

Lisburn Terrace Triangle Development Framework

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT AND REGENERATION

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 Lisburn Terrace Triangle draft Development Framework and to seek Committee's comments on the revised Development Framework.
- 1.2 The Committee's comments will be reported to Cabinet on 29th July 2009 when agreement will be sought to approve the Lisburn Terrace Triangle Development Framework as planning guidance.

2.0 Background

- 2.1 At its meeting on 8th April 2009, Cabinet approved the draft Lisburn Terrace Development Framework for the purposes of public consultation.
- 2.2 The main proposals contained in the draft development framework included:
- The development of a mix of C3 (residential) and B1 (office) uses on the site, with offices uses to be located to the north of the site and residential on the remainder
 - A strong gateway development to the north of the site to provide a strong frontage to Pallion New Road and a buffer to residential development
 - Open amenity space and equipped play space to be provided within the site
 - The opportunity to explore a green boulevard, linking Diamond Hall Pocket Park with Deptford to the North
 - Public art on site
 - A well-connected, pedestrian and cycle friendly layout that binds effectively with the surrounding streetscape

3.0 Consultations on the draft Development Framework

- 3.1 The draft Development Framework was the subject of public consultation for a five week period between 20 April and 20 May 2009.

- 3.2 All the relevant information relating to the consultation, including the draft Development Framework document was available online at www.sunderland.gov.uk/lisburnterrace
- 3.3 Letters including Freepost envelopes and comments forms for completion and return were delivered to all households and businesses in close proximity to the Lisburn Terrace site. The letter notified recipients of the consultation period, invited them to see the main proposals plan at an exhibition displayed at Kayll Road Library and the Civic Centre throughout the consultation period and notified them of three two-hour 'drop-in' sessions at the Library where they could see the exhibition and discuss the proposals with council staff. Freepost envelopes and comments forms were available at both venues. Responses could also be made by email.
- 3.4 Over 190 stakeholders including a range of businesses, organisations and other individuals were consulted by letter asking them to respond formally. A list of formal consultees is included in Appendix 1 to this report.

4.0 Consultation responses and changes to the masterplan

- 4.1 The 'drop-ins' at Kayll Road Library were attended by approximately 10 people. 45 written responses were received in total.
- 4.2 32 comments forms were completed and returned by local residents. In addition 2 emails were submitted. 25 respondees supported the Framework proposals and 7 objections were received.
- 4.3 Thirteen representations were received from formal consultees. They were generally supportive of the Development Framework. Further consideration of representations submitted by Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners, Sport England, Natural England, Northumbrian Water, the Coal Authority, Nexus, the County Archaeologist, English Heritage and Barton Wilmore have resulted in minor changes to sections of the Development Framework document.
- 4.4 The representations received, together with the City Council's response and how, if necessary, the Development Framework has been amended to reflect the representations are set out in Appendix 2 to this report.
- 4.5 In addition, the following minor changes have also been made to the document:
- The amended Development Framework indicates that residential development on the site will be required to provide 0.9ha of open amenity space per 1000 bed spaces; in accordance with policies H21 and L5 of the Unitary Development Plan.
 - The City Council is to negotiate with developers over the provision of affordable housing on the site

- Greater clarity has been provided on the various site constraints requirements including the the requirement for a noise and vibration assessment
- Further information on the required developer contributions for the site has been included
- In addition to the green boulevard linking the site with Deptford, the amended Development Framework seeks to provide a north-south cycle/walkway, in order to take advantage of cycling and walking improvements that have previously taken place on the Queen Alexandra Bridge. The site will serve as a key pedestrian link between the bridge and Millfield Metro station to the south.

4.6 Copies of the proposed final Development Framework are available for inspection in the Members' Rooms and the proposals plan will be displayed at the Committee meeting.

5.0 Reasons for decision

5.1 The approval of the Lisburn Terrace Triangle Development Framework will provide a formal planning framework that will facilitate the redevelopment of the area by a private developer. The Framework will be used by developers as a basis for preparing a masterplan and detailed proposals for the site and would be afforded weight as a material consideration when determining future planning applications

6.0 Alternative options

6.1 The alternative option is not to prepare a development framework. The consequences of this would be a failure to meet the requirement set out in the adopted UDP Alteration No.2 policy ECB5 to prepare a broad framework for each Strategic Location for Change site, the Lisburn Terrace Triangle being one of them. In addition failure to prepare an endorsed framework will reduce the Council's ability to ensure a high quality of development on the site.

7.0 Recommendation

7.1 Committee is recommended to consider the amended Lisburn Terrace Triangle Development Framework and refer its comments to cabinet for consideration

8.0 List of appendices

- Appendix 1: Lisburn Terrace draft Development Framework public consultation - list of formal consultees
- Appendix 2: Lisburn Terrace draft Development Framework public consultation - schedule of representations, City Council responses and amendments to the Development Framework

9.0 Background Papers

- Lisburn Terrace Triangle Development Framework (2009)

Appendix 1: Lisburn Terrace Triangle draft Development Framework public consultation - list of external stakeholders

The following list comprises the organisations, stakeholders and individuals formally consulted by letter as part of the statutory consultation process on the Castletown masterplan strategy

Formal Consultees

North East Assembly
The Coal Authority
Environment Agency
Natural England
English Heritage
The Secretary of State for Transport
Northumbria Police
Gateshead MBC
South Tyneside Council
ONE NorthEast
Allcom Communications Ltd
BT
Cable and Wireless
Easynet Telecom Ltd
Energis
Fibrenet
Fujitsu Telecommunications Europe Ltd
Mobile Operators Association
NTL
O2
Orange Communications
Redstone Communications
T-Mobile
Thales Communication Services
Vodafone Corporate Communications
Verizon
Virgin Media
VSNL Telecommunications UK
Sunderland Teaching Primary Care Trust
South Tyneside Primary Care Trust
National Grid
NEDL
Northern gas Networks
Northumbria Water

Other organisations and bodies

CABE Space
English Partnerships
Government Office North East
Home Builders Federation
Housing Corporation
North East Housing Board

Sunderland arc
Coalfield Regeneration Trust
DTZ
NPower
Northern Electric
Powergen
Go-Ahead Northern
Nexus
Stagecoach North-East
Sustrans
Transport 2000
Tyne and Wear Passenger Transport Authority
NHS Executive North and Yorkshire
Priority Care Wearside
South of Tyne and Wearside Mental Health NHS Trust
Sunderland Health Commission
Sunderland Carers Centre
Church Commissioners
Diocesan Board of Finance
County Archaeologist
Sport England
CPRE Sunderland
DEFRA
Durham Biodiversity Partnership
Durham Wildlife Trust
Forestry Commission
Great North Forest
RSPB
The Woodland Trust

Local stakeholders / Landowners

Pallion Action Group
Deptford and Millfield Community Association
Barnes, Pallion and Millfield Residents Association
Saint Mark's Church Community Group
Inspector Neal Craig, Neighbourhood Inspector, Central Area
Chris Morris, Arson Task Force, Sunderland Central
Saint Joseph's RC Primary School
Pallion Primary School
Saint Modwen
Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners
Adderstone Group
Pallion Engineering
DNA Architects
Barton Wilmore
University of Sunderland

Bodies representing specific interest groups

Sunderland Council for Volunteer Services
Sunderland Volunteer Bureau

Sunderland Civic Society
Kite Project NCH Action for Children
MODIS
Money Advice Service
North of England refuge Service
Refugee and Asylum Seekers Support Network
North of England Civic Trust
Citizens Advice Bureau
Round Table (Sunderland)
Sunderland Law Society
Sunderland Federation of Community Associations
Sunderland Community Network
CRYOP
Headlight
Education Business Connections
Families in Care
Kaleidoscope (NSPCC)
Learning and Skills Council Tyne and Wear
Mental Health Matters
North East AIDS Care
North East Council on Addictions
North Regional Association for the Blind
North Regional Association for Sensory Support
REACH Project
Relate North East
Social Enterprise Sunderland
Springboard Sunderland
Sunderland Carers Centre
Youth Development Service
Salvation Army
Samaritans
Sunderland People First
Sunderland Bangladeshi Community Centre
Sunderland Mosque
Sunderland Sikh Association
British Council of Disabled People
Disability Rights Commission
Disabled Persons Transport Advisory Committee
Sunderland Council for the Disabled
Physical Disabilities Alliance
Wear Able
Wearside Disablement Trust
North East Chamber of Commerce
Federation of Small Businesses
Sunderland North Community Business Centre
Sunderland Business Network
Business Link Tyne and Wear
North East Business and Innovation Centre
Tyne and Wear Development Company

MPs and MEPs

Chris Mullin MP

Stephen Hughes MEP

Martin J Callanan MEP

Fiona Jane Hall MEP

In addition to the above, the Leader and Deputy Leader of the council, the then Portfolio Holders for Planning and Transportation, Housing and Public Health and Regeneration and Community Cohesion, local ward councillors and all relevant services within the City Council were formally consulted by memo.

Appendix 2: Lisburn Terrace Triangle draft Development Framework public consultation – Stakeholder responses

Stakeholder	Summary of response	Council's response
External Stakeholders		
ONE	<p>One North East welcomes and endorses the provision of a development framework for this important site which is a 'gateway' to Sunderland City Centre.</p> <p>One North East urges the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to recognise in the document the importance of providing an appropriate balance of type, size and tenure in the housing provision.</p> <p>One North East welcomes the document's emphasis on the need to achieve a high standard of urban design throughout the development of the site.</p> <p>One North east welcome the sustainable construction and energy requirements for the site; however urges the LPA to require the achievement of Excellent BREEAM rating post construction.</p> <p>One North East welcomes the document's requirement for developer contributions¹ and would encourage the LPA to provide a methodology to calculate the level of contribution required.</p>	<p>Comments Noted – No change</p> <p>The methodology for developer contributions is being discussed with the developer and negotiations are underway as part of the pre-application stage. Notwithstanding this, further details on the S106 process will be included in the amended Development Framework.</p>
GONE	<p>A) All matters covered in Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) must relate to policies in a development plan document or a saved policy in a development plan and SPDs should clearly state which DPD policies or saved policies they support</p> <p>B) Section 19(5) of the planning and compulsory purchase Act 2004 requires LPA's to produce a sustainability Appraisal of SPDs and a report of the findings</p> <p>C) Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 sets out the</p>	<p>Comments Noted – No Change</p> <p>In relation to point A) The Development Framework contains a list of relevant Local policies in Appendix 2 and Appendix 3. The site specific policies are contained in Appendix 2. Appendix 3 contains UDP saved policies, Alteration No. 2 policies and emerging Core Strategy policies.</p> <p>The Development Framework is to be taken forward as planning guidance, which will support relevant UDP Alteration Number 2 policies. It is not SPD and points B and C in this case will not be relevant</p>

	requirements for publicising and consulting on draft SPDs	
Natural England	<p>Page 3 - PPS9 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation also needs to be considered, particularly in relation to protected species, biodiversity by design, and biodiversity on brownfield sites.</p> <p>Page 5 - Design and Access Statement – this could also appraise biodiversity present on the site and any opportunities for inclusion of biodiversity in the design.</p> <p>Page 7 - Public realm/Page 9 Amenity Open Space – we would encourage consideration of linkages to the wider green infrastructure network too.</p> <p>Page 11 - S106 agreements – could these also cover landscaping/greenspace/biodiversity enhancements?</p>	<p>Comment noted - reference to PPS9 to be included in amended Framework on Page 3.</p> <p>Comment noted – No change - As part of the Tyne and Wear Validation requirements, a biodiversity survey and report will be required prior to the consideration of any planning application. This will inform a Design and Access Statement. Reference to the validation requirements can be found on page 11 of the Development Framework.</p> <p>Comment Noted. Page 7 add: <i>Consideration should be given to linkages to the wider green infrastructure. The creation of green boulevards within the site linking the Queen Alexandra Bridge and Diamond Hall Pocket Park and providing a route into Deptford will be considered favourably. (see indicative framework plan Appendix 4)</i></p> <p>Comment Noted – Greenspace to be delivered as integral part of the development. Section 106 on the continuing maintenance of landscaping proposals to be included on Page 11.</p>
County Archaeologist	<p>The site is of potential industrial archaeological interest. In the mid 19th century it was the site of a brick and tile works, a brick field, the Diamond Bottle Works and Wear Flint Glass Works. Glass working has continued on this site into modern times at Cornings Glassworks. The diverted Lambton Railway was built through the site between 1865 and 1890 and its course is still apparent.</p> <p>An archaeological desk based assessment will be required with any future planning application. Any surviving glassworks buildings should be recorded as part of this process. The work must be undertaken in accordance with a specification provided by the County Archaeologist. The assessment is likely to recommend evaluation trial trenching, which would need to be undertaken before development commenced.</p>	<p>Comment Noted – Insert new section P.11:</p> <p>Archaeology <i>The site is of potential industrial archaeological interest. In the mid 19th century it was the site of a brick and tile works, a brick field, the Diamond Bottle Works and Wear Flint Glass Works. Glass working has continued on this site into modern times at Cornings Glassworks. The diverted Lambton Railway was built through the site between 1865 and 1890 and its course is still apparent.</i></p> <p><i>An archaeological desk based assessment will be required with any future planning application. Any surviving glassworks buildings should be recorded as part of this process. The work must be undertaken in accordance with a specification provided by the County Archaeologist. The assessment is likely to recommend evaluation trial trenching, which would need to be undertaken before development commenced.</i></p>

<p>Northumbria Water</p>	<p>NWL generally support the redevelopment of the Lisburn Terrace Triangle and welcome the principle of a Development Framework for the area</p> <p>NWL would notify the Council and partners that the area within the master plan boundary is crossed by several major public sewers and a strategic water main. The Company would therefore advise that the Design and Access Statement for the proposals discussed on page 5 needs to address how NWL's apparatus will be protecting during and after development by either designing the layout to allow easements for access and maintenance or by diverting the apparatus, which would be at the developer's cost.</p> <p>NWL support the reference to Sustainable Construction which also includes water efficiency and conservation measures.</p> <p>NWL also support the section on Flood Risk and Climate Change but would urge the Council to ensure that every opportunity is taken through redevelopment of the site to reduce the amount of surface water that enters the old sewerage system. As well reducing flood risk, this would also bring benefits in terms of addressing climate change by reducing the energy needed to pump and treat surface water as well as environmental and ecological benefits of Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS) to manage surface water.</p>	<p>Comments Noted – Amend Insert new section P.1:</p> <p>Constraints <i>NWL has notified the Council that the area within the Development framework boundary is crossed by several major public sewers and a strategic water main. The design of Masterplan layouts must allow easements for access and maintenance. Diversion of apparatus would be at the developer's cost. NWL request close liaison on schemes at the earliest opportunity.</i></p> <p>Insert in new section under Site Specific requirements: Ground stability, Noise and Services <i>The design of the Masterplan for the area's development must allow easements for access and maintenance of major public sewers and a strategic water main. Diversion of apparatus would be at the developer's cost. NWL request close liaison on schemes at the earliest opportunity</i></p>
<p>Nexus</p>	<p>In principle Nexus is happy with the proposals set out in the DDF.</p> <p>Concerned by the fact that a possible Metro station site is shown towards the west end of the site. This is not</p>	<p>Comment noted – Amend Remove proposed Metro station from Indicative Framework Principles plan in</p>

	<p>something that Nexus proposed and it could be interpreted that Nexus is already planning an additional station when this is not in fact the case. Nexus would prefer that the proposed Metro site is removed from the map accompanying the document.</p> <p>We would also consider it unlikely that any public transport routes will be diverted through what is a relatively small site. What is important is that there are direct, safe pedestrian routes (including safe road crossing points) to reach the nearest bus stops and Millfield Metro station. Nexus would also request that a suggestion for prospective developers of this site to contact us at an early stage to discuss public transport issues be added.</p>	<p>Appendix 4</p> <p>Comment Noted – Amend remove final two bullets P7 and amend to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The development should introduce direct, safe pedestrian and cycle routes through the site that establish linkages to outside routes and potential new development sites such as DeptfordTerrace to the north.</i> • <i>These routes must also allow for safe access to existing public transport infrastructure including bus stops and the Millfield Metro Station to the south</i> • <i>It is recommended that prospective developers contact Nexus to discuss Public Transport issues at the site</i> • <i>The existing railway tunnel located under Pallion New Road should be explored as a potential cycle/pedestrian route access</i>
National Grid	<p>Based on the information provided and the proximity and sensitivity of the electricity and gas transmission networks to your proposals, we have concluded that risk is negligible NOTE: this refers only to national networks only. You must also obtain information of focal information on gas and electricity distribution networks</p>	<p>Comments noted</p>
The Coal Authority	<p>Given the major redevelopment of this area, and the presence of previous mining activity under the site it will be necessary for ground stability issues to be considered and addressed in accordance with the advice in PPG14. This will be purely to ensure that any necessary mitigation measures are incorporated into the development scheme in order that no future ground stability issues present any public safety issues for residents and that no future cost liability falls onto the public purse. The Coal Authority would suggest the inclusion of the following wording:</p> <p><i>“Flood Risk, climate change and ground stability</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The site may have legacy issues associated with former underground mining activity within Sunderland and consequently a ground stability report will be necessary to determine whether any appropriate mitigation</i> 	<p>Comment noted - Amend Insert new section P.1</p> <p><i>Constraints</i> <i>The Coal Authority has notified the Council that the site may have legacy issues associated with former underground mining activity within Sunderland. In accordance with PPG14 a ground stability report will be necessary to determine whether any appropriate mitigation measures need to be incorporated into the detailed design of new development.</i></p> <p>Comment noted - Amend Insert new section under Site Specific requirements:</p> <p><i>Ground stability, Noise and Services</i> <i>In accordance with PPG14 a ground stability report will be necessary to determine whether any appropriate mitigation measures need to</i></p>

	<p><i>measures need to be incorporated into the detailed design of new development."</i></p> <p>Reason – To reflect the requirement of PPG14</p>	<p><i>be incorporated into the detailed design of new development.</i></p>
Allcom Ltd	<p>Level 3 Communications have no plant in the vicinity and are not affected by these works.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>
University of Sunderland	<p>This development site is located in close proximity to "The Forge" student halls of residence on Neville Street. We are obviously concerned about the Lisburn Terrace development and would like to be reassured that any scheme brought forward for the site will be done so without creating any problems for our existing student accommodation or in relation to the current planned housing development on the Forge site.</p>	<p>Comment noted – No change The Development Framework covers land to the east of the Metro line. The Forge Site and Halls of residence lie to the west. Development within the Framework area will be sufficiently removed from The Forge Site to negate any significant impact on the university property. In the long term it is likely that development within the Framework area will enhance the outlook for residents of the student accommodation and residents of any future housing scheme at the Forge site.</p>
Barton Willmore (Aurora Property Developments)	<p>Our Client is supportive of the proposal to include a new Metro Station as part of the redevelopment of Lisburn Terrace Triangle.</p> <p>The Development Framework should also establish the principle of access either from the new Metro Station or the existing Millfield Metro Station to the River Wear, in order to provide easy access to the riverside for those who live and work in the Lisburn Triangle area. The Framework should also include an aspiration to deliver an access route centrally through the Lisburn Terrace Triangle site linking to a central route through the Deptford Terrace site providing both sites with direct access to the river Wear, encouraging its use for recreational purposes</p> <p>The Development Framework should ensure that access arrangements to the Lisburn Terrace Triangle site do not prejudice the opportunity for comprehensive redevelopment of the adjacent Deptford terrace site</p> <p>Consideration should be given to addressing the levels change along the northern boundary of the Lisburn Terrace site to allow vehicular access to the site, east of the Queen Alexandra Bridge.</p>	<p>Comment noted Due to comments from Nexus (noted above), the option for a metro station has been removed from the Framework</p> <p>Comment noted - Amend <i>Insert P. 7 (Public realm):</i> <i>The creation of green boulevards within the site linking the Queen Alexandra Bridge and Diamond Hall Pocket Park and providing a route into Deptford will be considered favourably</i></p> <p><i>Insert P. 7 (Access Movement and Highways):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The development should introduce direct, safe pedestrian and cycle routes through the site that establish linkages to outside routes and potential new development sites such as Deptford Terrace to the north.</i> <i>These routes must also allow for safe access to existing public transport infrastructure including bus stops and the Millfield Metro Station to the south</i> <p>Comment noted - No Change Considered that agreed access arrangements for Lisburn Terrace would not prejudice Deptford Terrace Site. Access arrangements to be indicated in Indicative Principles Plan</p> <p>Comment noted – No Change Access requirements as agreed with Highways will ensure that this will be taken into account.</p>

<p>North East Councils</p>	<p>I would advise that RSS policies 2, 3, 24, 38 and 39 aim to reduce energy consumption and the impact on climate change from development. In particular policy 38 requires development to generate at least 10% of its energy from decentralised renewable or low carbon sources and go for BREEAM/Code for sustainable homes. If it doesn't already it would be good if your document set out how that would happen for this area. Similar for reducing the need to travel and improving access and integration.</p>	<p>Comment noted – Amend</p> <p><i>Insert RSS Policies 3, 24 and 38 into Appendix 3 of Development Framework</i></p> <p>The Development Framework includes requirements for 10% renewables and at least Code for Sustainable Homes level 3 on residential development/BREEAM Very Good or Excellent.</p> <p>Whilst the document itself does not set out how the targets can be achieved the developer is required to produce a Sustainability Statement as part of the Validation requirements for the site This statement must demonstrate how the principles set out in policy and the Framework have been achieved. It has been agreed that this will be submitted as part of the Design and Access Statement</p>
<p>Sport England</p>	<p>The Development Framework should acknowledge the principles of Active Design and this should be included in the best practice guidance documents of page 3 of the draft.</p> <p>Active Design is an innovative set of design guidelines to promote opportunities for sport and physical activity in the design and layout of development. The guidance has three key principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accessibility • Amenity • Awareness 	<p>Comment Noted - Amend</p> <p><i>Insert Page 4:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Active Design, Sport England/CABE/DCMS/DH (2007)</i>
<p>English Heritage</p>	<p>Site and surroundings – Contains only a very brief description of the site and its surroundings. No analysis of the characteristics is provided or commentary on its historical importance/heritage value. Refer to: <i>Creating successful Masterplans: A Guide for clients (CABE)</i></p> <p>Planning Policy and Best Practice – Welcome reference to PPG15 & PPG16. This implies there is heritage</p>	<p>Comment noted – Amend</p> <p><i>Insert text page 1 paragraph 2.</i></p> <p><i>The site is surrounded by the residential areas of Pallion and Millfield to the east, south and west. The area surrounding the site is predominantly characterised by Victorian single-storey terraced cottages (known as Sunderland Cottages), originally constructed for local shipyard workers.</i></p> <p><i>These areas are densely developed with open space provision falling below the City Council's requirements. The environment also lacks softer landscaping features and dwellings have little or no private garden space to compensate for this.</i></p> <p><i>Pallion Engineering - a cluster of warehouse style industrial buildings - are located to the north-west.</i></p> <p>Comment noted – No change</p> <p>County Archaeologist has been consulted in respect of this site. See comments noted</p>

	<p>value to the scheme. If so point above is even more important. Also increases the need for liason with the County Archaeologist and inspect the Historic environment Record. Heritage Assets should be incorporated into the scheme. Nearby QA bridge and its setting will need to be safeguarded.</p> <p>Development Principles – Heritage value and significance should be evaluated in the Design and Access Statement.</p> <p>Third bullet reference to ‘masterplans’ rather than ‘masterplan’. Suggests Council need to set out more clearly what its own vision is, in order to assess these masterplans.</p> <p>Reference to gateway development at key positions. How many gateways does the site have?</p> <p>Public Realm – replacement of ‘that’ with ‘there’ (third bullet last line).</p> <p>Amenity open Space - Show Culvert on plan</p>	<p>above. The City Council’s Conservation Team has indicated that the site itself is not of significant interest in terms of the protection of heritage structures. Nevertheless the public art requirement contained in the Framework will present the opportunity to explore the glassmaking industrial heritage of the site.</p> <p>Comment noted – No Change As discussed, it is not considered that the D&A statement will need to consider historical structures of note. However the developer will be required to assess and respond to the character of the surrounding built form which has itself been shaped by the historical uses of the area.</p> <p>Comment Noted - Amend <i>Remove reference to ‘masterplans’ and replace with ‘masterplan’</i></p> <p>Comment noted – Amend <i>Remove relevant paragraph</i></p> <p>Comment noted – Amend accordingly</p> <p>Comment Noted – No Change Route of Culvert is already indicated in the Indicative Framework Principles plan as the green route(Appendix 4)</p>
<p>Nathaniel Lichfield (St. Modwen)</p>	<p>Request DDF’s references to ‘requirements’ be amended to guidance or principles</p> <p>Planning policy SA6B.1 is a permissive policy, allowing B1, C3 and D1 uses as acceptable uses. DDF refers to required B1 & C3 uses. Request amendment to the wording to reflect the policy and ‘allow’ C3 & B1 & D1 uses on the site.</p> <p>March 2009 version of Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) identifies a capacity for 317</p>	<p>Comment noted – No Change Although the document is not an SPD but planning guidance, it will nevertheless be a material planning consideration and is to be treated as such. Its purpose is to outline principles for the development of the site. Many of these principles are in line with key requirements of established higher level statutory planning policies. There is no need to amend the document.</p> <p>Comment noted - Amend <i>Amend 3rd bullet page 2 to read:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Allow Class B1 (business) C3 (residential) and D1 (non-residential institutions) to be developed on site;</i> <p><i>Remove ‘required’ from 3rd paragraph page 4</i></p> <p>Comment noted – Amend <i>Amend final sentence 4th paragraph page 4 to read:</i></p>

	<p>houses on Lisburn terrace site not 270 as in DDF. Request text be amended to reflect the updated version and confirmation of deliverability in the next 1-5 years</p> <p>DDF states <i>'in accordance with PPS3 developers must..provide a phasing and delivery strategy..'</i> This requirement does not exist and the reference should be removed.</p> <p>DDF requires a Design and Access (D&A) Statement early in the masterplanning process at pre-application stage. There is no statutory requirement for this. Request removal this requirement.</p> <p>Amend heading 'Site Specific Design Requirements' to 'Site Specific Design Guidelines' for reasons given previously</p> <p>The Indicative Framework Principles Plan in Appendix 4 illustrates the Council's view on how the site be developed. There may be alternative solutions to the site development. Request text include an explanation of this fact</p> <p>Note that Policy H21 of the UDP which sets the open amenity Space requirements is not based on a PPG17-compliant assessment of open space and will be replaced by more up to date policies as part of LDF</p>	<p><i>It has been established through the SHLAA that the Lisburn Terrace Framework area has a capacity for 317 dwellings. 240 of these are considered deliverable within the next 1-5 years. The remaining 77 are considered deliverable in 6-10 years.</i></p> <p>Comment noted – Amend Remove paragraph 5 page 4 from text</p> <p>Comment noted – No Change The preparation of a D&A Statement early in the masterplanning process would be beneficial to the developer in conveying and clarify their design ideas for the site. The council considers Design and Access Statements not as a statutory hoop to be jumped through, rather a useful tool which facilitates effective pre-application discussion. Therefore it would be in the developer's interest to start preparing one early in the process. The Development Framework reflects good practice and the expectation to produce one early in the masterplanning process will remain.</p> <p>Comment noted – No Change See response to first comment. The requirements proposed in the framework do not preclude developers from interpreting design solutions for the site in different ways. The document sets standards, reflective of local and regional statutory policy.</p> <p>Comment noted – No Change Whilst the document is to be used as guidance for developers, in Appendix 4 the use of the term 'indicative' in the heading 'Indicative Framework Principles' clearly denotes a suggestive approach to development. In addition the key highlights 'potential' elements (e.g. potential green route). The document is not intended to be prescriptive, rather set the principles for development. Further explanation and clarification is not necessary.</p> <p>Comment noted Policy H21 is a saved policy in the UDP and is still relevant for the assessment for planning applications. This was sanctioned by GONE 2 years ago, as the policy met DCLG criteria regarding appropriateness. The policy will continue to be used until replaced by relevant LDF policy. Indeed PPG17 Companion Guide: Assessing needs and Opportunities</p>
--	---	---

	<p>Welcome the DDF suggestion that options to convert basements of former buildings on site into open amenity space/public realm should be explored. This is in line with PPG17 guidance that land otherwise unsuitable for development should be considered for open space. Open space in this area would reduce noise experienced by dwellings by acting as a buffer. PPG17 encourages provision of open space close to employment areas to provide workers with somewhere to eat lunch or take breaks.</p> <p>Is the reference to Noise Constraint supported by any survey work undertaken by the Council?</p> <p>St Modwen is of the view that their proposed area of open amenity space is sufficiently convenient and well overlooked to meet DDF requirements. In addition the proposed location would contribute to overall open amenity space standard of 0.4ha.</p>	<p>acknowledges that LAs will use existing policy and standards relating to open space (p.74). On page 17 the document states: 'There is no point discarding these policies before new ones are available'.</p> <p>Comment noted Whilst the use of basements may have value for the reasons given and is suggested as an option in the DDF, it should be noted that this does not preclude the requirement for open space on land under the developers ownership in line with UDP policy requirements (i.e. within residential development). PPG 17 recognises that open space is valuable in both employment areas and residential areas. There is a danger that relying on sites unsuitable for development such as the basement areas can result in SLOAP (Space left over after planning). Annex A of PPG17 Companion Guide highlights that as well as developing on land unsuitable for development, an Urban Design led approach to amenity green space must also be adopted in order to ensure high quality environments.</p> <p>Comment Noted No survey work has been undertaken by the council, however the Environmental Health Team have indicated that they will require a PPG24-compliant noise and vibration survey to be carried out to accompany planning application for the site This has been agreed as part of the validation requirements for the site.</p> <p>Comment Noted An area of open space to the front of the site has merit as it provides a link through from the north and would provide a sitting out area for employees of office development.</p> <p>However it should be noted that UDP polices H21 and L5 indicate that 0.9ha per 1000 bedspaces is appropriate for the Lisburn Terrace site rather than 0.4ha. This shall be amended in the Development Framework accordingly. In addition H21 indicates that the open amenity space should be within residential development sites. There is concern that the majority of open amenity space shown in the masterplan would not be within land under the developer's ownership and therefore could not be guaranteed to come forward. This would be contrary to UDP policy. Policy SA6B.1 of UDP Alteration No.2 recognises that the the site may come forward in different stages over time. The current masterplan layout and arguments in favour of the greenspace requirement to the north of the</p>
--	---	--

	<p>The use of basement areas will achieve a successful balance between secluded and overlooked space as advocated by Play England's Design for Play: A Guide for Creating Successful Play Spaces and will provide a meaningful concentration of open space</p> <p>The requirement for play space is acknowledged. However the development framework should provide an explanation of how the cost of the play (£680 per family dwelling) has been calculated.</p>	<p>site suggest that the site will come forward comprehensively. Given that this is unlikely and that greenspace needs to be delivered as part of the residential development, the masterplan needs to be amended to show greenspace within the residential development.</p> <p>Comment noted The encouragement of a balance between seclusion and overlooking is included in the guide. It is considered that the balance between overlooking and seclusion has not been achieved. The proposed area of green space is divorced from the housing development would not benefit from surveillance from nearby dwellings. Seclusion can be designed into the scheme through landscaping and planting. It is not necessary for the amenity space to be segregated from the residential development to achieve this.</p> <p>It should be noted that Play England's guide also indicates that successful spaces are located '<i>away from dangerous roads, noise and pollution</i>'.</p> <p>Comment noted – No change The development contribution towards play is now £701 per family dwelling. The calculation towards play is a historic one which was and still is considered a suitable method. This method has been used by the City Council for many years and is applicable to all new residential development sites of over 10 dwellings. The sum has risen over years in line with inflation. There is no reason why the method of calculation should be explained in the Development Framework, but has been explained to NLP representing St Modwen separately.</p>
--	---	---