developments, in the interests of minimising visual impacts. As part of applications for major development, applicants are required to submit refuse disposal details.
RSM8	Mr & Mrs A Peverley	Supports	How about indoor bowls at Seaburn Centre. How about using the empty fairground site for a cycle and skateboard area for the kids.	RESPONSE - With regards to the Seaburn Centre see response to RSM1. Indoor bowls may be considered a compatible leisure use. However it is not the role of the MDC to prescribe specific facilities for the site; but to provide parameters and principles to guide developers when preparing their proposals for the site. Ultimately it is for developers to determine the exact nature of facilities to be provided. RESPONSE - Whilst the council considers that the current provision of BMX/skateboard facilities is suitable for the areas needs, should a developer come forward with a cycle/skateboard proposal this would be considered on its individual merits and in the context of planning policy.
RSM9	Mr T Sheerin	Supports	Would welcome any improvements. Look at South Shields seafront – coloured paving, floral displays, performance area etc. The airshow is a chance to showcase the area and it has been wasted year on year. Seaburn Centre is embarrassment, shell with very little purpose.	RESPONSE - Comment Noted RESPONSE - Comment Noted, the inclusion of high quality public realm is a high priority in the MDC. RESPONSE - Comment Noted RESPONSE - With regards to the Seaburn Centre see main body of Cabinet Report.
RSM10	Alison Dorrian	Supports	Remove the amusement arcades and do something with the land where the fair is. Bring back the illuminations.	RESPONSE - The amusement arcades are in private ownership and provide a tourism based attraction. Consequently, the council will seek to work with arcade owners in seeking clarification on their longer term aspirations. Nevertheless, the MDC establishes a vision for a family friendly resort therefore the development of future arcades will need to be carefully considered. RESPONSE - Lighting and events are important to the regeneration of the seafront and this was recognised within the Seafront Regeneration Strategy. As part of the Sea Change funding received from CAFE new high quality lighting is being installed along Marine Walk.
RSM11	Watson	Supports	Disagrees with letter. Council have known for 20 years what this seafront needs. Why is it going to take another 15 years to get the seafront sorted? We need action now. Have a look at Hexham leisure facilities.	RESPONSE - Much of the development of Seaburn is private sector dependent whereby market conditions have an important influence. A timescale of 10 to 15 years is considered to be realistic given the complexities of the site and the need for high quality development

				capable of driving forward sustainable regeneration. This timeframe involves a phasing process where certain developments i.e. Seaburn Promenade improvements (currently on site) may be developed prior to larger schemes. Nevertheless this does not restrict the opportunity for development proposals to come forward before then. For example Seaburn and Roker public realm works are currently on site and work towards the re-development of Seaburn Shelter is well advanced.
RSM12	Joy Dagless	Supports	Supports but maintenance important. Continue to care for revamped environment around seafront including litter collectors in skate park.	RESPONSE - The council believes that proper maintenance of public realm is essential to ensure sustainability. Materials will therefore need to be durable particularly given local weather conditions. Proposals to develop management plans for a number of issues including litter will be developed.
RSM13	L Hetherington	Non given	10 years behind the times. Indoor children's play zone, crazy golf, boating lake, miniature railway, promenade, tractor train, landscaped park, open topped tram car Seaburn to Roker, ice rink, a large covered tea shop, would all go along way to attract visitors.	<p>RESPONSE - The council's vision for Seaburn is for a family friendly resort and therefore uses which support vision are likely to be looked upon favourably provided they comply with planning policy. A number of the uses suggested may be considered compatible but ultimately it is for developers to bring forward proposals for specific uses.</p> <p>Provision for snow/ice facility was set out within the Stadium Village Development Framework as part of a sports led development. Stadium Village is also considered a more sustainable location for such a facility by reason of its access to the city centre and close proximity to Tyne and Wear Metro system.</p> <p>The council recognises that local weather conditions enhance the need for indoor all year round attractions to ensure the MDC's success.</p> <p>Within chapter 9.9 of the MDC (Landscape and Public Realm) provision is made within the Linear Park for high quality durable play area with equipment for people of all ages including adults.</p>
RSM14	Mrs Mitchell	Objects	Concerned about parking. Street already experiences high volume of traffic and parking issues, especially at weekends. No details on proposals about parking provision for new facilities.	<p>RESPONSE - Car parking is a recognised constraint in the area and has influenced the MDC's design considerations. Chapter 9.8 (Access and Servicing) sets specific design standards to guide developers and decision makers in bringing forward development proposals.</p> <p>The council will seek to ensure suitable parking is provided both during and after the delivery of the MDC either through retaining existing parking in the short term, or the constructing replacement public parking in the long term.</p> <p>All new commercial developments at Seaburn will need to provide sufficient on-site parking to meet demands.</p> <p>The MDC requires additional parking associated with new commercial uses, to be accessible and in close proximity of the seafront. The MDC also identifies parking will be in locations that are not detrimental to the area's visual character.</p> <p>In reducing congestion, the council proposes to improve the Lowry Road link with Whitburn Road, through improving the access to Morrison's and taking out tight bends and widening roads to increase capacity reducing demand along Whitburn Road. Through remodelling of Whitburn Road a more pedestrian friendly environment will be created.</p> <p>The council consistently aims to promote higher levels of sustainability i.e. public transport which is integral to the MDC. Consequently both primary and secondary routes will have the ability to be adopted as bus routes.</p> <p>Whilst the provision of additional bus services is dependent upon independent operators, the MDC seeks to improve public transport by securing contributions from developers towards infrastructure such as bus stops and a seasonal shuttle bus service between Seaburn and the City Centre to supplement existing public transport.</p>
RSM15	Sonia Spence	Not sure	Unsure of whether supports proposals, as very different to what have previously seen.	RESPONSE - Comment Noted
RSM16	Margaret Miller	Supports	Appears a vast improvement on current development and amenities.	RESPONSE - Comment Noted

			Action and development is required. A fifteen year timescale is far too long. Seaburn needs development now.	RESPONSE - Comment Noted see response to RSM11.
RSM17	Ms C Fletcher	Objects	Object to the building housing on car parks. Hoped for increase in parking as improvement seafront facilities would require. Housing will not attract visitors. The "upgraded green spaces" is only land that would have been suggested for more housing if not flood risk. Strongly object to housing.	RESPONSE - See main body of Cabinet report for information on housing.
RSM18	No name given	Objects	Ridiculous a no go area for the elderly.	RESPONSE - The intention of the MDC is to develop Seaburn as an area providing leisure uses for people of all ages including the elderly. Consequently natural surveillance through providing active frontages along all routes is a key principle. Lighting is also vital in deterring anti-social behaviour and stimulating an evening economy.
RSM19	Fitzsimmons	Objects	More housing is not the solution.	RESPONSE - See main body of Cabinet report for information on housing. Whilst it is accepted that Seaburn extends beyond the northern boundary of the masterplan the area contained within the boundaries of the framework is considered to be the focus for regeneration with the areas to the north primarily consisting of existing high quality residential housing and large areas of open space.
			Seaburn does not stop at Morrisons.	RESPONSE - Whilst it is accepted that Seaburn extends beyond the northern boundary of the masterplan the area contained within the boundaries of the framework is considered to be the focus for regeneration with the areas to the north primarily consisting of existing high quality residential housing and large areas of open space.
			The leisure centre is totally under used no need for more.	RESPONSE - See main body of Cabinet Report in relation to Seaburn Centre.
RSM20	Mr D M Caslan	Supports	Hopefully architecture of 'public space improvements'/ street furniture traditional not trendy chrome abstract features i.e. Sunnyside. Follow South Tyneside's example in this regard.	RESPONSE - Section 9.9 of the MDC identifies street furniture/hard and soft landscaping as important to creating a sense of place throughout Seaburn. This must conform to quality expected from the rest of the MDC paying due regard to contextual setting.
			For future consider sea front to St Peter's Metro station, a tram system (like Blackpool's) linked to South Shields.	RESPONSE - The provision of public transport facilities and therefore improving access to the seafront from other parts of the city is a primary objective of the masterplan. Indeed provision is made for the encouragement of increased bus service provision. However, the provision of a tram system would require resources unavailable to the council at the present time.
RSM21	Mr N Thursby	Supports	Put traffic lights at one entrance to South Bents estate.	RESPONSE - The South Bents estate is outside the boundaries of the MDC. Traffic flows/safety will be monitored with appropriate measures taken where necessary.
RSM22	Mr Marshall	Supports	No reasons given.	RESPONSE - Noted
RSM23	Martin Ronson	Objects	The plans only outline new housing as a definite proposal. Every other plan is a refurb or unknown. An unknown plan without details.	RESPONSE - The MDC guides the proper planning of Seaburn through providing broad development parameters which reflect constraints and opportunities. The MDC's success requires private sector investment. In order to provide conditions which encourage growth the MDC is not overly prescriptive, enabling flexibility of nature/location of proposed uses.
RSM24	Ian Ellis	Supports	Integrated approach to park, promenade and seafront is essential. Natural asset to city, future development should be sustainable.	RESPONSE - Comment Noted
			Will it all stall in the current financial climate?	RESPONSE - With regards to timescales see response to RSM11.
RSM25	Mrs J Pratt	Supports	Excellent, but needed urgently. Shelter is not very pleasant, but is only shelter.	RESPONSE - For timeframe/market conditions see RSM11. For indoor facilities see RSM13.
RSM26	Occupier of 53 North Guards, Whitburn, Sunderland.	Letter - Supports	What about handicapped and wheelbound people. In 2/3 mile stretch, 5 disabled parking spaces (South Shields 3x no. disabled spaces).	AMEND - Disabled access is critical to MDC. The need to ensure that footpaths and areas of public realm are suitable for those with limited mobility has been included in section 9.9. Parking standards will ensure that sufficient disabled parking spaces will be provided at the planning application stages.
RSM27	Ron Middleton	Support	Supports proposals. Would like covered promenade i.e. South Shields, create all weather facility. If cash not available, should be considered when economy upturns.	RESPONSE - Comment Noted Public realm works will be continued through the delivery of the MDC with financial contributions sought from major developments. Scale of development will impact on contributions made in turn impact on nature of public realm improvements. A covered promenade has not been considered at present.
RSM28	William Nesbitt	Supports	(i)There are a few assets needed at Seaburn. Ice rink, roller skate, skate board park.	RESPONSE - The MDC will support proposals which contribute to the vision for Seaburn as a family friendly resort. However, the facilities suggested need to be considered in relation to planning policy particularly impacts on the vitality of the city centre. Furthermore, Stadium Village has been identified as regeneration area focused on sport/leisure, which may be more suitable for the suggested facilities. Ultimately it is for the developer to

				propose specific uses.
			(ii)Artificial palm trees along sea front.	RESPONSE – Species need to be appropriate to context/climate.
			(iii)A large bad weather shelter.	RESPONSE – Wet weather facilities important to MDC success see RSM13.
			(iv)A permanent fairground.	RESPONSE – Should a developer come forward with proposals for such a scheme this would be considered on its merits.
			(v)A large restaurant.	RESPONSE – Refreshment facilities are important. Seaburn Shelter site/leisure & entertainment core identifies café/restaurant as suitable use.
			(vii)Coloured seats along the prom, windmill or coloured light globe on top of the roundabout.	RESPONSE – Public realm is important to MDC. However, features need careful consideration, easily maintainable and are able contribute to wider regeneration of seafront.
RSM29	The Occupier	Supports	Workmanship must be good quality.	RESPONSE – The council will ensure materials/construction is high quality and sustainable this will be set out further as design proposals brought forward.
RSM30	Valerie Hughes	Supports	What about toilets.	RESPONSE – With main body of Cabinet Report for information on toilets.
			What about indoor playing area for children.	RESPONSE – See response to RSM13 for information on indoor facilities.
RSM31	Mr & Mrs N Moxey	Supports	There is a need for the actual seafront to be improved seating, floral beds.	RESPONSE – Please see response to RSM20 info on public realm.
			Good toilets	RESPONSE – With regards to toilet provision see main body of Cabinet Report.
			Refreshment bars.	RESPONSE – See response to RSM 28 for information on refreshments.
			The empty fairground needs to be put to good use.	RESPONSE – See RSM4 for information on fairground.
RSM32	Mrs M Ashcroft	Supports	Support proposals would have preferred more specific plans.	RESPONSE – Comment Noted
			At previous consultation stage was informed that research had identified need for 'higher end' housing so hope this will be implemented i.e. would not support apartments/flats or developers trying to cram in as many units as possible with consequent car parking/traffic issues.	RESPONSE – See main body of Cabinet report for information on housing.
			Good quality restaurant on shelter site good. High quality frontage important along coastal route.	RESPONSE – Comment Noted
RSM33	Mr C Lee	Supports	Seats face out to sea on promenade opposite Seaburn hotel, look to South Shields.	RESPONSE – Seaburn public realm improvements phase 1 incorporates granite steps along lower promenade enabling people sit down looking out to sea. Additional seats being installed facing sea on upper promenade. Recognised that seating along the sea wall faces away from the sea. However, physically unachievable for these seats to face the sea due to the location of the promenade in relation to the sea defences.
RSM34	No name supplied	Objects	Need facilities to attract people back to Seaburn i.e. fairground, toilet facilities, stalls, kiosks selling fish & chips, toys, candy floss etc. Public realm waste of money.	RESPONSE – The vision of the MDC is to strengthen Seaburn's role as a family friendly resort and as such facilities which support this are likely to be compatible. Ultimately it is not the role of the MDC to propose specific uses (rather the role of private developers). See main body of Cabinet Report for information on toilet provision.
			Make more use of the Seaburn Centre.	RESPONSE – See main body of Cabinet Report for info on Seaburn Centre.
RSM35	Hazel Shoulin	Supports	No reasons given.	RESPONSE –Noted
RSM36	David Shoulin	Supports	No reasons given	RESPONSE –Noted
RSM37	George Armbruster	Objects	View of participants during initial consultation for more attractions i.e. South Shields. Against more housing.	RESPONSE –See main body of Cabinet Report for information on housing.
RSM38	No name given	Supports	Palm trees/better weather.	RESPONSE –Comment Noted
RSM39	Ron Mcquillan	Objects	Millions wasted on the cross town intercept sewer, the beach is still polluted. Enhanced riverside could be inexpensively achieved with free rocks, boulders and bricks to form a barrage to high tide level, thereby reinstating the natural level of the river bed obviating river bank erosion and silt.	RESPONSE –It is important to note that the River Wear falls outside of the boundaries of the MDC and as such does not form part of any proposals. The beach is regularly monitored for pollution by Environmental Health. The purpose of the MDC is to set out guidance relating to planning and design and not to assess pollution within the sea.
RSM40	Ian Richardson	Letter- Supports	Commend safe approach to development. Lack of flagship development is a worry, as area will offer very little that is different to the current seafront. Forward thinking approach introduce focal point, set the area apart from its local competitors. Please make the most of our natural resources and develop something that can harness it.	RESPONSE –The vision for Seaburn is as a family friendly resort offering high quality all year round facilities. It is not considered that Seaburn would support a seafront related regional attraction, given the presence of established facilities including the already successful South Shields resort, Wet & Wild at Royal Quays and Blue Reef Aquarium in Whitley Bay. Leisure operators for larger scale developments in Sunderland are primarily

				considering sites closer to city centre. Demand exists for local scale facilities, which would can draw sufficient trade from visitors/residents.
			Leisure/entertainment core – Hopefully mixed use bars, restaurants, hotels, cafes and shops. What guarantee of custom?	RESPONSE –Custom can never be guaranteed, but seafront attracts large number of visitors throughout the year. Genuine interest has also been shown from a number of developers for commercial development in and around Seaburn. The council recognises the need to preserve/enhance range of existing businesses and services on offer, and ensure longevity of businesses. As new developments come forward will need to provide flexible floorplates/shopfronts to reduce vacancy levels.
			Will transport links be improved?	RESPONSE –With regards to transport see response to RSM14.
			Will there be a spread of entertainment to cover multiple age ranges? Will the development provide a high level of cover from the elements to allow for a pleasant experience?	RESPONSE –The central vision for Seaburn objective of developing Seaburn is to provide a family focused resort catering for people of all ages throughout the year with indoor and outdoor attractions.
			Residential park – Will there be affordable housing/first time buyer properties? Will the park be open and well lit – safety, will allow for a cohesive blend linking areas 1,2,3.	RESPONSE – The masterplan document sets out that all new developments of over 15 dwellings will be required to deliver 10% affordable housing. It is likely that this would be delivered offsite, however, with a tenure split of 75% social rented and 25% intermediate.
			Modern play area – Herrington Park good model – area designed specifically for younger kids but also BMX/skate for teens.	RESPONSE – As part of the MDC, modern play facilities are proposed at the southern end of the Linear Park adjacent to Roker Burn. The council aims to provide facilities through developer agreements or planning obligations from other developments throughout Seaburn. Facilities will be expected to meet national Play Pathfinder Standards.
RSM41	Vincent T Wright	Supports	Comprehensive, far reaching and ambitious plan should significantly improve important sea front area, provide area be proud of, and one that will benefit the local and wider community and also visitors.	RESPONSE – Comment Noted
RSM42	Dorothy Davison	Not given	Disappointed about inclusion of more housing.	RESPONSE –See main body of Cabinet Report for information on housing.
			Problems with litter, huge clean up needed. Playing fields littered with bottles and rubbish. Hope upgrading Dene will include clean up/ improvement of path. On the stop fines should be used, similar to dog fouling.	RESPONSE –With regards to litter please see response to RSM4.
			Do not spoil the seafront through cheap amusements, quality needed, somewhere for young families when poor weather.	RESPONSE – The objective of the MDC is to provide a family focused resort incorporating high quality all year round indoor and outdoor facilities. Careful consideration will be given to uses and their ability to contribute to regeneration.
RSM43	Mr H Smithson	Supports	Agree with proposal don't pull down Seaburn Centre.	RESPONSE – See main body of Cabinet Report for information on Seaburn Centre.
			Use open space for bands etc to bring people into area.	RESPONSE – The Central Gateway at the end of the proposed boulevard linking the leisure and entertainment core with the seafront will act as a focus for smaller scale events including music.
			Provide better toilets.	RESPONSE – See main body of Cabinet Report for information on toilet provision.
			Upgrade shelters along prom.	RESPONSE – Comment Noted.
			A much better area for children similar to park in South Shields.	RESPONSE – Comment Noted
			More sales units along prom area.	RESPONSE – Provision is made for ancillary retail facilities as part of the redevelopment of the Seaburn Shelter.
RSM44	Mr P Durham	Supports	The draft Seaburn masterplan looks fine in its current proposal.	RESPONSE – Comment Noted
			Leisure & entertainment core, total resistance to late licences, including special hours certificates or night club licences.	RESPONSE – In complying with planning policy evening uses will need to respect residential amenity of nearby residents. If a use is considered likely to cause excess noise & disturbance to residents it would not be looked upon favourably.
			More attention also for daytime activities for children aged between 3 and 7 years.	RESPONSE – A key objective for Seaburn is the creation of a family focused resort, which includes children of all ages.
RSM45	Ann Blakelock	Non given	We need a small bathing pool at Seaburn for under 5's to learn about swimming with their parents.	RESPONSE – A small bathing pool may be considered compatible. However it is not the role of the MDC to prescribe specific facilities for the site; but to provide parameters and principles to guide developers when preparing their proposals for the site.
RSM46	Forster	Non given	About time	RESPONSE – Comment Noted

Appendix 3 - Schedule of representations received from members of the public

RSM47	Nicky Aslam	Non given	Sunderland needs a big change for a better future. More shops.	RESPONSE – Comment Noted
RSM48	J Rochester	Non given	Build small leisure centre for young people to use wet weather.	RESPONSE – With regards to wet weather facilities see response to RSM13
RSM49	K M Conlon	Non given	Need to keep people in Seaburn all year round.	RESPONSE – Comment Noted
RSM50	Non given	Non given	About time	RESPONSE – Comment Noted
RSM51	Maureen Cummings	Non given	There's more things to do on computer and it's all helpful.	RESPONSE – Comment Noted
RSM52	JH	Non given	All the benches should be facing the beach not the traffic.	RESPONSE – With regards to seats facing the sea see response to RSM33.
			Money spent on pier gates should have been spent elsewhere, gates only keep people out as far as pier concerned.	RESPONSE – The pier gates are not located within the boundaries of Seaburn MDC, please see Seafront Regeneration Strategy for further information.
RSM53	Brian Barry	Supports	Roker and Seaburn make a very attractive seafront and walk. Need to take note of South Shields. Everything from Dykelands Road to the north (excl Morrisons) should be demolished and sensible shops and cafes built.	RESPONSE – Comment Noted
			Need fairground for kids.	RESPONSE – With regards to providing a fairground see response to RSM28 (iv).
RSM54	Non given	Supports	Illuminations back, events weekends – fairgrounds, music, military displays, markets, car boot.	RESPONSE – With regards to lighting and events please see response to RSM10.
RSM55	J Watts	Objects	Sunderland Council could spend £1bn on project and make a mess of it.	RESPONSE – Comment Noted
RSM56	Lyn Chapman	Non given	Display in library had no key or arrows to link visuals to map.	RESPONSE – Comment Noted
RSM57	Les Crago	Objects	Waste of money. Real investment on seafront please.	RESPONSE – Comment Noted
RSM58	Visitor to Sunderland	Non given	Nothing at sea front. Airshow same every year. Nothing to do, no bucket & spade shops, we need something.	RESPONSE – Vision of MDC to build on Seaburn's unique natural environment and rich heritage through the creation of a family focused resort. It is recognised all year round amenities and facilities are needed which attract people of all ages. Leisure and entertainment uses of a suitable scale are promoted in the MDC.
RSM59	Non given	Non given	Give us back our seafront of 1950-1965.	RESPONSE – Seaburn is recognised as having a rich cultural heritage and whilst the MDC seeks to preserve and enhance this, the council's vision is to return the area to a level of vibrancy previously enjoyed through the provision of modern facilities and amenities fit for 21 st century.
RSM60	Mr J Jameson	Non given	Seats face wrong way. Put seats back along prom near lost children's post, they looked out to sea. Older people cannot be expected to sit on tiered concrete steps.	RESPONSE – With regards to seating facing the sea please see response to RSM33.
			Sheltered parts needed to protect from wind and rain, sudden showers.	RESPONSE – With regards to all weather facilities please see response to RSM13.
RSM61	Non given	Non given	A complete waste of money and resources.	RESPONSE – Comment Noted
RSM62	E Annowl	Supports	Essential if Sunderland not to be shamed by South Shields.	RESPONSE – Comment Noted
RSM63	M Cooke	Non given	No mention of improving Roker.	RESPONSE – The regeneration of Roker is set out in the Marine Walk Masterplan adopted in 2009. The purpose of the Seaburn MDC is to focus on Seaburn specifically.
			Too many properties have been allowed to be converted into multi-flats for students.	RESPONSE – New proposals for houses in multi-occupation (Use Class C4) are considered to be inappropriate within the MDC area and will be resisted.
RSM64	A Dawns	Supports	About time Seaburn improved beautiful coast but nothing to do. Don't let the residents pull the plug on it.	RESPONSE – Comment Noted
RSM65	Julie Foskett	Supports	Focus of seafront should be for 'relaxed leisure and sport.' Lots of green areas with new child park facilities at marina, seafront and Seaburn areas.	RESPONSE – The vision for Seaburn is to provide a family focused resort with high quality indoor and outdoor attractions which may include a range in provision of sports and leisure facilities. This also includes areas of open space for recreation. This is considered important in promoting a healthy environment amongst local residents.
			New toilets.	RESPONSE – See main body of Cabinet Report for information on toilet provision.
			Some paved areas with family restaurants, good lighting, security.	RESPONSE – Food and drink uses form an important part in the providing facilities required by the MDC. The leisure and entertainment core will form the heart of the wider MDC and will be the focus for many of these facilities. At the centre of this core will be an open plaza with high quality public realm including lighting, street furniture, surface materials and planting wherever possible.
			Do not want late night bars and clubs.	RESPONSE – See response to RSM44.
RSM66	Angela Barr	Supports	What's new? Why can't we have a scaled model to see what the development will actually look like. Suspect these have already been given the go-ahead.	RESPONSE – The purpose of the public consultation of the draft MDC is to generate input and response from the public and statutory consultees in order that they are able to influence the outcome of the final document including suggesting changes where

				necessary and relevant.
RSM67	Non given	Non given	Do something with the Vaux site. Stop wasting money on spin, £5mn spent on this what a waste. Holmeside Triangle – what a laugh. Arc another waste.	RESPONSE – All sites mentioned lie outside of the boundaries of the MDC and will be/have been covered under other regeneration documents.
RSM68	T Todd	Non given	Sunderland needs an iconic leisure amenity/concert venue for live events and music. It will attract thousands of people to Sunderland.	RESPONSE – The Stadium of Light has successfully held a number of pop concerts for major bands i.e. Take That. However, should a private developer come forward with such proposals at the seafront this would need to be considered on its merits in relation to relevant planning policy particularly impacts on the vitality of the city centre.
RSM69	Non given	Non given	Good idea, but will Seafields estate like having houses so near them.	RESPONSE – See main body of Cabinet Report for information on housing.
RSM70	J Walton	Non given	It looks as though you are getting rid of the kiosk near Seaburn Camp on the prom so everybody along that end will have to get refreshments in Little Italy.	RESPONSE – Refreshment facilities are considered important in attracting people to the seafront particularly along the promenade, resulting in a development brief being prepared for Seaburn Shelter for a café/restaurant. Food and drink uses are also appropriate within the leisure and entertainment core.
RSM71	Non given	Non given	Look to South Shields/Cornwall. Families need wet weather facilities.	RESPONSE – Comment Noted
RSM72	B Duncan	Non given	Is there no limit to the amount of cash that can be spent (wasted).	RESPONSE – Comment Noted
RSM73	Oswald & Dorothy Mussa	Non given	New seats along promenade facing the sea – senior citizens would appreciate seats facing the sea close to beach.	RESPONSE – With regards to seats facing the sea please see response to RSM33.
RSM74	Brain Robson	Objects	Whilst glad the council is getting round to this at last, the draft proposals really are about managing decline – reducing the amount of space available now in future for leisure use, and introducing more housing. What’s required is bigger thinking, this isn’t it.	RESPONSE – The MDC has been prepared as a ambitious yet realistic and deliverable document with the objective of providing a family focused resort offering high quality indoor and outdoor attractions.
			Think creatively about traffic re-route along Lowry Way to create pedestrianised use between Dykelands Road and Morrisons.	RESPONSE – Traffic is an important consideration in the MDC. As part of the proposals, the council intends that whilst Whitburn Road will remain the primary coastal route, works will be undertaken to reduce the dominance of vehicles and improve pedestrian flow through a reduction in width of the carriageway. Furthermore, a new route will be created through the middle of the development site following the alignment of Lowry Road dividing the leisure and entertainment core to the east and residential park to the west.
RSM75	John McCaig	Objects	Nothing more than income generation for the council.	RESPONSE –Comment Noted
			Where are the facilities on offer at the Seaburn Centre going? Used by local residents needs updating and expanding.	RESPONSE –See main body of Cabinet Report for information on Seaburn Centre.
RSM76	Kevin Robson	Supports	Non given	RESPONSE –Noted
RSM77	Bobby Saftoe	Non given	Bring back the little train and the fun fair.	RESPONSE –The council will support uses that contribute to the vision of Seaburn as a family focused resort. The use suggested may be compatible with these principles. However, it is for the private developer to propose specific uses.
RSM78	Non given	Non given	Hardly South Shields or Blackpool. It’s a drop in the ocean.	RESPONSE –Comment Noted
RSM79	V Stirling	Supports	Non given	RESPONSE – Noted
RSM80	D Winter	Non given	I care nothing for any proposals unless the first priority is complete update of toilet facilities which are dreadful.	RESPONSE – See main body of Cabinet Report for information on toilet provision.
			Try looking at South Shields and follow their example.	RESPONSE – Comment Noted
RSM81	Mrs O Acklam	Non given	Parking should be readily available and not curtailed.	RESPONSE – See main body of Cabinet Report for information on parking.
			Extra housing of good quality ok not scattered haphazardly around existing car parks.	RESPONSE – See main body of Cabinet Report for information on housing.
			Reasonable entertainment should be available i.e. boating pool/children’s train. Changing facilities needed for surfers. How about a helter skelter etc to draw peoples attention.	RESPONSE – Entertainment facilities are important to the success of the MDC in fulfilling the council’s objective for Seaburn as a family focused resort. Should a private developer bring forward such proposals they will be considered on their own merits.
			More toilet facilities.	RESPONSE – See main body of Cabinet Report for information on toilet provision.
			Wider/varied uses for Seaburn Centre and regular catering for events/groups.	RESPONSE – See main body of Cabinet Report for information on Seaburn Centre.
			More events – e.g. Remembrance Day	RESPONSE – As part of the council’s commitment to improving the profile of the seafront, it is actively seeking to build upon Seaburn’s success as an events destination by expanding the events calendar for the area.
RSM82	R J Hutchinson	Supports	Great plan start now or funding will disappear if it hasn’t already.	RESPONSE – Comment Noted

RSM83	George Maw	Supports	Before further development commences: 1. Replace fencing around recreation park with steel to avoid regular damage by kids who will not use gates provided.	RESPONSE – The recreation park is outside of the boundaries of the MDC. Improvements to Recreation Park are addressed within the Seafront Regeneration Strategy.
			2. Fence to be extended around grassed area west of Martino's to prevent ingress of so called travellers and horses – numbers increasing yearly.	RESPONSE – The council has enforcement powers to control the unauthorised pitching of gypsy and traveller camps.
			3. Reintroduce park wardens to parks such as Roker to allow for safe access for families. Ensure finance for regular policing, extended seasons, beach cleaners, full time litter and fouling wardens for seafront. Scale back licensing for tables and chairs on public footpaths – think about disabled!	RESPONSE – Whilst Roker Park is outside of the remit of the MDC, a management plan is proposed to ensure that all aspects of maintenance of the wider seafront are taken into due consideration. Matters such as litter and events will also be covered in relevant management plans.
			4. Quality of granite seating – what about protection against skateboard damage.	RESPONSE – Granite seating has been chosen as a hard wearing yet high quality material that is durable in form and can withstand impact.
RSM84	Mr & Mrs T R Hughes	Non given	Take amusements away from seafront as they attract undesirables at night. Look to South Shields. Not have many hot days and if people come here there is not much to do and it is not all parents that want to take their children to amusement arcades.	RESPONSE – With regards to amusement arcades please see response to RSM10.
RSM85	J A Wright	Supports	Facilities on beach i.e. climbing frames	RESPONSE – Comment noted
			More parking areas or better transport, stop off street parking, consider residents.	RESPONSE – See main body of Cabinet Report for information on parking/transport.
			A decent fair, swimming pool.	RESPONSE – See response to RSM2 in relation to a swimming pool.
RSM86	A Sheriff	Supports	Better cycle access over Roker ravine bridge possible cycle bridge.	RESPONSE – Roker Ravine bridge falls outside of the boundaries of the MDC and is addressed in the Marine Walk Masterplan.
RSM87	J M Lennox	Supports	Better parking facilities	RESPONSE – See main body of Cabinet Report for information on parking.
			Cleaner toilet facilities	RESPONSE – See main body of Cabinet Report for information on toilet provision.
			An all year leisure complex for the people of the city to attract families and tourists alike. Complex would be inclusive to all - amateur theatre, sports facility, families.	RESPONSE – Providing all year round leisure facilities is key to the MDC's success. The uses suggested may be compatible. However, it is the role of the developer to detail specific uses for proposed schemes.
RSM88	Mr Robert H Robson	Non given	Need leisure activity centre including swimming pool/leisure pool for those rainy days also sauna, solarium, massage in Seaburn Centre.	RESPONSE – For swimming pool provision see response to RSM2. See main body of Cabinet Report for information on the Seaburn Centre.
			Fairground could be covered over used for indoor activities e.g. golf.	RESPONSE – See response to RSM4 in relation to the fairground site.
RSM89	Jill Lambley	Supports	Extend Seaburn Centre - pool/ice rink for all year and weather uses.	RESPONSE – See main body of Cabinet Report for information on Seaburn Centre.
			More & upgraded toilet facilities	RESPONSE – See main body of Cabinet Report for information on toilet provision.
			Ice cream parlour with seated area	RESPONSE – Refreshment facilities are considered important in attracting people to the seafront particularly along the promenade, resulting in a development brief being prepared for Seaburn Shelter for a café/restaurant. Food and drink uses are also appropriate within the leisure and entertainment core.
			More floral beds on the seafront.	RESPONSE – See response to RSM20 in relation to public realm.
RSM90	Mr & Mrs I Ainsley	Objects	As we understand numbers 1, 3, 4 and 5 on leaflet are fine and needed.	RESPONSE – Comment Noted
			Number 2 residential park is absolutely awful.	RESPONSE – See main body of Cabinet Report for information on housing.
			It will infringe on our green belt, an area for walking and enjoying the wildlife. A lot of dog walking takes place there it just needs tidying properly.	RESPONSE – Soft landscaping is crucial to the success of the MDC, resulting in proposals for a linear park which will act as a primary open space providing a coherent green link and an ecological corridor allowing for the expansion of existing habitats/creation new habitats. Cut Throat Dene is recognised as an important ecological resource and as such will be preserved enhanced as an urban meadow.
RSM91	Kamla Pannu	Supports	Facilities for all age groups.	RESPONSE –Comment Noted
			Elderly need somewhere to relax with over a cup of tea.	RESPONSE – For refreshment provision see response to RSM89.
			Direct buses from Washington to Seaburn, currently not visit as requires 2 buses or bus/metro.	RESPONSE – With regards to public transport provision please see response to RSM85.
RSM92	C Spence	Supports	More parking would attract visitors as currently limited.	RESPONSE – See main body of Cabinet Report for information on parking.
			Hope current access to Morrison's will be retained.	RESPONSE – The existing access to Morrison's will be retained.
RSM93	No name given	Objects	Look after existing assets before building new schemes. Repair roads; clean pavements in the town rather constantly replacing them. Stop the spending spree.	RESPONSE – As referenced within the council's Seafront Regeneration Strategy, an attractive seafront with a variety of leisure opportunities within close proximity is a unique selling point to Sunderland and will assist the delivery of major projects within the city through providing a high quality of life pulling in new residents and businesses. The value of coastal tourism is estimated to be worth £400-450m to the north east (over 20% of the

				value of tourism to the region as a whole). Consequently the importance of the seafront to the city's economy should not be underestimated and forms a crucial element of providing a sustainable future for Sunderland. Furthermore, the majority of development within Seaburn is expected to be private sector led with financial contributions being sought towards improving and maintaining local infrastructure.
RSM94	No name given	Supports	Hopefully the skateboarding park will be demolished as I cannot imagine anyone wanting to buy a home next to a litter ridden, gang attraction where fences are vandalised, and people feel intimidated (an utter eyesore).	RESPONSE – The skate park provides an important recreational facility within the city and as such there are no plans for its demolition. However, it is recognised that residential layouts will need careful consideration in relation to the siting of the existing skate park. The presence of nearby residential properties may reduce levels of antisocial behaviour through improved natural surveillance.
RSM95	Andrew Mould	Supports	I am looking at starting my own business in the Seaburn area and think Seaburn needs a big revamp to bring it to life. Interested in unit on the seafront as a surf school, Sunderland needs one.	RESPONSE – Comment Noted – no contact details provided
RSM96	Graeme Howe	Non given	What leisure entertainments to feature in core? Need covered in facilities to include swimming pool, bowling greens to attract elderly, interactive state of the art areas, cafes.	RESPONSE – Appropriate uses for the leisure and entertainment core include food and drink (A3 and A4), leisure (D2), non-residential institutions i.e. museums/galleries (D1), hotels (C1), ancillary retail (A1) and with justification residential (C3) and extra care housing.
			Additional facilities - promenade to support use of best asset sea and beach (toilets, changing facilities, beach guard huts) introduce & encourage extensive use of seaside activities.	RESPONSE – Retaining important seaside infrastructure i.e. toilets, changing facilities and provision for lifeguards is important to the MDC's success.
RSM97	John Tumman and M Gray	Supports	Broadly supportive of redeveloping Seaburn's leisure core. See letter for detail on key points set out below: Boundary of masterplan (p9) Why playing fields/Seaburn Camp not included? Could provide integrated development with better circulation patterns and landscaping, integrated uses (ancillary facilities for playing fields within envelope of development).	RESPONSE – Comment Noted RESPONSE The focus of the Seaburn Masterplan is to set out regeneration plans for Seaburn, with the aim of providing a family friendly visitor destination with both indoor and outdoor facilities. Certain areas of open space have been included within the Masterplan area as improvements to these spaces are considered to have a direct role in delivering the objectives of the plan. For example the creation of a park area on the former boating lake and improvements to Cut Throat dene would improve pedestrian movement within and outside the area and could have a significant role to play in improving biodiversity in the area. Other areas of open space to the west of the masterplan area are in particular need of regeneration as they are underused and in some cases suffer associated issues such as anti-social behaviour. The restructuring of these areas in a manner would also assist in delivering the regeneration objective of the Masterplan and regeneration Strategy for the area.. Seaburn camp is a significant area of open space to the north of Ocean Park and is allocated in its current form by the Unitary development Plan as playing fields and open space. As the Masterplan document establishes on Page 8, work as part of the emerging LDF into the identification of new housing sites is ongoing. Seaburn Camp has been identified as a potential site for consideration. It is not within the remit of the Masterplan as SPD to change the use of land. Therefore proposals for this area in future would need to be considered as part of the preparation of the LDF rather than through the Masterplan.
			Viability/Feasibility No reference to scale (floorspace). Soft mkt testing concludes limited demand other than residential. Seems speculative without evidence, possibly over ambitious, particularly when taking into account competition from South Shields. May need pre-conditions to promote developer interest. Demolition of existing facilities i.e. Seaburn centre result in further cost impacting upon economic viability.	RESPONSE The timescale as set out within the MDC is for development to take place over a 10 to 15 year period. It is also important to be aware that the masterplan is indicative. From an urban design perspective whilst there is flexibility over layout and floorspace, provided proposals comply with planning policy such as PPS4, it is considered necessary to set out design principles such as storey heights. The MDC has been prepared as a realistic yet ambitious vision based upon what is considered to be deliverable taking into account private sector interest already received and which are currently ongoing.
			Green space/housing Loss of green space link to housing development – ref made to potential loss to residential devt between commercial uses and Seafields. Study justification that of	RESPONSE The council is currently in the process of reviewing its open spaces. Nevertheless it is considered that a loss of open space to residential can be justified in this instance as the

		<p>poorer quality referring to “carefully composed comprehensive development which would provide regeneration solution.” In practice a housing devt on both sides of a very linear open link. No discussion acknowledging importance of link in present form and potential to upgrade open space ensuring better use. Proposals likely to attract strong opposition until alternative option conclusively considered of retaining existing open space in present form and upgrading. Detailed concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Loss open space between cut Throat Dene/Seaburn Camp (ii) Whether loss can be justified paras 16,17,18 PPG17 (iii) Linear Park would be incidental to residential, linear suburban form, similar to other housing estates rather than recreation asset (iv) What mkt for expensive housing adj Morrison’s carpark. Residential should be in form of apartments overlooking seafront with upper floors facing boulevard. May help to provide massing shown in indicative scheme. 	<p>area of open space is considered to be under-used in its current form and generally of low amenity value due to problems with antisocial behaviour and a lack of surveillance. The potential for a green link through the site which benefits from greater natural surveillance therefore improving security is considered to outweigh the negative impacts of a loss of part of the open space.</p> <p>For information on housing see main body of Cabinet Report.</p>
		<p>Seaburn Centre Significance as indoor multi-purpose resource is barely touched upon. Any work to evaluate economic contribution as events/exhibition centre. Scheme does not appear to make provision for building of footprint which replacement for centre would require. Is centre near end of life, if not is there financial adv in demolition and replacement. Close scrutiny required to see if inclusion within scheme viable.</p>	<p>RESPONSE The Seaburn Centre is currently a significantly under-used facility, and although it is recognised to be a valuable facility to the local community it is sited at a very important location at the heart of the MDC area and as such is nit currently fulfilling its potential. As identified within the MDC any specific facilities should be relocated and further work is currently being undertaken in this regard. For further information please see response to Cabinet Report.</p>
		<p>Design Issues</p> <p>Block principles devt. conceived as an entity but may be implemented incrementally need to secure high degree of co-ordination esp around boulevard and Whitburn Rd to give unity i.e. window proportions, storey heights, massing, materials. Will council have powers to enforce design standards?</p> <p>Leisure use east of Whitburn Rd No ref in MDC to scale of activity. Could represent sizeable and intensive devt given prominent location. No info how will be serviced, nor where staff parking located. Given all four elevations of block visually prominent, most obvious service point from Whitburn Road, vitally important consideration should be addressed in MDC.</p> <p>Car Parking Concern over potential loss of parking, whether adequate to meet normal demands. If not residents quality of life may suffer due to parking on residential streets.</p> <p>Circulation Major element MDC enhance Lowry Road whilst downgrade Whitburn Road. Appreciate principles but two main concerns. (i) Intended route less direct, therefore people unlikely to use voluntarily. Enforcement would require stretch of Whitburn Road to have limited access, is this the intention? (ii) Can proposed primary route be fit for purpose – number of accesses required, alignment. More congestion may result. May be more appropriate introduce physical features in carriageway, selective road narrowing.</p> <p>Implementation Land Assembly What is unexpired term of leases referred to? Are leaseholders/private landowners willing to work with council? How can proposals be delivered whilst not disrupting existing business.</p> <p>Phasing Alteranative method of phasing leisure entertainment core, may be more appropriate to develop as an entity to provide uniformity, co-ordination landscaping, facilitate symmetry design at corners leading to Boulevard.</p>	<p>RESPONSE It is important to note that as stated on p32 of the MDC the council will take a regeneration and design-led approach to development whereby the council will release sites for development and developers will be selected based on criteria that ensure the regeneration and design ambitions of the MDC are delivered. The council agrees that co-ordination is required. However, it is the purpose of the MDC to set out broad design parameters and principles. Development Briefs will be prepared for each site providing more detailed design guidance.</p> <p>RESPONSE A detailed development brief has been set out for the Seaburn Shelter, whereby bidders have been invited to prepare their own solutions to servicing and parking. All proposals will need to satisfy the council’s transportation team in ensuring that they do not compromise highway safety or lead to unreasonable levels of congestion without implementing means of mitigation.</p> <p>RESPONSE Please note that the masterplan is indicative showing preferred arrangements, for further information please see main body of Cabinet Report.</p> <p>RESPONSE Work has been undertaken with highways to come up with an innovative proposal appropriate to reducing traffic levels along Whitburn Road. Lowry Road will be an easier route to navigate which will provide suitable access to many of Seaburn’s primary facilities. However, it is important to note that it is not the intention of the MDC to divert all traffic away from Whitburn Road.</p> <p>RESPONSE Extensive work has been undertaken with landowners and leaseholders which is still in progress. The importance of ensuring minimum disruption to existing businesses is recognised and is an important consideration in taking proposals forward.</p> <p>RESPONSE Comments noted. The masterplan is an indicative plan of the preferred location for uses, this will be looked at in more detail as development brief are prepared for each site.</p>
		<p>2.2 Objectives Difficult to see how council can influence affordability of activities (obj 4), MDC plan for</p>	<p>RESPONSE Intellectually accessible is referred to as meaning accessible to all in terms of being able to</p>

		built development not management. What is meant by intellectually accessible (obj 6).	be understood by everyone. The respondee is correct in stating that the council does not have the ability to influence pricing for private schemes. Nevertheless it remain an aspiration that all activities both private and public will be affordable to all.
		<p>3.6 SWOT analysis Strengths – open space second strength “large areas of green open space suitable for events.” Land refers to Seaburn Camp – not in MDC area. Seaburn Camp should be included or ref to strength deleted.</p> <p>Strengths – commercial demand, strength 6, what basis has strong commercial demand been identified – weakness poor commercial mix suggest not. Sough after location – presume refers to Seaburn as residential area, amend “...and sought after residential location”</p> <p>Threat – Neighbouring Resort – major threat South Shields. Work may need to be done to establish what is deliverable scale of commercial investment at Seaburn.</p> <p>Threats – Impact on existing residents – increasing events and commercial offer and reducing parking will exacerbate parking/access problems for residents. Duplication of point as last threat refers to impacts on existing and future residents.</p> <p>Threat – events space – threat posed by emerging events space elsewhere city could be threat. May need to be resolved by developing strategy for provision of events space.</p> <p>Threats – current economic climate – little/no devt short to medium term likely. Could be opportunity to make sure scale of devt proposed is right in relation to potential demand.</p>	<p>AMEND Strength 2 to read “large areas of green open space in and around the study area suitable ...”</p> <p>AMEND Strength 6 to read “...and sought after residential location”</p> <p>RESPONSE The council recognises that the market today may not support attempts to replicate the Seaburn of old and that demand for large-scale attractions are lessened by the proximity of competing major attractions such as South Shields. As a consequence the council does not intend to replicate South Shields’ offer but to provide facilities on a more modest, local scale able to draw visitors to the beach but also support from local residents.</p> <p>AMEND Remove threat 8. With regards to parking please see main body of Cabinet Report.</p> <p>RESPONSE As part of development of the MDC close work will be undertaken with the council’s events team to ensure that appropriate events are held in Seaburn to promote its tourism potential.</p> <p>RESPONSE Comment Noted</p>
		<p>4.0 Policy Review UDP – pg 24 Policy NA40 is omitted although referred to on map of policies on pg 25.</p>	<p>RESPONSE Policy NA40 on is referred to in Appendix A..</p>
		<p>5.0 Feasibility Appraisal 5.4 Scale of Development – nowhere ref made to actual scale i.e. floorspace. Illustrations show substantial scale but not made reference to in text. Para 5.1 “following section informs development of masterplan having regard to city council strategic objectives, relevant planning considerations and the economic and land ownership realities of the area.” Does not do this in practice, reader left with no indication of scale of devt, basis upon which established or economic viability.</p> <p>5.5 Development Types – How soft was mkt testing, what extent scale of devt can be justified. Recognised in MDC scale of uses is limited, unlikely scale of devt required. Viability of scheme on scale proposed is unproven.</p>	<p>AMEND HEADING Replace Scale of development with Extent of development The masterplan is intended to be indicative. The scale of development is not precise and whilst it is possible to restrict building heights in order to protect amenity as a design consideration, it is not possible to make accurate speculations over the exact scale of development as this is dependent upon the private sector.</p> <p>RESPONSE It is important to note that the MDC is intended to be developed over a phased 10-15 year period and as such whilst it is acknowledged that at the present time demand for the scale of facilities on the masterplan may not be present, as Seaburn develops over time it is likely to benefit from increased demand, with larger facilities being constructed within the latter phases.</p>
		<p>6.0 Evolution of Masterplan 6.1 Masterplan Evolution- Para does not make sense “would it be best to redevelop....”Reworking required.</p> <p>6.2 Masterplan Workshop & Consultation – 3 development options mentioned, no previous mentions of options.</p>	<p>RESPONSE In the context of an amended section it is considered this section now makes sense</p> <p>AMEND Further details have now been included.</p>
		<p>9.0 Design Code Indicative Masterplan – Unclear what building is proposed in front of F. If replacement</p>	<p>RESPONSE These matters will be considered further at the detailed design stage.</p>

21

			<p>for water pump station then require careful design if not to detract from devt to west. If doesn't require precise location could be incorporated within block F.</p> <p>9.1 Urban structure and character areas</p> <p>Pg 46 Leisure & Entertainment Core –Given potential Seaburn Centre demolition council should make every effort to provide new facilities of at least same standard/accessibility, would show acknowledgement of the importance of such uses at the seafront – all weather facilities. Such uses D1/D2 should be essential.</p> <p>Pg 47 Residential park – not opposed overall principle but concerns over extent/form currently proposed.</p> <p>P49 Existing businesses – Error of fact in para. Martino's stated to be existing business to remain but identified as part of redeveloped Leisure & Entertainment Core on plan on p45. Needs clarification.</p> <p>9.4 Building Heights & Densities</p> <p>Last bullet point any buildings over 6 storeys not permitted, is this really the case should iconic building proposal over 6 storey be submitted. Not conservation area, no listed buildings nearby.</p> <p>Para 9.5 Northern Gateway</p> <p>By what means scale of Morrisons increased? How is review of orientation of supermarket to be achieved? How practical given main entrance is from car park and secondary entrance onto Whitburn Road at south east corner. Have Morrisons been approached regarding issues?</p>	<p>RESPONSE - The council fully intends to ensure that the majority of uses considered important within the Seaburn Centre are relocated elsewhere.</p> <p>RESPONSE - Comment Noted</p> <p>AMEND - Remove Martino's from retained businesses on p49.</p> <p>AMEND see response to Homes and Communities Agency comments to para 9.4</p> <p>RESPONSE</p> <p>Morrison's were consulted as part of the proposals and the guidance has been prepared as advice should Morrison's decide to refurbish their store in the future.</p>
			<p>Urban Design Principles (p38) & Street Hierarchy (p69) Conflict between diagrams. UD map shows Lowry Road as primary road with Whitburn Road stretch secondary. Street hierarchy diagram shows Whitburn Rd as 'primary coast road' and Lowry Rd as 'secondary road.'</p>	<p>AMEND</p> <p>Amend Urban Design Principles map (p38) to show Whitburn Road as primary throughout.</p>
			<p>Multi-user boulevard (p74) could become focus for anti-social behaviour. No clear idea of ground floor uses. Should be well-lit, free from landscape features recesses, preferably have uses on upper floors which provide natural surveillance.</p>	<p>RESPONSE</p> <p>Comment Noted</p>
			<p>Private parking & servicing (p77 & 78) – Second bullet p78 where visitor parking for shops restaurants is it with public parking south of boulevard therefore no obvious problems, other than whether can all be accommodated. If visitor parking to be made in private parking areas issues arise with adequacy to meet potential demand and accessibility from rear. Further compounded by duplication of para relating to parking requirements being shared with other non residential uses in both public and private parking sections. Lack of clarity of roles of both parking areas.</p>	<p>RESPONSE</p> <p>With regards to parking see main body of Cabinet Report.</p>
			<p>Seaburn Public Realm – presentation unfortunate takes no account of development proposals including kiosk on seafront.</p>	<p>RESPONSE</p> <p>Public realm works have already started on site as a separate project covering the wider seafront. The Seaburn Shelter development brief requires public realm works on the promenade to the front of the existing shelter as part of redevelopment.</p>
RSM98	S M Alder	Objects	<p>5 star hotel with balcony/sea view, together with upmarket wet/wild Crowtree Leisure type of facility which everyone can use all year round regardless of this weather.</p>	<p>RESPONSE - With regards to all year round attractions please see response to RSM13.</p> <p>In the medium/longer term may be scope for hotel as part of mixed-use leisure development. Scope may also exist for upgrading of guest houses to cater for the boutique hotel market.</p>
RSM99	Ian Taylor	Supports	<p>Time to build indoor cycling Velodrome in the area as everyone has to go to Manchester, it would get used all the time by North East cyclists and schools.</p>	<p>RESPONSE - A veldorome would be considered more appropriate as part of the Stadium Village redevelopment, please refer to the Stadium Village Development Framework for info.</p>
RSM100	M Heine	Supports	<p>Character should reflect a) what is unique to Sunderland, b) what will add to the reputation of the city nationwide c) be attractive to the public nationwide. Avoid burger bars, fruit machines fairground rides.</p>	<p>RESPONSE - The council's vision for Seaburn is for an attractive high quality family focused resort that is building upon its unique natural environment.</p>
			<p>Developers opt for "limited investment/high returns" projects should be required to contribute to cultural elements in the development. EC could be approached for</p>	<p>RESPONSE - Contributions will be sought for a range of improvements including public realm, open space, transport infrastructure and affordable housing. Details of financial</p>

			additional financial support. Suggestions for features within the development: Assuming funding available. Major community centre to replace Seaburn Centre supporting wide range of social and commercial functions incorporating meeting rooms, tiered auditorium/hall. A unique and attractive business and conference centre, exhibition space, theatre and dance school productions, indoor sports hall and dance hall for public. Café/bar on first floor overlooking the sea front would be a clinching attractant and money spinner for whole complex.	contributions will be finalised at the planning stage. RESPONSE - At present no funding is available for such facilities and it is considered that a conference centre/exhibition hall would be more sustainable being located within close proximity of the city centre. Furthermore any proposals would need to comply with relevant national planning policy in relation to economic development including PPS4.
			Tramway running shuttle trams from northern boundary of city to lighthouse could be major and very profitable tourist attraction. If battery or fly-wheel powered no need for visually intrusive and expensive overhead wires. Novel and example of 'green' engineering.	RESPONSE - For tram provision please see response to RSM20.
			Make more of Lowry connection with Seaburn i.e. emblematic stick figures in walkway areas and perhaps with the overall development so named.	RESPONSE - Cultural identity is important to the success of the MDC. However, these matters will be addressed in more detail later in the design stages.
			Could there be a pedestrian crossing outside the Waterfront Café/Paradise Garden. Currently only 1 light controlled crossing. At many times of day trying to cross road from restaurant to bus stop and beach opposite highly dangerous. Increased development lead to increased tourist activity so even more hazardous.	RESPONSE - The council proposes to narrow the carriageways along Whitburn Road reducing traffic speeds therefore creating a more pedestrian friendly environment.
RSM101	R Bell	Non given	Seems like a comprehensive plan. Seaburn Centre extensively used and will be greatly missed. Seaburn always suffered from absence of bad weather provision.	RESPONSE - See main body of Cabinet Report for information on Seaburn Centre. RESPONSE - In relation to all year round attractions see RSM13.
RSM102	Martin Wilkes	Support and Object	Overall – frustrating Great opportunity let down by desire to force housing into an area that does not require it. Forget housing develop leisure facilities to attract the volume of visitors the area deserves.	RESPONSE - Comment Noted RESPONSE - See main body of Cabinet Report for information on housing.
RSM103	Mrs S M Thompson	Supports	Need plenty of toilets. Play areas for children, open weekends and holidays.	RESPONSE - See main body of Cabinet Report for information on toilet provision. RESPONSE - In relation to play facilities see RSM40.
			Undercover shelter for wet days.	RESPONSE - Whilst the council recognises that proposals to develop Seaburn Shelter will result in the loss of a facility as a shelter, it is considered that the site does not fulfil its potential and a range of wet weather facilities will be provided as the MDC progresses. Please see RSM13 for further information.
			No buildings on cliffs blocking the views.	RESPONSE - Panoramic sea views are key to Seaburn. All developments must preserve/enhance sea views.
			Too much housing. Reduce height of house fencing around Roker.	RESPONSE - See main body of Cabinet Report for information on housing. RESPONSE - Roker falls outside of the boundaries of the MDC.
RSM104	Miss J Reed	Supports	Make Seaburn brilliant, have a fantastic city and seafront everything done right revenue could be going into economy.	RESPONSE - Comment Noted
RSM105	Miss D Regan	Supports	Support proposals for revitalisation of Sunderland's sea front but would like consideration of an ice rink.	RESPONSE - With regards to an ice rink see RSM13.
RSM106	R Hughes	Object	Too much of area 1 is close to the road, an area of open space in front of 1 will give a better perspective & not overwhelm the aspect to the sea. Wide pavement/promenade on west side of road with seating, trees, concession huts (high quality). Residential devt. is a concern in a leisure area. Why necessary and will developers have a disproportionate influence on the proposals as with Morrisons & Seaburn Centre. Concern at lack of detail Seaburn Camp and playing fields.	RESPONSE - The MDC intends to reduce vehicular dominance along Whitburn Road through narrowed carriageways, the provision of a new widened route for vehicles along the alignment of Lowry Road thereby reducing traffic flows along Whitburn Road and more priority for pedestrians. RESPONSE - All residential development will be subject to strict criteria set out in the MDC and subsequent development briefs ensuring high quality design. See main body of Cabinet Report for information on housing. RESPONSE - With regards to Seaburn Camp please see RSM97.
RSM107	David Cutts	Supports	Care needs to be taken that no rash decisions taken as consequences long lasting and permanent. Seafront key city asset/income generation. Housing attracts investment but limits potential for tourism avoid. Larger soft play area, secure paddling pool with adjacent picnic area for young children. Upgrade pirates play area. Lambton Worm area could be put out to private tender for one of the above or a themed crazy golf.	RESPONSE - Comment Noted RESPONSE - See main body of Cabinet Report for information on housing. RESPONSE - The uses suggested may be compatible with the MDC's vision. However, such facilities require funding being obtained or development contributions.

21

			Fairground needs developing fairground or amenities for teenagers.	RESPONSE - See response to RSM4 in relation to the fairground site.
			BMX feature good idea but situated badly littered/utilised for antisocial behaviour. Better sited adj Dykelands Road illuminated at night.	RESPONSE - With regards to surveillance and the skate park please see response to RSM94.
			Seafront needs pub, either on own or as part of restaurant. Proposed devt.of promenade good as long as public conveniences attached, friends and family visitors always surprised by lack of bars, more so now Bay Hotel demolished.	RESPONSE - Seaburn Shelter dev currently undergoing tendering process has provision for café/restaurant or bar. However, whilst this is the only site deemed suitable for development on the e. side of Whitburn Road, it is anticipated that leisure & entertainment core support range of evening uses. Public toilets are a requirement for developers bringing forward Seaburn Shelter site.
			Escalator built at Roker for access to prom.	RESPONSE - Comment Noted
RSM108	Alvin White	Supports	Great idea, get started straight away. At the moment place is a dump.	RESPONSE - Comment Noted
RSM109	B Clark	Objects	Need leisure pool not swimming pool. No to Seaburn Shelter leave it alone.	RESPONSE - See RSM2 in relation to swimming pool. RESPONSE - The Seaburn Shelter represents a significant development opportunity to create a landmark building framing the Central Gateway of Seaburn connecting leisure and entertainment core with the promenade and is a crucial to early phases regeneration of Seaburn.
RSM110	Philip Dixon	Supports	Looks good. Cannot see any reason to object. What about renewable technologies such as wind turbines. Would make Sunderland more energy independent. Would be ideal location. The windspires are very attractive and would help support local authority energy demands at Seaburn.	RESPONSE - Comment Noted RESPONSE - All new developments within Seaburn MDC area required to meet Target Emission Reduction levels prescribed by Building Regulations. Developments are also required to supply minimum of 10% of the site's energy consumption from renewable sources located on site unless it is demonstrated that this unfeasible. Exact nature of renewable energy progressed in further detail at the planning application stage.
RSM111	Keith Baharie	Supports	Re-brand Sunderland to include ref to coastal location draw people to the city highlight that Sunderland only place in the north east with such close accessibility between sand, beaches, city centre. The use of hardy exotic plants such as phormium, yucca spp, would be a cost-effective way of updating the landscaping. Maybe replicate the landscaping found on the A1231 roundabouts all along the Seaburn/Roker areas? Striking plants with all year round foliage.	RESPONSE - The Sunderland Image Strategy sets out the city's key brand values and recognises the importance of the seafront as a key asset in maximising the quality of life for local residents and a cultural and tourism attraction. RESPONSE - In areas of public realm, open space and other appropriate locations new planting should be indigenous to encourage habitat diversification and encourage biodiversity. Appropriate species will be identified as the MDC develops.
RSM112	Mrs A Maw	Supports	Area described as vacant land (2) is green space used by dog walkers/children. Concern at the supervision of new play/public area, do not want a repeat of problems skateboard park brought.	RESPONSE - The presence of large areas of green space offers some value to the local population. However, the quality of open space is poor and under-used. Furthermore, there are limited amounts of natural surveillance resulting in anti-social behaviour. Consequently whilst residential development would lead to some loss in quantity of open space, the quality of open space will be enhanced through providing a Linear Park and enhancing biodiversity within Cut Throat Dene.
RSM113	Paul Hepple	Non given	Will the proposed redevelopments include five-a-side football facilities?	RESPONSE - Facilities such as five-a-side football pitches may be better located elsewhere within the city such as at Stadium Village where a planning framework has been adopted promoting sports-led redevelopment.
RSM114	Mr G Petrie	Objects	Plan is an excuse to build houses on leisure land. Where is provision for parking car park shown is inadequate. The plan will force even more people to South Shields.	RESPONSE - See main body of Cabinet Report for information on housing. RESPONSE - See main body of Cabinet Report for information on parking. RESPONSE - Comment Noted.
RSM115	J Owen	Objects	Concern over lack of parking as visitors already park on cycle path/yellow line/pavement during summer months. Concern over policing of parking/yellow lines/dog fouling/anti-social behaviour will there be any.	RESPONSE - See main body of Cabinet Report for information on parking. RESPONSE - The council in partnership with Northumbria Police continuously aims to improve the management of parking/anti-social behaviour and this will continue as the development of the MDC progresses.
RSM116	Wayne Kemp	Supports	Aspiration for outdoor exercise equipment e.g. as seen in LA/San Diego Along designated route (2-3miles) several workstations that people can stop at and complete exercises e.g. pull ups, press ups, dips, See www.fresh-airfitness.co.uk/p_all.htm	RESPONSE - The council will consider future opportunities for new leisure facilities to support the delivery of this objective.
RSM117	E and D Blakie	Supports	Removal of car park incr. existing problems, p.transport will not help. Traffic calming – greater problem removing bottle necks. Some traffic calming measures dangerous i.e. lane narrowing. Whitburn traffic lights are biggest bottleneck particularly match days/sunny days problems for both residents and visitors.	RESPONSE - See main body of Cabinet Report for information on parking. RESPONSE - In relation to traffic calming see RSM6.

			Skate park in wrong place, noise & rubbish disgusting. Like S. Shields build proper skate park in full view of seafront not hidden away.	RESPONSE - With regards to the skate park please see response to RSM94.
			Need for decent anti vandalism i.e. surveillance cameras or more police on beat.	RESPONSE - Natural surveillance is important to the MDC and includes environmental design i.e. building orientation, overlooking of open space/footpaths and use of appropriate boundary treatments and lighting as less oppressive form of reducing crime and fear of crime in comparison to measures such as CCTV. Whilst some CCTV/policing required where high crime risk, should not be over dominant. Where these measures required most effective in combination with natural surveillance.
RSM118	Peter Walton	Objects	Need traffic calming measures in my street until now council have resisted such measures. Proposals bound to increase traffic flow.	RESPONSE - The responsees address is located outside of the MDC area. With regards to traffic calming see RSM6.
RSM119	Frank Hunter	Objects	When moved to Seafields 1993 believed housing would never be overlooked, since then in correspondence from council regarding path through Mere Knolls Cemetery (alongside Seafields), and also construction of skateboard park, assurances have been given land is reserved for leisure use. Why have council abandoned this policy.	RESPONSE - After carefully considering the need for regeneration within Seaburn in balance with amenities of nearby residents, small quantity of res. development required to ensure long term sustainability. MDC sets strict design criteria to ensure existing residents not harmed by future development. For further information see Cabinet Report.
RSM120	Peter Ramsey	Supports	Move amusement arcades away from seafront.	RESPONSE - For amusement arcades see RSM10.
			Extend Seaburn Centre with swimming pool in place of old showground.	RESPONSE - For information on Seaburn Centre see main body of Cabinet Report.
			New res. devt single storey to give views over green belt.	RESPONSE - Building heights of residential properties required to be in context with surroundings (between 1.5 and 2.5 storeys) and at lowest adj Seafields. Private views however, are ultimately not a planning consideration.
			Develop more flower beds along seafront and grassed area south of South Bents, currently not properly maintained.	RESPONSE - Comment Noted
			Good to hear green belt including university fields is being retained.	RESPONSE - Comment Noted
RSM121	Adam Lyons	Unsure	Don't build speed humps, loads at S Shields, more boy racers there than Seaburn, already have speed camera so no need.	RESPONSE - Comment Noted
			Better lighting on prom near Little Italy.	RESPONSE - Improved lighting along promenade is important consideration of MDC in attracting people to the seafront in evening whilst maintaining high level of natural surveillance and is included in public realm proposals.
			Rebuild Seaburn fountain, was focal point.	RESPONSE - Comment Noted
			Build something where old funfair was e.g. Seaburn Centre extension.	RESPONSE - In relation to fairground site see RSM4.
			Make better feature of Seaburn Dene i.e. park.	RESPONSE - Comment Noted
RSM122	Leigh Green	Support	Bring back illuminations would attract more people/trade.	RESPONSE - In relation to illuminations see RSM10.
RSM123	Barbara Clark	Supports	Object to the Seaburn Shelter being turned into café.	With regards to the Shelter site see response to RSM109.
			Would benefit from leisure pool.	RESPONSE - See response to swimming pool provision see RSM2.
RSM124	Katie O'Brien	Supports	Long overdue. Anything encourages visitors particularly families, is encouraging. More upmarket coffee bars, restaurants and gift shops. Anything that capitalises on the fantastic views is great idea. Anything to remove image and build positivity fantastic.	RESPONSE - Comments Noted
RSM125	Councillor Kay	Supports	Good balance in light of the economic times between council leadership and private opportunity. Seaside venues can be subject to dramatic rapid declines in fortunes if strategies not in place.	RESPONSE - Comments Noted
RSM126	Ash Griffiths	Supports	No reasons given	RESPONSE - Noted
RSM127	Dianne Snowdon	Supports	No reasons given	RESPONSE - Noted
RSM128	Andy Corbett	Supports	The timescale (of up to 15 years) seems a long. Could MDC take greater advantage of current economic climate?	RESPONSE - With regards to timescales please see response to RSM11.
RSM129	Patricia Robinson	Objects	No concrete plans for entertainment for families visiting Roker and Seaburn, facilities such as Fun Fare, indoor bowling, small scale golf site, miniature railway, under cover facilities for live entertainment.	RESPONSE - The central vision of the MDC is to strengthen Seaburn's role as a family focused resort. Such facilities as those suggested may be compatible with this vision however it is the purpose of the MDC to set out broad development parameters rather than list specific uses.
RSM130	Mary Chadburn	Supports	Bring funfair back, punch and judy, donkey rides, little kiosks, crazy golf and fun fair and boating pool. Nice to see family attractions.	RESPONSE - Seaside attractions such as those suggested are appropriate for the location. However, it is not the purpose of the MDC to prescribe specific uses rather instead to set out broad planning and design parameters. Ultimately developers will need to bring forward proposals for specific leisure uses.

21

RSM131	N Davison	Objects	I have no objection to the principle of the plan. Concerns loss of green site to housing - residential park proposal, do not recall any mention in original display within leisure centre. Pods - failed to see use when saw initial proposal can find no mention of them in the latest plan have these been discarded? What facilities for leisure & entertainment core - swimming pool? Ice Rink? Not more slot machines enough already. What will be in modern play area will local children be invited for ideas.	RESPONSE - Comment Noted RESPONSE - With regards to housing see main body of Cabinet Report. RESPONSE - The proposals for the Pods are progressing as part of the Sea Change funding. However, these will be located near Marine Walk and therefore ref made in Marine Walk Masterplan. RESPONSE - With regards to appropriate uses for the leisure and entertainment core please see response to RSM96. RESPONSE - See RSM40 for play area facilities.
RSM132	Mr. R.D.Dunn	Objects	Where visitors parking after car parks adj Morrison's sacrificed. Proposing to build over good parking area. Proved inadequate at events i.e. Air Show, to further reduce will result in fewer visitors not more. How long before we lose what was Seaburn Camp and the fields west of there? More seats on prom facing the sea. More toilets not less, toilets closed down at the junction of Dykelands Road and Queens Parade, toilets south of the bus shelter opp. Recreation Park, both underground therefore not eyesore.	RESPONSE - With regards to parking see main body of Cabinet Report. RESPONSE - In relation to Seaburn Camp see RSM97. RESPONSE - With regards to seats facing the sea please see response to RSM33. With regards to toilets see main body of Cabinet Report.
RSM133	Jessica Clark-Barkess	Supports	Upgrade promenade, seating areas opp Marriott Hotel poor image as in bad condition.	RESPONSE - Public realm works are currently being undertaken within Seaburn including the Promenade. These works are part of phase 1 for the public realm and it is expected that this will continue throughout the lifetime of the MDC.
RSM134	Anne Twine	Supports	Make promenade footpaths user-friendly for summer time bathers. Free standing showers (or fresh water taps) near the beach, these would not cost too much to implement in both Roker and Seaburn.	RESPONSE - Upgrading the footpaths along the Promenade forms part of the long term ambitions for public realm improvements to be carried out over the lifetime of the MDC. RESPONSE - The Seafront Regeneration Strategy recognises that initial seafront consultations identified a number of requests for a foot shower as such the council will seek to deliver facilities and will look favourably upon proposals incorporating such amenities.
RSM135	P Minto	Supports	No reasons given	RESPONSE - Noted
RSM136	Angela Wilkinson	Supports	Appreciate overall objective would like to see Seaburn for young families and older generation. Indoor activities tea rooms, children's activities, (not bandits and gambling). Visitor walk leading through various attractions. Many resorts abroad well organised. People want to take in the air, have a walk, and sit to have a drink, ice-cream or a snack (not just chips). Modern indoor leisure centre. Bulldoze Seaburn Centre and start again - indoor bowling alley, bowling green or adventure park. Think big, and compete with South Shields. Must keep some free parking otherwise visitors will park local streets. Cannot allow to happen year round as caused accidents, inconvenience and access problems for residents, our visitors and emergency services. Nice to see new housing in the area. Good to have events plan to use fields more often i.e cars/bike shows, food fairs, fashion shows and music events.	RESPONSE - The vision for Seaburn is as a family focused resort for people of all ages throughout the year. With regards to refreshments please see response to RSM70. RESPONSE - Proposals exist to develop an advisory/interpretive signage scheme encouraging responsible recreation and guide people to use less sensitive areas of the seafront. RESPONSE - With regards to the Seaburn Centre see main body of Cabinet Report. RESPONSE - With regards to parking see main body of Cabinet Report. RESPONSE - Comment Noted RESPONSE - Comment Noted
RSM137	Edward Flood	Supports	Pleased leisure/residential mix. Concerned loss of 2 large car parks on sea front adj Morrisons. Where will visitors park? May lead to two problems people use Morrisons car parks but conflicting chaos between shoppers/visitors or visitors will use residential streets unless permits implemented. Safety concerns.	RESPONSE - Comment Noted RESPONSE - With regards to parking please see main body of Cabinet Report.
RSM138	Terry Sandison	Objects	Against residential development. Building height should be restricted & properties not "affordable Gentoos" type. Playing fields & Seaburn Camp better sense to improve.	RESPONSE - With regards to housing see main body of Cabinet Report. RESPONSE - Comment Noted
RSM139	Ross Hall	Supports	Encourage private sector investment i.e. indoor water park/aquarium of national scale attraction similar to theme parks like Alton Towers family friendly. Would increase need for accommodation in area/city centre. If attractions too small/local scale will not succeed only attract local people.	RESPONSE - Much of development within the MDC area will be private sector led although on certain sites the council may seek to enter into partnership with developers in order to stimulate development and secure a high quality of development. RESPONSE - The introduction of an artificial reef for tourism purposes was given consideration by the project team early on. However it was considered that resources should initially be focused on the improvement of the onshore elements of the seafront. Therefore

21

				whilst such a proposal would be compatible with the aspirations of the overall Seafront Regeneration Strategy for Sunderland, it would be necessary for the private sector Artificial reef encourage scuba diving/underwater wildlife to the area e.g. sink old ship off coast suitable to shipbuilding heritage/incr tourism/additional business. Needs private sector investment to deliver an attraction of this kind.
RSM140	W Watson	Objects	1. Neither consultation findings nor regen strategy identified residential use as priority. Some residential may be required (for financial reasons) but 40% of footprint excessive and against stated aim of the masterplan leisure and associated uses.	RESPONSE - Development parameters set out in the Masterplan and Design Code have been prepared in the context of existing views to and from the seafront and countryside. The scales proposed are not significantly greater than that of existing buildings currently on the site and it is considered that the site could accommodate a greater density of development than is there currently - the current development appearing fragmented and lacking continuity. In developing Seaburn as a 'destination' for both visitors and residents it is considered that future proposals at Ocean Park should provide a greater arrival experience and more unified 'street scene', whilst not detracting from the context of the area. With regards to housing see main body of Cabinet Report.
			2. The residential use at the northern nexus bus turnaround is considered a major mistake, this will remove approximately 1/3 of the available view across the camp field from the coast road. The SWOT analysis identified the enhancing of existing views and provision of visual links with surrounding areas of open green space as an opportunity, this small residential addition goes against this opportunity. Similarly the Constraints Plan has failed to identify this very important view across the open countryside.	RESPONSE - In terms of the bus turning head, longer distance views across the site to the west will largely still be visible. In addition due to the angle of the road, when adjacent to the turning head and approaching from the the south, views to the west from Whitburn Road are partially obscured by existing houses. In approaching from the north views to the south west from the Coast Road will be partially lost, although these are not as long-distance and are obscured already by existing Morrisons and Seafields developments. Currently the turning head does not represent a particularly attractive foreground to the views to the west. It is anticipated that a high quality new development in accordance with the design criteria set out in the Masterplan and Design Code could better benefit the views across the countryside.
			3. The building height of 4 to 5 stories and density at the coast road is considered too great in relation to the seafront and open countryside into which the development sits, in effect visually 'too much' development.	RESPONSE - The Masterplan seeks to balance the regeneration and development aspirations for the Seaburn area with the natural qualities of the local area. It is considered that this can largely be achieved even where certain elements of development are of a greater scale and density than current buildings. In some cases there will be elements where existing views may be lost. However in taking a comprehensive approach to developing the masterplan, it is considered that the net outcome will be greater for views across the site and the open countryside which lies beyond the Masterplan study area and improved framing of key views into and out of the site through the development of high quality buildings. Where development takes place, any loss of open space is to be offset by provision of replacement green space of improved quality than that which precedes it.
			4. This consultation should perhaps have included an additional option - 'object in part' as the strategy proposal of developing the seafront is to be welcomed.	RESPONSE - Comment Noted
			5. Why not include the other two seafront shelters in any facelift so that there is continuity along the seafront.	RESPONSE - The Seaburn Shelter, is the only site deemed appropriate for redevelopment within the lifetime of the MDC. Whilst minor changes may be made to the other shelters it is not considered relevant to include such details.
			6. The master plan has not included any proposals / suggestions etc. as too what leisure or associated uses the development will seek to fulfill, this would appear to be a starting point for then deciding the extent and size of the buildings required.	RESPONSE - The purpose of the MDC is to set out broad planning and design parameters, it is not the role of the MDC to identify specific uses, as this would be overly restrictive to potential developers. Consequently it is the responsibility of the developer to bring forward proposals for detailed uses which the council will then assess upon their own merits.
RSM141	A Siggins	Objects	Seaburn is residential area. Concerned area will become more dog unfriendly, antisocial behaviour, litter. Noise at weekends, due to activities on the seafront and in Roker Park, are not reasonable for residents.	RESPONSE - Whilst Seaburn is considered to be a key asset to Sunderland's tourist economy, the council will pay due regard to noise considerations in determining planning applications for leisure uses, including the need for methods of mitigation. For further information on housing see main body of Cabinet Report.
RSM142	Brian Davison	Supports	Glad new park area being considered as Roker Park unconnected to sea front. Hopefully park's visibility will be similar in appearance to South Shields' park.	RESPONSE - Comment Noted
			Links to seafront from town centre/outlying districts some distance, unlike South Shields logistics. Public transport access little awareness, buses head along sea front to S. Shields as final destination. Needs prominent, identifiable and readily accessible bus service around Wearside.	RESPONSE - The council will prepare a travel plan to maximise public transport opportunities throughout Seaburn. The council will also seek developer contributions towards bus stop improvements, and during the latter phases of development through the provision of a shuttle service linking the seafront with the city centre.
			Keen to see cycle ways improved.	RESPONSE - Comment Noted
			Amusements arcades eyesore, limit to travelling shows and during high season only.	RESPONSE - Careful consideration will need to be given to prevent an over-proliferation of licensed premises detracting from the resort's family focus.
			Aim to avoid cheap drinking joints.	RESPONSE - With regards to amusement arcades please see response to RSM10.

RSM143	Ken Spencer	Objects	Car parking facilities are by far the worst for seafront in GB. Seaburn shelter good idea. Housing will do nothing.	RESPONSE - With regards to parking please see main body of Cabinet Report. RESPONSE - Comment Noted. RESPONSE - With regards to housing please see main body of Cabinet Report.
			Modern facilities for in-line roller skating, skate boarding, biking, ice skating, are missing from the city as a whole.	RESPONSE - Whilst the leisure facilities suggested may be compatible with the vision of the MDC as a family focused leisure resort, it is the purpose of the document to set out broad planning and design parameters not specific uses.
			Only more celebration and a pride displayed for the great traditions and enormous national contribution of Sunderland will bring tourism i.e. ships, engineering, mining.	RESPONSE - Comment Noted
RSM144	William Harrison	Supports	Need more attraction to the walkway on the front ideal business opportunity for market huts and traders.	RESPONSE - Refreshment facilities are considered important in attracting people to the seafront particularly along the promenade, resulting in a development brief being prepared for Seaburn Shelter for a café/restaurant. Food and drink uses are also appropriate within the leisure and entertainment core.
			Pay and display parking i.e. South Shields - revenue. Rear of Pullman already introduced Pay and Display, permit scheme for residents in surrounding streets help with air show: model like Durham CC, reduced need for waiting restrictions which upset residents.	RESPONSE - As new parking provision is provided, charging may be considered. However, such proposals are considered overly prescriptive for the MDC which has been prepared to set out broad planning and design parameters.
RSM145	T MacDonald	Supports	Action required. Don't compare to S Shields, better it. Need volunteers to help clean area.	RESPONSE - Comment Noted
RSM146	S Wright	Supports	What's going to attract visitors, only weekend busy is air show. Families need to be attracted i.e. Sea Life centre, model railway, boating lake, more things for families to do.	RESPONSE - The council recognises that Seaburn does not currently fulfil its potential. Consequently the MDC has been prepared to regenerate the area. The council envisages the MDC will increase developer confidence/interest through promoting leisure and entertainment uses.
			Don't like the units on the front. The improvement to the seating and promenade is long over due.	RESPONSE - Comment Noted
			Public toilets are massive issue for visitors, toilet opp Marriott not been open this year.	RESPONSE - With regards to toilet provision see main body of Cabinet Report.
RSM147	Eric Glasper	Supports	Welcome improvement but please do something about it soon. We have had too much waste of time & taxpayers money talking about Sunderland's future and not enough action.	RESPONSE - With regards to timescales please see response to RSM11.
RSM148	Dr Myra McDonald	Supports	Support regeneration of seafront. Plan underestimates need for public transport to underpin planned developments. Public transport currently deplorable, especially evenings/summer period when busy. Metro could be more widely used as for people from further afield if onward bus transport links were available (need to improve signposting from Metro stations to Sunderland attractions). Shuttle service linking Stadium of Light/St Peter's Metro/Roker/Seaburn and Seaburn Metro would encourage visitors from Sunderland/further afield and greatly improve general accessibility to a variety of Sunderland attractions.	RESPONSE - Comment Noted RESPONSE - Planning applications for development will be assessed against accessibility particularly in relation to public transport. Mechanisms are also available i.e. planning obligations will be explored with prospective developers to enhance the provision of public transport to, from and through the masterplan area. In addition whilst the council cannot guarantee increased bus service/frequency, the council is keen to participate in discussion with Nexus and developers to ensure adequate provision is maintained, and where appropriate, expanded. Developer contributions will be sought from the latter phases of development towards a seasonal shuttle bus service between Seaburn/city centre to supplement existing provision.
			Cafes and restaurants are to be welcomed.	RESPONSE - Comment Noted
			Housing developments should ensure affordable housing and not be aimed solely at affluent.	RESPONSE - With regards to housing see main body of Cabinet Report.
			Outdoor/indoor play areas need to be incorporated.	RESPONSE - In relation to indoor play facilities see response to RSM13.
			Green areas preserved/improved need sufficient priority relative to commercial development interests).	RESPONSE - With regards to open space provision please see response to RSM90.
			Litter management extremely important if area to be maintained/ improved.	RESPONSE - See RSM4 in relation to litter management.
			Flood defences need careful assessment if developments are to be sustainable.	RESPONSE - The council has recently prepared (2010) a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment which identifies measures to ensure flood risk is minimised. All development is required to link in with the future flood risk management strategy for coastal defences and land around Cut Throat Dene will be retained as open space. In relation to surface water flooding all development should maximise opportunities to improve surface water drainage, through incorporating storage or reducing conveyance.
RSM149	G Nixon	Objects	How can converting public shelter to private restaurant promote tourism in Seaburn.	RESPONSE - The Seaburn Shelter is the only site deemed appropriate for development on the east side of Whitburn Road and is vital to the regeneration of the area. Part of this

				redevelopment will also include the incorporation of new public toilets and a Changing Places facility for disabled people (the first on the seafront). The redevelopment of the Seaburn Shelter is intended to provide activity throughout the year where people are able to enjoy refreshments whilst taking in sea views.
			Scheme revolves around building of houses on publicly owned land.	RESPONSE - With regards to housing please see main body of the Cabinet Report.
RSM150	E R Ambrose	Objects	Potential previously wasted, every effort must be made for residents to enjoy facilities/attract visitors. Will bring much needed revenue.	RESPONSE - Comment Noted
			No provision visitor for car/coach parking. Current parking should remain.	RESPONSE - With regards to parking see main body of the Cabinet Report.
			No further residential building on Whitburn Road. Residential development only allowed adjacent to Seafields.	RESPONSE - With regards to housing main body of the Cabinet Report.
			Toilet facilities are required along the sea front not just on air show weekend.	RESPONSE - With regards to toilet provision see main body of Cabinet Report.
RSM151	Mr Smith	Objects	Loss of free, convenient, car park adj. Morrisons serious flaw. Need free car parking will still exist and just be transformed to existing residential streets.	RESPONSE - With regards to parking please see main body of Cabinet Report.
			New residential development means loss of valuable public amenity space.	RESPONSE - With regards to housing see main body of Cabinet Report.
RSM152	Freda & Dave Leeming	Supports	Plan would improve area.	RESPONSE - Comment Noted
			Lacks major vision, primarily designed to bring revenue in to the council through sale of land for housing (and Council Tax) provision of large commercial units which bring a financial return to both occupiers and council. Missed opportunity.	RESPONSE - The MDC has been prepared as an ambitious but deliverable plan. Consequently uses have been identified in order for regeneration to be viable, it is not considered that there is a sufficient gap in the market for large scale seaside related leisure attractions. For further information on housing see main body of Cabinet Report.
			Car Parking – existing mostly under-used but loss of all other than Morrison’s increase visitor on-street congestion parking, other than when controlled.	RESPONSE - With regards to parking please see main body of Cabinet Report.
			Devt. will modernise/smarten area, visitors more to do, nothing suggested unique/grand enough attract extra visitors from wider area than at present. Plans concentrate on small area of Seaburn seafront rather than whole seafront.	RESPONSE - The Seafront Regeneration Strategy acts as the overarching document in the regeneration of the seafront for both Roker and Seaburn. The MDC concentrates specifically on the Seaburn area in supporting the delivery of objectives set out for the Seaburn character area within the SRS. The scale of facilities need to be of an appropriate to prevent harm the vitality of the city centre.
			Sunderland coast lot of positives. Council must build on strengths. Proposals seem to fall way short of this.	RESPONSE - Comment Noted
RSM153	George Jackson	Non given	Why sell WC’s for private development so no more public toilets.	RESPONSE - For toilet provision see main body of Cabinet Report.
			To rely on private enterprise funds is folly, more careful thought and research needs to be put in.	RESPONSE - At the present time the council has limited funding for investment. Market testing has identified genuine private sector interest. The MDC has been prepared to be phased over 10-15 years allowing for changes in the economy.
RSM154	Mark James Holland	Support and Objects	P30-31 Object to ‘catchment and demand has increased.’	RESPONSE - Comment Noted
			Theme park would be huge benefit to area. Outdoor swimming pool with bar interesting prospect i.e. Stanhope.	RESPONSE - For swimming pool provision see response to RSM2. For info relating to large scale attractions see RSM40.
RSM155	L Nixon	Support and Object	Worried about small businesses on Queens Parade – is there enough business support all re mixed use ‘C&D’ in the new development.	RESPONSE - The council will work closely with existing businesses and landowners to ensure their needs are represented. All existing businesses will be retained including those along Queens Parade. The intention of the MDC is to preserve and enhance the range of existing businesses and services currently on offer along the seafront and to ensure the longevity of these businesses.
RSM156	Daisy Campbell	Non given	Beach safety important.	RESPONSE - Beach safety is of paramount importance for the council.
RSM157	K Brown	Supports	Build tall landmark can be seen when Great North Run cameras at South Shields.	RESPONSE - The MDC sets out principles in relation to building heights. Buildings of up to 6 storeys may be acceptable further away from dwellings. However, additional storeys are unlikely to be acceptable unless it can be demonstrated that they would not cause harm to the residential and visual amenity of the area or the wider environment.
RSM158	T Shevlin	Objects	Used Seaburn Centre since opened as have lots of friends.	RESPONSE - For Seaburn Centre see main body of Cabinet Report.
RSM159	J McDermott	Objects	Any proposals should include sports and recreation facilities.	RESPONSE - For Seaburn Centre see main body of Cabinet Report.
RSM160	Mr G Meek	Objects	Keep Seaburn Centre used by lots of people.	RESPONSE - For Seaburn Centre see main body of Cabinet Report.
RSM161	Mr G Meek	Objects	Keep Seaburn Centre.	RESPONSE - For Seaburn Centre see main body of Cabinet Report.
RSM162	Mrs J Meek	Objects	Keep Seaburn Centre.	RESPONSE - For Seaburn Centre see main body of Cabinet Report.
RSM163	S Lamb	Objects	Strongly object to proposed closure of Seaburn Centre.	RESPONSE - For Seaburn Centre see main body of Cabinet Report.
RSM164	Mr M Furness	Objects	Seaburn Centre fills recreational need.	RESPONSE - For Seaburn Centre see main body of Cabinet Report.
RSM165	Dwane Pipe	Supports	Very good.	RESPONSE - Comment Noted

RSM166	Thomas Guespie	Supports	Looks amazing can't wait.	RESPONSE - Comment Noted
RSM167	Glen Hargrave		Extend Fulwell skatepark before anything.	RESPONSE - The Seaburn skate park lies outside of the boundaries of the MDC and as such is under the remit of other LDF documents.
RSM168	Chelsey Robins	Supports	Staff very kind and welcoming.	RESPONSE - Comment Noted
RSM169	J Chattenton	Supports	Swimming pool would be appreciated by day trippers when weather bad. Not everyone knows where Aqua Centre is.	RESPONSE - For swimming pool provision see RSM2.
RSM170	Anomynous	Objects	Keep Seaburn Centre. Boxing Day dip? Airshow? Sunderland football club winning a trophy?	RESPONSE - For Seaburn Centre see main body of Cabinet Report. Comment Noted
RSM171	A England	Objects	Hope will not cause increase in noise or traffic especially late at night.	RESPONSE - Balancing the needs of local residents whilst promoting Seaburn's growth as a resort is vital to the success of the MDC. Consequently in considering the design and location of developments noise will be of utmost importance minimising impacts on residents. With regards to traffic please see response to RSM74.
RSM172	Sophie Douthwaite	Supports	Like beach activities, like dips in sea, surfing.	RESPONSE - Comment Noted
RSM173	Lynn Carrington	Supports	Swimming pool would be draw for bad weather.	RESPONSE - For swimming pool provision see RSM2.
RSM174	W Browning	Objects to some	Retain Seaburn Centre. Council lose revenue from cancelled gym memberships. Supposed to be encouraging healthy lifestyle.	RESPONSE - For Seaburn Centre see main body of Cabinet Report.
RSM175	Anomynous	Supports	Need more shops at seafront	RESPONSE - The MDC recognises that there has been little retail development due to the presence of Morrisons and nearby Sea Road local centre. Limited retail development in the form of specialist retailers catering for the foreshore location and leisure orientated character of the area may be acceptable.
RSM176	Anomynous	Non given	These plans will never happen.	RESPONSE - Comment Noted
RSM177	Doreen Whitwell	Objects	Shouldn't extend buildings to sea side of road. Enough clutter on other side. Leave grass and view undisturbed.	RESPONSE - The only site acceptable for development on the eastern side of Whitburn Road is the Seaburn Shelter. Retaining views is key to redevelopment of site.
RSM178	William Burdon	Supports	S. Shields received £20m European grant recently. Sunderland lagged behind in completing upgrade Roker/Seaburn most certainly a priority.	RESPONSE - Comment Noted
RSM179	John Lloyd	Non given	Keep Seaburn Centre used for many years	RESPONSE - For Seaburn Centre see main body of Cabinet Report.
RSM180	Mrs M Todner	Objects	Why centre of plan huge chunk of parking. Another eyesore? Park machines underground and leave space for people to use. Is the only thing we're good at/good for another car park.	RESPONSE - The MDC will take a carefully managed approach to location and design of new car parks ensuring suitable provision for visitors. Underground car parks may be considered as part of a development proposal. However, these often require significant investment which can harm the viability of development.
RSM181	W Craddock	Supports	Million just start, investments i.e. Bridlington excellent family resort. A good start, toilets up to standard.	RESPONSE - Comment Noted. For toilet provision see main body of Cabinet Report.
			Black/sponsored seats facing sea.	RESPONSE - For seats facing sea see RSM33.
RSM182	L Hughes	Supports	More control of parking on main road.	RESPONSE - As part of the MDC a new approach to parking will be undertaken, ensuring greater pedestrian priority on Whitburn Road and less dominance of motorised vehicles.
RSM183	Anomynous	Neither (plans inadequate)	Where are the public toilets?	RESPONSE - For toilet provision please see main body of Cabinet Report.
RSM184	H Schell	Objects	Looks awful. Sunderland council/officials so badly informed about city developments. Much better as it is.	RESPONSE - Comment Noted
RSM185	Ron McQuillan	Objects	Seaburn expenditure low priority. First priority for 90% plus of population 1) New river road crossing to utilise existing roads. 2) Conserve industrial land from Q. Alexandra Bridge to Groves site for industrial use. 3) Develop leisure potential of Wear by constructing a barrage e.g. Tees.	RESPONSE - The Seaburn MDC focuses on the regeneration of Seaburn as a family focused resort. The areas identified by the respondees are outside of the boundaries of the MDC and are therefore not included within the document and are covered elsewhere within the LDF.
RSM186	Marilyn Fairs	Supports	Good plan long awaited improvements. Train and paddling pool would be excellent.	RESPONSE - Comment Noted. The facilities suggested may be compatible with vision for Seaburn as family focused resort. However, MDC's purpose set out broad planning and design parameters not detail specific uses.

**FORWARD PLAN – KEY DECISIONS FOR THE PERIOD 1
JUNE 2011 – 30 SEPTEMBER 2011**

REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

Strategic Priorities: SP5 Attractive and Inclusive City

**Corporate Priorities: CIO1: Delivering Customer Focused Services, CIO4:
Improving partnership working to deliver ‘One City’**

1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 To provide Members with an opportunity to consider those items on the Executive’s Forward Plan for the period 1 June 2011 – 30 September 2011 which relate to the Environment and Attractive City Scrutiny Committee.

2. Background Information

- 2.1 Holding the Executive to account is one of the main functions of Scrutiny. One of the ways that this can be achieved is by considering the forthcoming decisions of the Executive (as outlined in the Forward Plan) and deciding whether Scrutiny can add value in advance of the decision being made. This does not negate Non-Executive Members ability to call-in a decision after it has been made.
- 2.3 To this end the most recent version of the Executive’s Forward Plan is included on the agenda of each of the Council’s Scrutiny Committees.

3. Current Position

- 3.1 Following member’s comments on the suitability of the Forward Plan being presented in its entirety to each committee it should be noted that only issues relating to the specific remit of the Environment and Attractive City Scrutiny Committee are presented for information and comment.
- 3.2 For members information the remit of the Environment and Attractive City Scrutiny Committee is as follows:-

Place shaping; Building Control; Unitary Development Plan and the documents comprising the development plan; Local Transport Plan; Coast protection; Cemeteries and Crematorium; Grounds Maintenance; Flood Risk; Highways services and Streetscene; Waste and Recycling; Allotments

- 3.3 In the event of members having any queries that cannot be dealt with directly in the meeting, a response will be sought from the relevant Directorate.

4. Recommendations

- 4.1 To consider the Executive's Forward Plan for the period 1 June 2011 – 30 September 2011

4. Background Papers

None

Contact Officer : Sarah Abernethy 0191 561 1230
Sarah.Abernethy@sunderland.gov.uk

Forward Plan: Key Decisions from - 01/Jun/2011 to 30/Sep/2011
Items which fall within the remit of the Environment and Attractive City Scrutiny Committee

No.	Description of Decision	Decision Taker	Anticipated Date of Decision	Principal Consultees	Means of Consultation	When and how to make representations and appropriate Scrutiny Committee	Documents to be considered	Contact Officer	Tel No
01509	To approve the acquisition of additional land for the Sunderland Strategic Transport Corridor.	Cabinet	01/Jun/2011	Portfolioholder for Attractive and Inclusive City; Appropriate Chief Officers	Meetings; Briefings; Comments of Draft Report	To contact Officer by 20 May - Environment and Attractive City Scrutiny Cttee	Cabinet Report; Map and Schedule	Keith Atkinson	5611562
01504	To agree Environment and Attractive City Scrutiny Cttee's recommendations following a review of Sunderland 'the Place'	Cabinet	22/Jun/2011	Office of the Chief Executive and City Services Staff, External Partners, Residents and Students	Scrutiny Cttee, Community Spirit Workshops / Survey, Partners Student Ambassador, Elected Member Focus Group	Via the Contact Officer by 20 May 2011 - Environment and Attractive City Scrutiny Committee	Policy Review Final Report	Helen Lancaster	5611233
01484	To approve the Local Development Framework Core Strategy revised preferred option for public consultation.	Cabinet	22/Jun/2011	Head of Law and Governance, Acting Director of Financial Services	Circulation of draft cabinet paper	To the contact officer by 20 May - Environment and Attractive City Scrutiny Committee	Core Strategy revised Preferred Option	Neil Cole	5611574
01403	To consider the outcome of Public Consultation (March - June 2010) in relation to the Accessible Bus Network Design Project	Cabinet	22/Jun/2011	Portfolio Holder for Attractive and Inclusive City; Nexus; Appropriate Chief Officers	Briefings; Meetings; e-mails	Via the contact officer by 20 May - Environmental and Attractive City Scrutiny Committee	Cabinet Report	Bob Donaldson	5611517

No.	Description of Decision	Decision Taker	Anticipated Date of Decision	Principal Consultees	Means of Consultation	When and how to make representations and appropriate Scrutiny Committee	Documents to be considered	Contact Officer	Tel No
01412	To approve the procurement of specialist vehicles to be used in the waste and cleaning service.	Cabinet	22/Jun/2011	Procurement; Appropriate Chief Officers; Portfolio holder for Attractive and Inclusive City	Report; Briefings	Via Contact Officer by 20 May - Environment and Attractive City	Report	Les Clark	5614540
01498	To consider consultation responses received and associated actions; approve the Seaburn Masterplan and Design Code as Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)	cabinet	20/Jul/2011	Head of Law and Governance, Acting Deputy Director of Financial Resources	Circulation of draft Cabinet paper	To contact officer by 20 June - Environment and Attractive City Scrutiny Committee	Cabinet Report, Seaburn Masterplan and Design Code SPD with associated Sustainability Appraisal Appropriate Assessment.	Ben Winter	5612549

DRAFT

**REQUEST FOR INCLUSION OF AN ITEM FOR
CONSIDERATION – PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

Strategic Priorities: SP5 Attractive and Inclusive City

**Corporate Priorities: CIO1: Delivering Customer Focused Services, CIO4:
Improving partnership working to deliver 'One City'**

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To consider the inclusion of an additional item in the Scrutiny Committee work programme.

2. Background

- 2.1 Protocol 1 of the Overview and Scrutiny Handbook provides a procedure for members to follow when requesting items to be considered by a Scrutiny Committee (see also the Council's Constitution Part 4 Section 5 Rules of Procedures Paragraph 9).
- 2.2 In July 2010, the Scrutiny Committee received a detailed report regarding the Planning Application Consultation Process, following a request from five members.
- 2.3 Mr. Keith Lowes, Head of Planning and Environment presented a report which outlined the council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) adopted on 22 November 2006.
- 2.4 The SCI sets out how the Council proposes to engage communities and stakeholders in not only the preparation of local development documents but also the consideration of planning applications. The SCI was prepared in the light of consultation with community groups, other organisations and stakeholders. The SCI was tested for soundness at an examination by an Independent Inspector and incorporates binding recommendations.
- 2.5 An extract from the SCI covering the principles of consultation and publicity in respect of planning applications was highlighted to the Committee and a full debate was subsequently held around the issue.

3. Item Requested

- 3.1 At the end of the municipal year 2010/2011, five members requested that consideration be given to the following item:

Public Consultation – Planning Applications

- 3.2 The request asks that the Environment and Attractive City Scrutiny Committee look into:-

‘the current delegated powers for planning application decisions, together with recommendations for potentially removing delegated powers where planning applications of obvious public interest are involved. Additionally could members receive a scrutiny report explaining why public consultation was not performed prior to the planning application “11/00127/FUL – Wind Turbine St Robert of Newminster School” being submitted as “undertaking pre-application community consultation is best practice and it is something that the Planning and Environment Service actively encourages but isn’t obligatory”’.

4. Framework for Consideration of Submissions

- 4.1 In accordance with the Council’s Constitution and with Protocol 1, the Committee may choose to respond within the following framework:

- (1) The Scrutiny Committee may determine that the item is not relevant to the functions of the Committee. In these circumstances the Committee can resolve to take no action or may refer the item to another Scrutiny Committee.
- (2) If the issue is linked to an existing work programme item (within the next two cycles) then it should be discussed as part of that item and included in any officer report.
- (3) If the issue is a new item of business within the remit of the Committee, the Scrutiny Committee may:
 - (a) Request a response in writing (with copies to all Members of the Review Committee) or
 - (b) Request a presentation to a future Scrutiny Committee meeting, or
 - (c) Request a report to a future Scrutiny Committee meeting or
 - (d) Decide that the issue raised does not merit any response beyond noting the matter or

- (e) Decide to express a view or make a recommendation, by resolving accordingly, if the Committee considers it has sufficient information to make a fully informed decision.

5. Conclusion

- 5.1 The Committee is asked to consider the request and determine from the framework set out in Section 4 of this report which option to pursue.

6. Background Papers

- Sunderland City Council Constitution
- Overview and Scrutiny Handbook

Contact Officer: Helen Lancaster (0191 5611233)
Helen.lancaster@sunderland.gov.uk