

Sunderland Local Plan

**Draft South Sunderland Growth
Area Supplementary Planning
Document
Consultation Statement**

February 2020

Contents

Draft South Sunderland Growth Area Supplementary Planning Document – Consultation Statement (Regulation 12 & 13).....	3
Purpose of the Consultation	3
When did we consult?	3
Which bodies and persons were invited to make representations?	5
Summary of the main key issues raised by representations and how issues have been taken into account.....	5
Further Preparation and amendments to the Draft South Sunderland Growth Area Supplementary Planning Document.....	69
Further consultation	69
Next Steps	69
APPENDIX 1: Draft South Sunderland Growth Area Supplementary Planning Document Consultee Letter.....	71
APPENDIX 2: Draft SSGA Supplementary Planning Document Scoping Report – Consultees List....	72

Draft South Sunderland Growth Area Supplementary Planning Document – Consultation Statement (Regulation 12 & 13)

Purpose of the Consultation

A draft Supplementary Planning Document was prepared for the South Sunderland Growth Area (SSGA) to ensure development proposals for the area were brought forward in a comprehensive manner as the area was becoming subject to development pressure. The objective of the SSGA was to ensure the creation of a sustainable community, in a good quality built and natural environment, with access to local services that reflect the community's needs and support its health and well-being

The Council carried out public consultation on the South Sunderland Growth Area Supplementary Planning Document to seek views on the formulation and assessment of individual proposals for development within SSGA and the development as a whole.

When did we consult?

Initial pre-consultation was undertaken with the local community in July 2015 to raise awareness of the Council's intentions for SSGA and to seek the public's views. A draft SPD was then produced in January 2016 which was informed by comments received as part of the pre-consultation events.

The draft SPD was consulted upon alongside the Core Strategy and Development Plan and as such it was made publicly available for comment for 8 weeks between 7 August – 2 October 2017 and could be viewed on line on the Council's website¹, on the Council's online consultation portal², at Sunderland Civic Centre, libraries (in Sunderland's *City Library @ Museum & Winter Gardens*, Washington Galleries and Houghton-le-Spring), as well as at the 30 public consultation drop-in exhibition events held around the city during August and September. (see Table 1).

Table 1: Draft Core Strategy and Development Plan Consultation Drop-in Events

Wednesday 9 August	10am - 12noon	Springwell Village Hall, Fell Road, Springwell, Gateshead, NE9 7RP
	2pm - 4pm	Ryhope Community Centre, 2 Black Road, Sunderland, SR2 0RX
	6pm - 8pm	Fulwell Methodist Church, Dovedale Road, Sunderland, SR6 8LN
Thursday 10 August	10am - 12noon	Philadelphia Cricket Club, Bunker Hill, Houghton-Le-Spring, DH4 4JE
	2pm - 4pm	North East Business & Innovation Centre (BIC), Wearfield, Enterprise Park East, Sunderland, SR5 2TA

¹ <https://www.sunderland.gov.uk/article/14749/Draft>

² <https://sunderland-consult.objective.co.uk/portal/>

	6pm - 8pm	Harraton Community Association, Bonemill Lane, Washington, NE38 8BQ
Friday 11 August	10am - 12noon	Hetton Centre, Welfare Road, Hetton-Le-Hole, DH5 9NE
	2pm - 4pm	Barnwell Primary School, (Monument Centre), Whitefield Estate, Penshaw, Houghton, DH4 7RT
Monday 14 August	10am - 12noon	Holy Trinity Church, High Usworth, Washington, NE37 1NR
	2pm - 4pm	St Chad's Church Hall, East Herrington, Durham Road, Sunderland, SR3 3ND
	6pm - 8pm	Houghton Welfare Hall, Brinkburn Crescent, Houghton-Le-Spring, DH4 5AF
Tuesday 15 August	10am - 12noon	Raich Carter Centre, Commercial Road, Hendon, Sunderland, SR2 8PD
	2pm - 4pm	Customer Service Contact Centre, Fawcett Street, Sunderland, SR1 1RE
	6pm - 8pm	Washington Leisure Centre, Washington, NE38 7SS
Wednesday 16 August	6pm - 8pm	Doxford Park Community Centre, Mill Hill Road, Sunderland, SR3 2 ND
Monday 18 September	10am - 12noon	Raich Carter Centre, Commercial Road, Hendon, Sunderland, SR2 8PD
	2pm - 4pm	Hetton Centre, Welfare Road, Hetton-Le-Hole, DH5 9NE
	6pm - 8pm	Barnwell Primary School (Monument Centre), Whitefield Estate, Penshaw, Houghton, DH4 7RT
Tuesday 19 September	10am - 12noon	The Secret Garden, Doxford Park, Silksworth Road, Sunderland, SR3 2PD
	2pm - 4pm	Houghton Welfare Hall, Brinkburn Crescent, Houghton-Le-Spring, DH4 5AF
	6pm - 8pm	San Street Youth Project, Sans Street South, Sunderland, SR1 1HG
Wednesday 20 September	10am - 12noon	Fulwell Methodist Church, Dovedale Road, Sunderland, SR6 8LN
	2pm - 4pm	North East Business & Innovation Centre (BIC), Wearfield, Enterprise Park East, Sunderland, SR5 2TA
	6pm - 8pm	Springwell Village Hall, Fell Road, Springwell, Gateshead, NE9 7RP
Thursday 21 September	10am - 12noon	Philadelphia Cricket Club, Bunker Hill, Houghton-Le-Spring, DH4 4JE
	2pm - 4pm	Ryhope Community Centre, 2 Black Road, Sunderland, SR2 0RX
	6pm - 8pm	Washington Millennium Centre, The Oval, Washington, NE37 2QD
Friday 22 September	10am - 12noon	Hetton Centre, Welfare Road, Hetton-Le-Hole, DH5 9NE
	2pm - 4pm	Health & Racquet Club, 3 Camberwell Way, Sunderland, SR3 3XN
	6pm - 8pm	Lambton Street Youth Centre, 25 Falkland Road, Sunderland, SR4 6XA

Which bodies and persons were invited to make representations?

The Council wrote directly to all statutory consultees, general consultation bodies and those who had previously expressed an interest in the Local Plan. Over 1,200 direct letters and emails (see Appendix 1) were also sent out on 28 July 2017 direct to all statutory consultees and those who had previously responded to the Plan or requested to be included on the Local Plan database (see Appendix 2).

The Council undertook a variety of consultation methods and held a number of events to engage with stakeholders regarding the draft SPD. Stakeholders were invited to make representations electronically via the Council's online consultation portal (<http://sunderland-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal>), and in writing by email (planningpolicy@sunderland.gov.uk) or letter.

Table 2 below sets out a summary of the main key issues raised by representations and how they have been taken into account.

Table 2: Draft SSGA SPD – Summary of Representations and Council Responses.

Consultee	Summary of Representations	Council's Response
Bellway Homes	An alternative route for the section of the Ryhope Doxford Link Road (RDLR) running between Cherry Knowle and Eltham Road roundabout was put forward. The proposed alternative route involved moving the alignment further to the west to avoid sterilising land that could be brought forward for housing development in the short term and would result in significant landscape impacts in addition to those arising from the existing sections of the link road.	The City Council considered the proposed alignment put forward, however it was not considered achievable. The alignment as set out in the SPD has been designed to meet the optimal vertical and horizontal alignment based upon the topography of the site.
Councillor Marshall	Object to the bus only corridor proposed on the B1286 north of Ruswarp drive to Tunstall Village Green.	The proposed bus only link has been removed from the SPD.
Councillor English	Object to the bus only corridor proposed on the B1286 north of Ruswarp drive to Tunstall Village Green.	The proposed bus only link has been removed from the SPD.
Councillor Gibson	Object to the bus only corridor proposed on the B1286 north of Ruswarp drive to Tunstall Village Green.	The proposed bus only link has been removed from the SPD.
Residents petition containing 834 signatures	Object to the bus only corridor proposed on the B1286 north of Ruswarp drive to Tunstall Village Green.	The proposed bus only link has been removed from the SPD.
Mr Elkington	Disagree with the size of the developments.	<p>Two of the sites at SSGA are already allocated for housing, Chapelgarth and Cherry Knowle and 1 site is identified for employment, South Ryhope, which is no longer required for employment use.</p> <p>In accordance planning policy, the supply of new homes can sometimes be best achieved through planning large scale development rather than bringing forward small piecemeal sites, thus ensuring adequate infrastructure is provided and sustainable developments are brought forward. The quantum of development for the overall area and individual sites has</p>

	<p>Questions if disabled badge holder access is an option as cannot use any other form of transport.</p> <p>Object to the stopping up of Burdon Lane as can only travel by car due to disability and it currently provides access to the countryside as well as to Hetton and Easington Lane.</p> <p>Object to the bus only corridor proposed on the B1286 north of Ruswarp drive to Tunstall Village Green.</p> <p>Object to the closure or local access being applied to Hope Road.</p>	<p>been set out though the Local Plan Policy SS6 and site allocations.</p> <p>This level of detail would not be set out with the SPD. Any disabled parking spaces within car parks throughout the SSGA will conform to the relevant standards and ratios.</p> <p>The construction of the planned remaining sections of the Ryhope Doxford link road will ensure connectivity remains to countryside areas as well as Hetton le Hole, Houghton le Spring and Easington Lane. This is in addition to other routes on the local road network which will remain accessible and available, and not significantly disadvantage residents with disabilities as well as other road users.</p> <p>The proposed bus only link has been removed from the SPD.</p> <p>The closure or introduction of local access only has never been put forward through the SSGA proposals.</p>
Cushman and Wakefield on behalf of Homes and Communities Agency	Propose the release of a site within the Green Belt adjoining the Cherry Knowle site, so as to be brought forward for housing purposes.	The release of a green belt site would not be considered through the SPD. The appropriate mechanism for considering this would be via the Core Strategy and Development Plan.
Mr and Mrs Morrell	Object to the development of settlement break land on the grounds that brownfield land should be exhausted first.	Historically Sunderland has been very successful at developing previously developed land. In fact, between 1995 and 2019 82% of development in Sunderland was on previously developed land. The emphasis is to continue this trend and prioritise development on previously developed land and in sustainable locations with good transport links, however there is a lack previously developed sites available in the supply. The Council's latest SHLAA identifies only 41% of new homes will be delivered on brownfield land. This is because the supply of

	<p>Concerns over the proposed new road layout and the increase in traffic and noise this will facilitate.</p> <p>Support moving the proposed roundabout off the Ruswarp drive junction as will slightly distance the traffic.</p> <p>The addition of open space between Ruswarp drive estate and the new houses so included within new community, rather than faced with backs of properties is welcomed.</p> <p>Support the bus only corridor proposed on the B1286 north of Ruswarp drive to Tunstall Village Green.</p> <p>Plan could be improved further by not bringing the new road and roundabout as far down as Burdon Road.</p>	<p>brownfield sites that is considered to be deliverable is considered to be relatively low. This is partially due to Sunderland historic use which has resulted in large sites which are heavily contaminated, unviable and difficult to attract developers to.</p> <p>A transport model has been undertaken to inform the SPD. The model highlights sections of the existing road network and junctions where there may be implications as a consequence of development at SSGA. Where this is the case mitigation will be sought from developments through the use of S106s or S278 legal agreements. The model also reaffirms the need for the completion of the Ryhope Doxford Link Road (RDLR), which will be requested through the SPD.</p> <p>Alternative modes of transport are being promoted at SSGA, with requirements for cycle lanes, direct pedestrian routes, subsidised bus provision, these measures should assist in alleviating traffic levels in the area.</p> <p>Support noted</p> <p>Support noted</p> <p>The level of opposition to this bus only route has meant the removal of it from the proposals and the section of road to remain as is.</p> <p>The alignment of the RDLR within the SPD is indicative only at this stage as not all site constraints are known. The exact</p>
--	--	---

	<p>Flooding the market with additional houses at a time of population decline will be detrimental to property prices in the area.</p>	<p>alignment will come forward through the submission of a planning application.</p> <p>One of the key reasons for this population loss is the lack of suitable housing in the right location. The City needs to deliver sites which have high quality environments to encourage the development of larger family homes. Few such sites currently exist in the City.</p>
Mr Hopkirk	<p>Concerns over the detail of the Land North of Burdon lane site in relation to the location of SUDS not being indicated on the masterplan within the SPD.</p> <p>Privacy and amenity issues with regards overlooking from the new development into existing properties due to the proposed height of buildings.</p> <p>Points were made in relation to ensuring the SPD made reference to the existing residential properties/communities and integration with the new properties/ communities.</p> <p>Para 4.3 can a bullet be added that Land on the North of Burdon Lane site (western edge to the east of Lodgeside Meadows) Slopes north to south. Current housing is in a dip and house levels and positions will have to be carefully considered in order not to block view, light and a sense of open place that these</p>	<p>Any development on the Land North of Burdon Lane site will be required to submit a full drainage strategy and meet the standards set out by Sunderland Local Flood Authority. Survey work may include the provision of SUDs and could result in the proposed development deviating from the indicative Masterplan within the SPD, however the design principles within the SPD will still be sought.</p> <p>The indicative Masterplan proposes a 10m wide greenspace as a minimum, where new properties back onto existing properties. In addition any development which is proposed near existing residential properties will need to address Sunderland City Council residential amenity spacing standards (found within the Residential Design Guide SPD) which takes into account topography.</p> <p>These points have been taken on board where possible and the SPD updated to ensure reference to existing communities where appropriate.</p> <p>It was considered more appropriate to reflect this comment within Section 10 of the document, as such reference has been made within Section 10 in relation to the Urban Edge to reflect that careful consideration should be given to site topography.</p>

	<p>communities currently enjoy. There is a real danger the SPD currently ignores this risk.</p> <p>Para 4.7 page 30 discusses utilities but fails to mention broadband, even though this is a very important requirement. The Core Development Strategy covers the Digital Network in Sunderland and states at para 3.77 that there are very few “cold spots” in Sunderland where homes or business are unable to access broadband at speeds greater than 10mbps. The area covered by the Land North of Burdon Lane is such a cold spot in some places and therefore broadband speeds should be included as part of the SPD development priorities.</p> <p>Para 4.9 page 32, under constraints there has not been sufficient consideration given to the risks of flooding caused by ground and surface water flow, especially on the western edge of the site and the fields to the south and east of Lodgeside Meadow. Can it be added in “Constraints” that any future development MUST not make matters any worse and that every opportunity presented during development to negate or minimise current flooding should be pursued. This is an example of where the focus on new development ignores existing development.</p> <p>Para 5.2 page 36, table 2 SWOT. Insufficient consideration has been given when considering the rising topography on the western edge to the east of Burdon Road (it rises away from current houses in Lodgeside Meadow) meaning new development will severely impact on light, views, privacy and feeling of space and place so new house heights are a critical issue for that particular part of the development site.</p>	<p>Telecommunications is referenced within Section 7 under principles and parameters, within the utilities section, where reference is made to adequate utility infrastructure being provided to serve each phase of the development. Local Plan Policy BH6 also sets out that development should include high quality digital infrastructure, as such it is considered unreasonable to be so specific for broadband speeds through the SPD.</p> <p>Reference has been made to development proposals seeking to negate or minimise current flooding within the constraints section of para.4.9.</p> <p>Reference to existing topography has been made within Section 10 of the SPD.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>Para 6.3, page 43. Insufficient merging into current community. You have included many laudable objectives but none of them take account of current development. They talk about a new community but what about the existing community that the new community is adjacent to?</p> <p>Can an additional bullet point be added into the objectives <i>“To do all this without a negative impact upon current communities”</i></p> <p>Can an additional Key principal be added which ensures existing communities are not diminished by new developments?</p> <p>Page 53, bullet points under Built Environment Guiding Principals and Requirements, the first bullet point is again deficient with regards to existing development. Can the words “existing development” be added after “exact location”</p> <p>Page 54, should recognise the harm to existing houses in Lodgeside Meadows by building two or two and a half storey houses on the site immediately to the south.</p> <p>Concerns over the reference to values of the area being toward the low end within the Infrastructure Delivery Study 2016 and ignores the small area of executive houses to the western edge of Land North of Burdon Lane.</p>	<p>Additional wording has been included within objective 5 of para 6.3 to make reference to integrating with the existing community.</p> <p>Additional wording has been included within objective 5 of para 6.3 to make reference to integrating with the existing community.</p> <p>It was considered more appropriate to make reference to this within the key principles of this section, as such amendments have been made to the first bullet of the key principles of objective 2.</p> <p>Reference has been made within the relevant section of the document to ensure existing topography is considered. In addition to this any planning application submitted will have to comply with the council’s guidance for separation distances from existing properties in relation to windows, etc.</p> <p>The reference to character of the housing market in SSGA within the Infrastructure Delivery Study 2016 (IDS) is setting the scene and provides context and the overall document considers the infrastructure requirements of the SSGA. The lack of reference to the small area of executive houses to the western edge of LNBL would not have had an impact on the outcome of the IDS. It is the SPD itself which sets the parameters for development.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>Should include reference to executive dwellings being located near existing executive homes.</p> <p>Weak reference to self-build, Council yet to demonstrate anything remotely serious to enable self-build plots.</p> <p>Bus only link will have a negative impact upon the small shops in Silksworth as this route is the shortest and most direct route to the shops.</p> <p>Opportunities missed within the Design Code to merge the new development into the existing development, along with protection for existing houses from poor development.</p> <p>Risk to privacy of existing houses caused by inappropriate build heights of new development. This should be mentioned more explicitly in SPD.</p> <p>The guidance information for the Urban Edge takes no account of existing houses, house types or topography of the land.</p>	<p>Reference to executive dwellings is being replaced throughout the document with larger family dwellings as this is in line with the Local Plan. No further changes proposed.</p> <p>The reference to self-build is considered appropriate for the document. The Local Plan makes reference to self-build and encourages developers to consider including plots for self-build within schemes.</p> <p>The bus only link has been removed from the proposals.</p> <p>The document has been updated to ensure reference is made to existing communities where appropriate.</p> <p>Reference to existing site topography has been included within the SPD and the council's guidance for separation distances will be considered when planning applications are submitted.</p> <p>Reference to the existing topography has now been included within the SPD.</p>
Historic England	<p>Welcome reference to the heritage assets within the vicinity of, and within the SSGA.</p>	<p>Support noted</p>
Mr McKeown	<p>Object to the bus only corridor proposed on the B1286 north of Ruswarp drive to Tunstall Village Green</p> <p>Construction traffic should be kept away from residential areas</p>	<p>The proposed bus only link has been removed from the SPD.</p> <p>The detail in relation to construction traffic will be dealt with through individual planning applications rather than specified in the SPD.</p>

	<p>Better and safer segregation of road users</p> <p>Ensuring the positioning of drainage on roads allows for safe cycle use.</p>	<p>Objectives and principles of the SPD are to create developments which are well connected to the surrounding area and facilities by road, footpath, cycle route and public transport link and to actively encourage walking and cycling journeys through the provision of safe, attractive and direct routes to key destinations. This is reflected throughout the SPD, particularly within the indicative masterplans.</p> <p>The detail of drainage positioning on roads is not a matter that can be picked up through the SPD and would be dealt with through the detail within individual planning applications.</p>
Derek Stothard	Object to proposed bus only land on Burdon Road, Silksworth - would lead to further congestion and risk to pupils travelling to/from Venerable Bede School. Not opposed to the development per se, nor to the new road linking Ruswarp Drive and Burdon Road to the new road, but urges the council to reconsider proposals for the bus only lane.	The proposed bus only link has been removed from the SPD.
Northumbrian Water	Recommend that sustainable water management forms an important part of the SPD and welcome consultation.	Comment noted.
Wilfred Meldrum	Proposed SSGA Burdon Road bus-only route is unnecessary, would create traffic problems. No need for more shops. Notes proposed new medical centre.	The proposed bus only link has been removed from the SPD. The neighbourhood centre is proposed due to the overall number of new residents that will be residing in the area and will be serving local needs.
Mr John Stoker	The current proposal must take into consideration the effects of Wildlife the Public's interest in Flora and Fauna of the proposed area, this is an area of green belt that needs to be protected. Further encroachment of housing could seriously affect the area.	The SPD has considered these issue and appropriate principles and parameters have been put in place. The SSGA is not within the Green Belt.
Mr Philip Bonner	South Ryhope I am concerned with the development plans for the following reasons; Firstly, the Woodland View Care home, Sea View, Sunderland SR2 0GW. Some of these residents are severely disabled and in my view, need the peace and tranquillity offered by being in a semi-rural area. Secondly, the	The South Ryhope development site has an outline planning permission in place, as such amenity issues with regards Woodland View would have been considered through this process along with impacts of the proposed development on the Dean.

	<p>impact of development being so close to Ryhope Dean as to being detrimental to the wildlife that inhabit the wooded area. I have seen various animals that occupy the dean, including woodcocks and occasional birds of prey.</p>	
Mrs Julie Rowe	<p>Green belt land at Cherry Knowle and Burdon Lane - why does the building of houses have to extend onto green belt land surely the site at the site of the old Cherry Knowle hospital and grounds can be utilised without taking it into green belt areas. The Settlement break being used at Burdon Lane eventually merges the areas leaving very little green space in between. The Council are effectively turning small village communities into huge urban areas with no identity. Surely when the Settlement Break was introduced it was for a very valid reason - why the change now.</p> <p>Habitats Directive completed in 2014. This is outdated. A more up to date study needs to be done especially around the areas of Ryhope/Cherry Knowle Denes.</p> <p>Cherry Knowle/Ryhope - as you correctly state Sunderland is losing its population. In fact the City has the biggest loss of people in the country - partially (I think) because Sunderland has nothing to keep young people here. Poor job prospects, poor leisure facilities, run down city centre. So lets build big expensive houses that none of them can afford and put them on the sites with lovely surroundings and views - effectively spoiling these walks and views for the local people. I was told at the Consultation event that executive homes bring in executives to the area - however when the executives get here there are no</p>	<p>The 2018 Settlement Break Review identified that provided adequate mitigation was in place development could take place within much of the South Sunderland Settlement Break. The SSGA has been the subject of a masterplan and SPD to ensure the area is development comprehensively, this involves ensuring a green corridor remains in place to the east of the Land North of Burdon Lane site linking up with the Cherry Knowle site to ensure separation between the existing communities and provide a network of green spaces for recreational use and wildlife. The SSGA is not within the Green Belt.</p> <p>The SSGA Habitats Regulation Assessment Appropriate Assessment was undertaken in 2016 and used to inform the draft SPD. Sites which have been pursued through the planning process and gained planning permission have been in accordance with the requirements of the Habitats Regulation Assessment.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

	upmarket shops or restaurants. Also in best case scenario will you really get thousands of executive families to fill the thousands of new homes!	
Mr M Sidaway	<p>Section 4.5, Access and Connectivity: Metro The problem One of the major problems with the current plans for Sunderland South is that they are likely to encourage increased car use. In addition to the detrimental effects of congestion and pollution, this is also likely to have a harmful effect on Sunderland city centre. People with cars might prefer to drive to Dalton Park or the Metrocentre, or similar places, rather than Sunderland city centre. Railway lines, especially high-frequency services such as the Metro, are one of the best ways of drawing people into the city centre. People who would never go near a bus are often happy to use them. Many ideas for extending the Metro have been mooted, but none has yet seemed to be viable. The Leamside line through Washington runs on a high viaduct across the river Wear, making a junction expensive to build, and in any case it seems to be earmarked for other purposes; Seaham is apparently too small a community to justify the cost of such a long route; options that involve street running would not be much better than buses; etc.</p> <p>Another problem is that Sunderland city council's aim is to attract more people to come and live in Sunderland, and just building bigger houses might not be enough to achieve that. My proposal, the best Metro services are ones that run through the heart of a community, maximising potential ridership. My proposal is to build a railway line around the Sunderland built-up area, connecting the current Metro terminus at South Hylton with the Durham Coast line at Ryhope, allowing trains to loop back to Sunderland station, via the heart of the South Sunderland Growth Area. This would allow the Metro to serve the existing communities of Grindon/Pennywell, East Herrington/Farringdon,</p>	<p>Comment noted</p> <p>Comment noted</p>

	<p>Hendon/Ashbrooke, Grangetown and Ryhope, while also allowing stations to be built through the centre of the South Sunderland Growth Area, serving those new areas, and also the surrounding communities of Tunstall, Silksworth, Hall Farm, Moorside and Doxford Park. The new Metro stations could be strategically located on local bus corridors, providing an alternative to changing at Park Lane (especially for passengers from outside Sunderland). Naturally, in order to achieve all this, the council would have to be planning far ahead. The best (and certainly the cheapest) time to build such a line is when you still have open fields. Heading west from South Hylton station, the new line would skirt the northern edge of the South Hylton Playing Fields, before heading abruptly south alongside the A19. There would be two stations here, at the A183 and A690 junctions. It would then emerge into the SSGA, passing through the centre of Chapelgarth (station here), skirting the southern boundary of Hall Farm, bisecting the very centre of Nettles Lane (another station here), before heading straight for the A1018 junction (and another station here). It would then skirt the northern edge of South Ryhope before crossing the B1287 and joining up with the Durham Coast Line. There would then be new stations at Ryhope Village, Grangetown and Hendon. This would enable a number of different running patterns: Trains from Airport could pass clockwise (or potentially anticlockwise?) around the loop, terminating at the currently disused western platforms at Sunderland station. Trains from Airport could split into two - half the trains would go one way around the loop, half would go the other way, and both flows would join up again at Sunderland on the way back up, before heading back to Airport. Trains from Airport could pass either clockwise or anticlockwise around the loop, then head back up to East Boldon, then around the currently disused link line to Tyne Dock and on to South Shields, where they would terminate. They would then head back down</p>	
--	--	--

	to Sunderland, go the other way around the loop, then back to Airport. This would of course be in addition to South Shields existing Metro service. Additional benefits would be: Promoting regeneration in the Hendon area. Increasing the cachet of the new developments, and of the city as a whole. The Metro would serve a much greater proportion of Sunderland residents.	
Mr Andy Robson	<p>I was not aware of these proposed sites, I had received no documentation as had a lot of others on my estate. No one was aware until we gave them the information, not one person in our street had received any notification, my comments relate to South Ryhope, Chapel Garth, Land at Burdon lane, Land North of Burdon Lane and Cherry knowles I oppose the proposals for these sites for the following reasons: Environment Even though your team have said this isn't green belt, its part of Ryhopes make up and will be devastating for wildlife in the denes and also surrounding areas. This also relates to Chapelgarth site, Land at Burdon Lane and Land North of Burdon Lane. I often walk up here and over the years, lots of wildlife has started to re appear and this will be massively compromised with the extra housing, extra population, traffic etc. Its steeped in history and really important to preserve these areas for future generations instead of making it a concrete jungle. If the land keeps disappearing, where will their be land left to grow crops, vegetables and produce?</p> <p>City Centre - What I really also struggle with is , where you get the information that suggests all of these high council band properties will be filled by executive type people, bringing more money into Sunderland? Our city is a joke, there are no shops unless you want a charity shop or betting and fast food, we have absolutely nothing to attract people here. We live in Ryhope and if we travel 2 miles we are in Seaham with its beautiful sea front, marina, shopping centre and well tended public areas. Seaham is</p>	<p>The consultation process for the draft SPD was undertaken as part of the draft Local Plan consultation, as such it ran for 8 weeks between 7 August and 2 October 2017. Engagement undertaken was over and above the requirements, with all statutory consultation bodies being contacted, general consultation bodies and those who had previously expressed an interest in the pan. Over 1,200 letters and e-mails were also sent out. A number of events were held to engage with stakeholders, which included areas in close proximity to the SSGA.</p> <p>Consideration has been given to the environment when preparing the SPD and set out through the principles and parameters within the document.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>

	<p>a little town yet is far superior and better governed than our city. I'm really dismayed at Sunderland council as they don't seem to listen to what we want, it appears to be corrupt people lining each others pockets. Why can Sunderland not attract better businesses by lowering city centre rents, offering deals for empty shops to be filled, even on a temporary basis? How are you proposing to attract people to live here with such a sparse city centre. Jobs - Where are the jobs for the people you think will buy these houses? I work in recruitment and its dire, especially for higher earners. We do not want to spoil the make up of the area by more houses and especially if these houses are going to either stand empty or sold to landlords that charge extortionate rents. Its not only about finding jobs for all of these people, its also the threat of losing our jobs in the area.</p> <p>Infrastructure - For every house that is built, there is probably going to be more than 1 car per property , currently it is really busy using the A690 and A19 to travel to work(incidentally out of the area!) I cannot possibly see how the present road infrastructure will cope with this volume of extra traffic. It could have the opposite effect, rather than attract people, if the commute is going to be worse than it currently is, it makes no sense to move here. It could also stop people coming to Sunderland to shop, visit restaurants and the theatre. I realise there are plans to make Burdon Lane traffic free but this will only put more pressure on Tunstall village, Doxford international which is always horrendous. It will make my journey longer putting at least another half hour commute each way onto my day.</p> <p>Housing - The housing that was built behind Tunstall bank est are an eyesore and it is locally known as "Toy Town". I live in Leechmere Grange in a 3 bed link. My concern is that new</p>	<p>Alongside the SPD an Infrastructure Delivery Study was prepared, which has considered the overall impact on infrastructure and set out what is required for the area. The infrastructure requirements are reflected within the SPD and costings for provision are apportioned out to ensure when developments are brought forward the appropriate contribution is made towards infrastructure.</p> <p>All brownfield sites that are available city wide have been considered and contribute to the city's housing supply where possible, this includes the former Pennywell estate.</p>
--	---	--

	properties will also lower the value of my home, I appreciate you are predominately building higher council tax band properties however I still feel this has a major impact on my property, As above, I fail to see what you have to offer as a city to fill these properties. We need more social housing if anything, what about the land at Pennywell where all the houses were demolished?	Comment noted.
Tyne and Wear Archaeology Officer Newcastle City Council	Archaeological remains have been found at Cherry Knowles and Chapelgarth. Further archaeological work will be required. Extensive archaeological remains have been found at land north of Burdon Lane through geophysical survey and evaluation trenching. The significance of those remains is still to be determined. Archaeological work (desk based assessment, geophysical survey and evaluation trenching) is required as standard on all greenfield sites to ascertain if archaeological features are present. South Ryhope will therefore also need to be investigated.	Comment noted and additional text reflected within SPD.
Mr Mark Smith	Having read the proposals outlined in draft consultative documents no one should be left in any doubt into the almost entire disregard shown to the environmental sustainability, lack of oversight accountability and destruction of vast swathes of existing greenbelt. The very referencing of this policy I.e South Sunderland GROWTH Area seems to indicate a need for unrestricted development of the greenfield area at a time of declining population growth in Sunderland and ample opportunities to develop the huge brownfield areas available for modern development. The documentation available clearly assume that it is a foregone conclusion that development and despoilation of the greenbelt will get the approval of council leaders when surely it is their job to ensure a brighter sustainable future for the residents of Sunderland? When vast areas of Sunderland are lying derelict and in need of reclamation and redevelopment why is this proposal even being presented? The documentation reveals a potential conflict of interest when	<p>A Sustainability Appraisal (SA) was undertaken for the previous draft of the SSGA SPD, which fulfilled the requirements of the SEA Directive and also ensured that the social and economic impacts of the SPD were fully understood. The SA was consulted upon as part of the previous draft of the SPD and no responses were received.</p> <p>The SPD has been updated to incorporate changes where necessary.</p>

	oversight, policy approval and information sharing is taken into account, this situation must be addressed ASAP Their needs to be a vast improvement in the environmental sustainability aspects involved in any development before any approval is even considered as the existing reports etc are laughably poor, inconsistent with national environmental policy and do not reflect good governance standards. The documents available are already outdated I.e doctors surgery spaces available, archeological survey results, flood plain assessments, traffic flow predictions etc etc and need urgent reassessment before any progression can be contemplated.	
Mrs Brenda Smith	<p>I wish to object to the South Sunderland Growth area on the following grounds:- The proposals are not sustainable :- The reference in the Draft Corporate Strategy which states there will be no additional pressures on GP's is based on outdated information. Conishead Medical Centre at Ryhope is closing it's practice in November 2017 and this has placed additional pressures on the remaining practice at Southlands Medical Group, Ryhope Health Centre. Please find attached a recent comment by the Practice Manager at Southlands Medical Group regarding the GP crisis in Sunderland and closure of Conishead practice to support this objection. Copy attached.</p> <p>The destruction of the greenbelt and settlement breaks. There are sufficient brownfield sites within the City of Sunderland on which to build houses and these have already been identified by the council to be brought back into use. Sunderland's population is declining not increasing therefore there is no demand to develop significant numbers of housing. The destruction of the existing hedgerows and habitats will mean the loss of natural boundaries and barriers and disruption of the wildlife nearby e.g. pheasants, foxes, badgers, hedgehogs, flora and other fauna The bus only lane to Burdon Road, Tunstall will lead to traffic using</p>	<p>The City Council are currently liaising with the Clinical Commissioning Group with regards updated information on surgery capacities and are awaiting updated figures, as such any requirement for additional surgery provision may be requested through individual planning applications.</p> <p>One of the key reasons for this population loss is the lack of suitable housing in the right location. The City needs to deliver sites which have high quality environments to encourage the development of larger family homes. Few such sites currently exist in the City.</p> <p>A transport model has been undertaken to inform the SPD. The model highlights sections of the existing road network</p>

	<p>other routes to access the Silksworth and Tunstall areas e.g. routes adjacent to Lakeside Village, Silksworth Lane. The roundabout at Venerable Bede School is already a bottleneck during the school run hours and to increase the flow of traffic to this roundabout would exacerbate the traffic problem. The retail area indicated in the SSGA proposals would have a negative impact on the sustainability of the shopping centres at both Doxford Park and Ryhope. the stopping up of the country road at Burdon Road leading to/from Ryhope is detrimental to the accessibility, enjoyment and continued sustainability of the greenbelt at that location. The current interactive map which is integral to any decision making process is inaccurate and outdated i.e. it does not indicate the proposals for a bus only route on Burdon Road or does not show a roundabout proposed opposite Ruswarp Drive/ Closeburn Square. It also omits the environmental screening and noise mitigation which was outlined initially. Increase in noise and pollution levels from the proposed new Doxford Park Link Road which links up with Sunderland Radial Route (SRR) The traffic management estimates are based on a number of assumptions from the no.of car owners per household to the amount of traffic using this route joining from the SRR. Furthermore The SSGA refers to Northern Power carrying out further investigations at this time to establish the feasibility of moving the overhead electricity pylons before any decision can be reached regarding the exact location of the roundabout. If this is not a possible then what are the alternatives ? Any decision regarding the location of the Doxford Park Link Road should be deferred until it is clearer what the alternative proposals are.</p>	<p>and junctions where there may be implications as a consequence of development at SSGA. Where this is the case mitigation will be sought from developments through the use of S106s or S278 legal agreements. The model also reaffirms the need for the completion of the Ryhope Doxford Link Road (RDLR), which will be requested through the SPD.</p> <p>Alternative modes of transport are being promoted at SSGA, with requirements for cycle lanes, direct pedestrian routes, subsidised bus provision, these measures should assist in alleviating traffic levels in the area.</p> <p>The RDLR route as set out within the SPD is indicative only, the exact alignment is yet to be determined and will be subject to preliminary site investigation, which will be undertaken as part of any planning application.</p>
Mr Douglas Stoker	<p>Q3 : Noise pollution due to increased traffic as I own no 4 Ruswarp Drive and am aware of traffic noise now. The roundabout should be moved further away from the existing</p>	<p>The RDLR route as set out within the SPD is indicative only, the exact alignment is yet to be determined and will be subject to preliminary site investigation, which will be undertaken as part of any planning application. The SPD</p>

	road or a noise barrier between existing properties and proposed development. Housing : As above.	specifies that an area of green space will be created between existing residential areas and the RDLR.
Mr Paul Stanley	<p>Land opposite Venerable Bede school. It is clear within the plan that the land currently grass on either side of the road is green space. I would like the consultation to consider this should be green space and settlement break. it is a clear divide between villages and important to the historic pasts of both villages that the land remains as green space.</p> <p>Burdon Lane access from Ryhope to Hallfarm should be improved and not removed as a highway. the original proposals were not clear that part of burdon lane was to be changed into a no vehicle access. The new road plan would still leave residents with a longer route and not direct. The route of burdon lane has historical significance to the area and access to the surrounding village burdon, hallfarm, Houghton. this should not be removed or at least access to the new road to be relooked at to allow access from the top of burdon Lane.</p>	<p>This area of greenspace is to remain as green space through the SSGA SPD. The SPD masterplan sets out a green corridor running to the east of the Land North of Burdon Lane site to link up with green spaces at Cherry Knowle and to the north, creating a green gap between the existing settlements.</p> <p>The construction of the planned remaining sections of the Ryhope Doxford link road will ensure connectivity remains. This is in addition to other routes on the local road network which will remain accessible and available.</p>
Andrew Walker	The South Sunderland Growth Area Draft Supplementary Planning Document provides the detail required to address the potential difficulties faced by the scale of the developments proposed for this area. Much of what is included also aligns with the Nexus Planning Liaison Policy, including the 400m walking distance to bus stops as well as necessary road widths to accommodate full sized buses.	Comments noted.
Lead Adviser Natural England	We consider that the SPD has incorporated the requirements of the SSGA HRA well. Within Figure 19, the term SANGS is used, whilst elsewhere it is referred to as SSAANGs. The figure should therefore be amended. Furthermore, page 87 refers to Country Parks (SSANGS). Furthermore, page 106 mentions a cross section of the barrier to prevent access into the protected Ryhope Dene; this is not provided.	<p>Figure 19 amended to reflect SSAANGs.</p> <p>All references to SANGs within the document have been replaced by SSAANGs.</p> <p>The detail of the cross section of the barrier has been dealt with through the approved planning application.</p>

	As mentioned above, monitoring should measure the effects of the SPD itself and not wider changes. Only referring to SSSI conditions as a way of monitoring is not sufficient. As the HRA includes a monitoring schedule, it might be useful to refer to this as well.	The HRA monitoring schedule has been referenced within the SPD.
Colin English	I am putting in writing my formal disagreement regarding the proposal to make Burdon Road (B1286) a bus lane only. As you know I have already put in objections and comments regarding the SSGA in terms of infrastructure as well as amenities, as I believe the roads are already at full capacity. I would state that this road is of the three main arterial roads for both coming into Doxford and leaving Doxford. I would also add that this road is the primary arterial road for the city centre. The aforementioned is true for both residents and employees who both live and work in Doxford. As Doxford International has possibly the biggest concentration of employees (With the exception of Nissan)in that square mile, I believe it is beyond comprehension that you are considering the removal of Burdon Road to the car travelling public and thus increase pressure on both the existing roads within the ward as well as causing other issues in neighbouring wards. I acknowledge that you said that this was something you were only toying with, and that it would only be in place after the link road was implemented. However, I believe that this road should only be considered a bus lane AFTER the link road was in operation so that a full assessment could be done to analyse traffic flows. (Perhaps a year, so as to take into account seasonal trends of the both residents and employees) I believe it would be only after a year of actual traffic flows are analysed would we then even contemplate such a magnanimous decision.	The proposed bus only link has been removed from the SPD.
Mr Scott Robson	To begin, I was not aware of these proposed sites, I had received no documentation as had a lot of others on my estate. No one was aware until we gave them the information, not one person in our street had received any notification, my comments relate to	The consultation process for the draft SPD was undertaken as part of the draft Local Plan consultation, as such it ran for 8 weeks between 7 August and 2 October 2017. Engagement undertaken was over and above the requirements, with all

	<p>South Ryhope, Chapel Garth, Land at Burdon lane, Land North of Burdon lane and Cherry knowles I oppose the proposals for these sites for the following reasons: Enviroment Even though your team have said this isn't green belt, its part of Ryhopes make up and will be devastating for wildlife in the denes and also surrounding areas.This also relates to Chapelgarth site, Land at Burdon Lane and Land North of Burdon Lane. I often walk up here and over the years, lots of wildlife has started to re appear and this will be massively compromised with the extra housing, extra population, traffic etc.Its steeped in history and really important to preserve these areas for future generations instead of making it a concrete jungle.If the land keeps disappearing, where will their be land left to grow crops, vegetables and produce? City Centre - What I really also struggle with is , where you get the information that suggests all of these high council band properties will be filled by executive type people, bringing more money into Sunderland?Our city is a joke, there are no shops unless you want a charity shop or betting and fast food, we have absolutely nothing to attract people here. We live in Ryhope and if we travel 2 miles we are in Seaham with its beautiful sea front, marina, shopping centre and well tended public areas. Seaham is a little town yet is far superior and better governed than our city. Im really dismayed at Sunderland council as they dont seem to listen to what we want,it appears to be corrupt people lining each others pockets. Why can Sunderland not attract better businesses by lowering city centre rents, offering deals for empty shops to be filled, even on a temporary basis? How are you proposing to attract people to live here with such a sparce city centre. Jobs - Where are the jobs for the people you think will buy these houses? I work in recruitment and its dire, especially for higher earners.We do not want to spoil the make up of the area by more houses and especially if these houses are going to either stand empty or sold to landlords that charge</p>	<p>statutory consultation bodies being contacted, general consultation bodies and those who had previously expressed an interest in the pan. Over 1,200 letters and e-mails were also sent out. A number of events were held to engage with stakeholders, which included areas in close proximity to the SSGA.</p> <p>Consideration has been given to the environment when preparing the SPD and set out through the principles and parameters within the document.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>extortionate rents. Its not only about finding jobs for all of these people, its also the threat of losing our jobs in the area. Infrastructure - For every house that is built, there is probably going to be more than 1 car per property, currently it is really busy using the A690 and A19 to travel to work(incidentally out of the area!) I cannot possibly see how the present road infrastructure will cope with this volume of extra traffic. It could have the opposite effect, rather than attract people, if the commute is going to be worse than it currently is, it makes no sense to move here. It could also stop people coming to Sunderland to shop, visit restaurants and the theatre. I realise there are plans to make Burdon Lane traffic free but this will only put more pressure on Tunstall village, Doxford international which is always horrendous. It will make my journey longer putting at least another half hour commute each way onto my day. Housing - The housing that was built behind Tunstall bank est are an eyesore and it is locally known as Toy Town. I live in Leechmere Grange in a 3 bed link. My concern is that new properties will also lower the value of my home, I appreciate you are predominately building higher council tax band properties however I still feel this has a major impact on my property, As above, I fail to see what you have to offer as a city to fill these properties. We need more social housing if anything, what about the land at Pennywell where all the houses were demolished?</p>	<p>Alongside the SPD an Infrastructure Delivery Study was prepared, which has considered the overall impact on infrastructure and set out what is required for the area. The infrastructure requirements are reflected within the SPD and costings for provision are apportioned out to ensure when developments are brought forward the appropriate contribution is made towards infrastructure.</p> <p>All brownfield sites that are available city wide have been considered and contribute to the city's housing supply where possible, this includes the former Pennywell estate. Comment noted.</p>
Mrs Amber Harris	<p>For several reasons, I would like to oppose the proposed developments. To begin with, I was not aware of these proposed sites. No documentation reached the houses in Leechmere. I understand this is due to a third party failing to fulfill their responsibility of handing out leaflets. This means the correct procedure for planning has not been adhered to as many residents are STILL not aware of the proposed developments. I believe this sort of malpractice is actually against the law. My comments relate to South Ryhope, Chapel Garth, Land at Burdon</p>	<p>The consultation process for the draft SPD was undertaken as part of the draft Local Plan consultation, as such it ran for 8 weeks between 7 August and 2 October 2017. Engagement undertaken was over and above the requirements, with all statutory consultation bodies being contacted, general consultation bodies and those who had previously expressed an interest in the plan. Over 1,200 letters and e-mails were also sent out. A number of events were held to engage with</p>

	<p>lane, Land North of Burdon lane and Cherry Knowles. I oppose the proposals for these sites for the following reasons:</p> <p>Environment Even though your team have said this isn't green belt, it is part of Ryhope's make up and will be devastating for wildlife in the denes and also surrounding areas. This also relates to Chapelgarth site, Land at Burdon Lane and Land North of Burdon Lane. I often walk up here and over the years, lots of wildlife has started to re appear and this will be massively compromised with the extra housing, extra population, traffic etc. It is steeped in history and it is really important to preserve these areas for future generations instead of making it a concrete jungle. If the land keeps disappearing, where will there be land left to grow crops, vegetables and produce? Not only this, the green land in Ryhope and the surrounding areas make it a pleasant place to live. I feel these developments will have a detrimental affect on the city for these reasons.</p> <p>Jobs - Where are the jobs for the people you think will buy these houses? Recruitment and its dire, especially for higher earners. We do not want to spoil the make up of the area by more houses and especially if these houses are going to either stand empty or sold to landlords that charge extortionate rents. Its not only about finding jobs for all of these people, its also the threat of losing our jobs in the area. For this reason, I have to live and work in Teesside. I do however, walk with my family who live in Ryhope every weekend along the beach and through the Denes. Until you have spent time in them, you can not possibly understand just how special and unspoiled they are. My great grandfather walk through them, as did my grandfather, my dad and my brother and I. You are however, robbing future generations from experiencing this truly special piece of nature.</p> <p>Infrastructure - For every house that is built, there is probably going to be more than 1 car per property, currently it is really busy using the A690 and A19 to travel to work (incidentally</p>	<p>stakeholders, which included areas in close proximity to the SSGA.</p> <p>Consideration has been given to the environment when preparing the SPD and set out through the principles and parameters within the document.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>out of the area!) I cannot possibly see how the present road infrastructure will cope with this volume of extra traffic. It could have the opposite effect, rather than attract people, if the commute is going to be worse than it currently is, it makes no sense to move here. It could also stop people coming to Sunderland to shop, visit restaurants and the theater. I realise there are plans to make Burdon Lane traffic free but this will only put more pressure on Tunstall village, Doxford international which is always horrendous. It will make my journey longer putting at least another half hour commute each way onto my day. Housing - The housing that was built behind Tunstall bank est are an eyesore and it is locally known as Toy Town. My parents live in Leechmere Grange in a 3 bed link. My concern is that new properties will also lower the value of their home. I appreciate you are predominately building higher council tax band properties however I still feel this has a major impact on my property. As above, I fail to see what you have to offer as a city to fill these properties. We need more social housing if anything, what about the land at Pennywell where all the houses were demolished?</p>	<p>Alongside the SPD an Infrastructure Delivery Study was prepared, which has considered the overall impact on infrastructure and set out what is required for the area. The infrastructure requirements are reflected within the SPD and costings for provision are apportioned out to ensure when developments are brought forward the appropriate contribution is made towards infrastructure.</p> <p>All brownfield sites that are available city wide have been considered and contribute to the city's housing supply where possible, this includes the former Pennywell estate. Comment noted.</p>
<p>Taylor Wimpey, Persimmon Homes and Story Homes Burdon Lane Consortium</p>	<p>Section 1.1 The Burdon Lane Consortium welcomes and supports the proposed new growth area known as South Sunderland Growth Area (SSGA) for a major residential development and supporting community facilities, which includes the Land North of Burdon Lane. This is a long standing commitment by Sunderland City Council. The Consortium agrees with the strategy to focus approximately 3,000 new homes in this area to meet 20% of the City's future housing need and, in particular, to provide significant numbers of much needed executive and larger family homes. The delivery of the SSGA, including Land North of Burdon Lane, will deliver significant and lasting economic, social and environmental benefits to both the local community and the City of Sunderland. It will make a significant contribution towards meeting</p>	<p>Support Noted.</p>

	<p>Sunderlands housing requirement, widening the range and choice of new homes in the area, including providing a greater proportion of higher value housing whilst concurrently helping to retain and attract economically active, skilled residents as well as graduates who will generate significant local spending in the area.</p> <p>The high quality green infrastructure, including the South Sunderland Areas of Additional Natural Greenspace (SSAAGNs), will enhance the well-being of the community, whilst creating new wildlife habitats to compensate for the loss of existing habitats. The SSGA will also deliver significant economic benefits through the creation of direct and indirect jobs (both temporary during the construction period and permanent on occupation of the development), as well as additional GVA generation over the build period, additional New Homes Bonus Payments to the Council and additional Council Tax revenues. Overall, the proposals will deliver a high quality, vibrant and distinctive neighbourhood which will be well integrated with surrounding communities.</p> <p>Although the Consortium broadly supports the SSGA Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), it considers that the SPD is overly prescriptive and does not take into account issues of viability and deliverability. Flexibility is sought to enable the development to respond to changing market conditions, local context and developer/site requirements and to ensure consistency with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which is clear that design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail (paragraph 59). Furthermore, the Consortium considers that the SPD does not assess the full financial burden of its requirements and, taken together, all the additional requirements will threaten development viability,</p>	<p>A viability assessment has been undertaken that suggests there are no viability issues for any of the development sites, consequently all development proposals should be in accordance with the plan. The SSGA SPD has been updated to reflect the outcome of the Examination In public and the Inspector's report to ensure it aligns with Policy SS6. If viability issues do arise they will be considered in line with the NPPF and Local Plan viability policies.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>contrary to paragraphs 153, 173 and 174 of the NPPF, which is clear that developments should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened.</p> <p>Finally, the Consortium recognises that planning permission or minded-to-grant resolutions have been secured for the other four developments in the SSGA (namely Chapelgarth, Cherry Knowle, South Ryhope and Land at Burdon Lane) and hence many aspects of the SPD have not already been applied to these schemes, for example a contribution towards the District Heating System. This has set a precedent for the development of the Land North of Burdon Lane. The Consortium therefore asks that the Council adopt a consistent approach when considering the Land North of Burdon Lane development, rather than placing additional financial burdens on this scheme when compared to the neighbouring developments. The Consortium wishes to thank the Council for the opportunity to comment on the SPD and would like to work positively with the Council to bring forward the Land North of Burdon Lane.</p> <p>Section 2.1 The Burdon Lane Consortium suggests that a sentence is included to explain that Figure 1 provides details of the SSGAs allocation on the adopted Sunderland Unitary Development Plan (UDP) Proposals Map from 1998 and that the emerging Core Strategy and Development Plan proposes to release this land for residential uses. At the moment, the purpose of Figure 1 is not described in the text. The boundary for Cherry Knowle in the SSGA is not the same as that in the adopted UDP and the Consortium suggests that the boundary is amended to ensure consistency. The Consortium agrees with the Land North of Burdon Lane text and has no comments to make.</p>	<p>With specific reference to the District Heating system, this requirement has been removed from the SPD.</p> <p>Section 2 has been updated to reflect the current position with regards the status of the site allocations through the Core Strategy and Development Plan and reflects the current position with regards planning permissions and starts on site.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>Section 3.1 This section states the following: The Core Strategy identifies a series of Locations for Major Development (LMDs). Whilst not formally allocated through the Core Strategy , the LMDs will provide a bridge between the Core Strategy and the formal Allocations Development Plan Document. Four LMDs are proposed in South Sunderland which have collectively been grouped as the South Sunderland Growth Area. The Burdon Lane Consortium has concerns that the SPD implies that Locations for Major Development are not formally allocated through the Core Strategy and Development Plan (CSDP). The term Locations for Major Development is not a term used in the CSDP, instead Growth Area is used. Additionally, the draft CSDP clearly proposes to allocate this land, given the following: Policy SA2: South Sunderland Growth Area of the draft CSDP states : 227ha of land, between Ryhope and Doxford Park is allocated to create a new high quality, vibrant and distinctive neighbourhood. The draft CSDP 2015 “2033 Policies Map and Key Diagram 2017 Spatial Strategy Map clearly show the SSGA allocation under Policy SA2. It is therefore evident that the draft CSDP proposes that SSGA is allocated for residential-led development.</p> <p>Section 3.3 This section includes two paragraphs on Buildings for Life. The second paragraph states that all schemes should aim to achieve Building for Life Diamond status. The Burdon Lane Consortium raises concern about this requirement on the following grounds: There is no requirement that the other recently approved developments in the SSGA have to achieve this status (namely Chapelgarth, Cherry Knowle, South Ryhope and Land at Burdon Lane). This is not a requirement of the draft CSDP. As such, none of the other housing sites across the City will have to achieve this. A consistent approach should be followed.</p>	<p>This section has been updated to reflect the current position with regards the status of the site allocations through the Core Strategy and Development Plan.</p> <p>The SPD specifies that schemes should ‘aim to achieve’, it is not a requirement of the SPD to achieve these levels.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>The Land North of Burdon Lane would be the only site that would have to achieve this status, which would be unreasonable. This site also has to deliver significant infrastructure, including the delivery of substantial highway works, a 1.5 form entry primary school, a neighbourhood centre, ecological mitigation and green infrastructure, as well as pay substantial contributions in relation to matters including transport improvements and biodiversity. The additional costs associated with achieving this status have not been considered in the Sunderland City Councils Whole Plan Viability Assessment (August 2017), contrary to the NPPF which requires local planning authorities to assess the likely cumulative impacts on developments of all existing and proposed local standards, supplementary planning documents and policies when added to nationally required standards (para. 174). Any requirement to deliver more onerous design and sustainability standards will be likely to result in viability and deliverability issues. Guidance keeps changing and the Design Councils own website recognises that the Building for Life 12 could have a lifespan of another 5 years. As such, this status is unlikely to be around for the lifetime of the SPD and ultimately the delivery of the SSGA.</p> <p>Section 4.6 “Sustainability The Burdon Lane Consortium has serious concerns about the requirement for a district bio-mass/gas fired boiler plant for the following reasons: A District Heating System would require a significant heating demanding use at the outset to ensure it is feasible and viable. However, the proposed development on Land North of Burdon Lane would itself not generate sufficient heating demand to support such a scheme, particularly in the early years of development. The Councils Infrastructure Delivery Study (January 2016) costs the District Heating System at £11,350,000 or approximately £4,000 per dwelling, with this amount being split between the four large</p>	<p>The reference to providing district heating and power on a community wide basis has been deleted from the SPD.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>developments at the SSGA. However, the other schemes at Chapelgarth, Cherry Knowle and South Ryhope have now been approved and are not paying a contribution towards the District Heating System. It is not possible to retrospectively require that infrastructure for a District Heating System is put into these other schemes after they have been approved. This effectively means that the development on Land North of Burdon Lane would need to fund this system on its own. At a cost of over £11,000 per dwelling, this is nearly three times the amount suggested in the Councils own Infrastructure Delivery Study . This substantial cost would clearly render the development unviable. Accordingly, a District Heating System would not be viable or deliverable and it would be inefficient to provide a heat source for the Land North of Burdon Lane development only. The Infrastructure Delivery Study states that The Council will be promoting district heating in the forthcoming SPD, assuming it does not affect the viability of sites (para. 10.3.6). However, the Councils Whole Plan Viability Assessment (August 2017) has not assessed the cost implications of delivering the District Heating System and energy centre. Indeed, no reference is made to such a system. This is contrary to the NPPF which states that: Supplementary planning documents should not be used to add unnecessarily to the financial burdens on development. (NPPF, para. 153) Pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in plan-making and decision-taking. Plans should be deliverable. Therefore, the sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. (NPPF, para. 173) Local planning authorities] should assess the likely cumulative impacts on developments of all existing and proposed local standards, supplementary planning documents and policies when added to nationally required standards (NPPF, para. 174). 4. The District Heating System is not</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms and is not fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. As such, the requirement for this system conflicts with Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010. 5. The issues surrounding energy efficiency and low carbon energy are now matters of Building Regulations.</p> <p>Section 5.2 “Land North of Burdon Lane Table 2 identifies Ecological benefits such as priority species and habitats as a Strength in the SWOT analysis. However, the detailed ecological survey work undertaken by Burdon Lane Consortium has found that the Land North of Burdon Lane is of overall low ecological value, being used by breeding birds and small numbers of bats. The Consortium therefore suggests that this statement is removed given the absence of evidence that ecology is a strength.</p> <p>Section 6.1 The Burdon Lane Consortium supports that recognition of the need to diversity the Citys housing stock and that SSGA is seen as a crucial element in addressing the current housing imbalance through delivering executive homes. However, the Consortium considers that the references to higher value executive homes is too prescriptive and conflicts with Section 7.3 of the SPD which advises that the Council does not have a specific definition for executive dwellings.</p> <p>The introduction to this chapter refers to the principles and parameter set out within the chapter. The Burdon Lane Consortium suggests that the following text is included: The principles and parameters should be considered with flexibility given that they could be influenced by the findings of detailed studies and site investigations, in particular archaeology.</p>	<p>No changes proposed to the SPD.</p> <p>References to executive homes have been removed throughout the SPD and replaced with larger family dwellings.</p> <p>The principles and parameters of the SPD are in place to ensure the SSGA meets its full potential and the vision and objectives can be met and are considered flexible enough to deal with changes through detailed studies and site investigations.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>Section 7.1 The SSAANGS text box refers to this area being retained and maintained in perpetuity (minimum of 75 years). However, 75 years is an excessively long time period and requirements could change. The Burdon Lane Consortium suggests that this text is amended as follows: SSAANGs should be retained and maintained in perpetuity (minimum of 75 years), <u>whilst a scheme for their future maintenance will need to be agreed with the local planning authority.</u></p> <p>The Consortium supports the recognition in the supporting text to Figure 19 that this is an indicative plan and that the exact shape and positioning of the SSAANG and the precise location of the new green links may be amended during the planning of each SSGA development.</p> <p>Existing Corridors/Buffers. The Consortium requests that the first sentence is amended as follows to ensure flexibility in response to the quality and interest of the vegetation features: All existing woodland, hedgerows and other vegetation corridors will be retained and enhanced, where possible and practical and where this cannot be achieved compensation will be provided.</p> <p>The Consortium has concerns about the size of the proposed buffers and considers that the standoff distances should be applied with flexibility to take into account the quality and interest of any ecological features. The following amendments are suggested: Buffers will be required around each of the corridor types- tree belts (25m), hedgerows(10m), copses and local designations (50-100m), National/European designations (buffer dependent on development proposal). Buffers will be required around important woodland, hedgerows and copses, as well as around local designations and National/European</p>	<p>The minimum 75 years reference is considered quite low in comparison with other authorities, as such no changes proposed to the SPD.</p> <p>It is considered that to insert the proposed text will weaken this aspect of the sentence and as such no changes proposed.</p> <p>The proposed changes are considered to weaken the requirement as such no changes proposed.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>designations. The buffer size will depend on the quality and interest of the species/habitat and the proposed development. It is suggested that the following buffers are provided: Designated and/or ancient woodland - 25m buffer High quality hedgerows that are of ecological importance - 10m buffer Local designations - 50-100m buffer National/European Designations "the buffer width should vary depending upon the ecological value and function of the feature that is to be protected and the quality of the habitat within the buffer". These changes are suggested to ensure a fair and reasonable approach providing flexibility for delivery.</p> <p>Figure 19 "Potential Location of SSAANGs Figure 19 refers to Interpretation Boards, with black asterisks used to mark their location across the SSGA. However, no explanation is provided in the text about this. It is understood that the other approved schemes in this area are not providing interpretation boards. The Consortium suggests that the Interpretation Boards are deleted from this figure, to ensure consistency with the other developments.</p> <p>Play The supporting text to the Play text box refers to the play facilities being implemented by the developer with a commuted sum towards their ongoing maintenance. However, the Consortium suggest that the play facilities could also be maintained by a management company, in the same way that the SSAANGs would also be either managed by the council or a management company. The Consortium suggest the following amendment to ensure a consistent approach: Sufficient equipped childrens play spaces must be provided; therefore each of the 4 development sites should include an appropriate play facility, to be implemented by the developer with and is either maintained</p>	<p>The SPD has been updated to include reference to the Interpretation boards, which are required. The other SSGA schemes have provided these boards and the requirement for them is to remain. The cost of 12 boards has been included within the initial costings for the SSGA.</p> <p>The reference to commuted sum has been removed and replaced with 'maintained in perpetuity'.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>by a management company or a commuted sum is paid towards its ongoing maintenance.</p> <p>Allotments There is a discrepancy between the draft SPD and the SSGA Infrastructure Delivery Study (IDS) regarding allotment provision. The draft advises that allotments should be provided on-site and where this is not feasible appropriate off-site locations should be found in consultation with the councils allotment officer. However, the IDS does not refer to on-site provision and instead advises that contributions towards off-site provision will be sought. The Consortium also understands that the Chapelgarth and South Ryhope developments are paying a contribution towards off-site provision, whilst Cherry Knowle is providing allotments or community gardens on-site. In order to ensure consistency with the IDS and the other schemes, the Consortium suggest the following change to the text: Allotments should either be provided on-site and implemented by the developer or a commuted sum payment should be made towards their off-site provision. Where it is not feasible to provide on site, appropriate off-site locations should be found in consultation with the councils allotment officer.</p> <p>Management & Maintenance of GI and SSAANG The Consortium is concerned that the SPD states that a management board should be established that includes residents and council representatives. The Consortium frequently use management companies to successfully maintain public open space within their developments; however, there is not normally a requirement to set up such a management board. The Consortium also recognise that this requirement is not included in the Chapelgarth S106 Agreement or is this referred to in the Committee Reports of the other developments. To ensure consistency, the Consortium suggest the following text is deleted:</p>	<p>The SPD provides the flexibility for allotments to be provided on-site by developers or off-site through a financial contribution, if off-site the location for allotments should be discussed in consultation with the council's allotment officer.</p> <p>No changes proposed to the SPD.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>A management board should be established that includes residents and council representatives.</p> <p>Section 7.2 “Built Environment Built Environment Guiding Principles and Requirements The Burdon Lane Consortium is committed to deliver a development to a good urban design standard; however, the Consortium is concerned about the wording under Objective 2 and within the Place-Making text box which requires that development proposals should strive for the highest standard in the design of buildings, public realm and landscaping and schemes to be built to the highest possible urban design standards. Their concerns are for the following reasons: The Council has not considered the cost for achieving the highest possible urban design standards in their Whole Plan Viability Assessment (August 2017). Rather, this assessment confirms that the Council is not seeking to impose or seek standards that are over and above the national standards (para. 8.37). This Assessment recognises that environmental standards contained in the Building Regulations are increasing. As such, the Viability Assessment has used enhanced standards based on the BCIS costs for Building Regulations (Part L) 2010 + 1.5% (paragraphs 7.5 -7.8 and 10.9). Furthermore, the spreadsheets toward the end of the document (for example on page 389) do not include any additional build costs in relation to Design. It is therefore clear that the highest possible urban design standards have not been costed. There are no requirements for the other approved similar developments at the SSGA (Chapelgarth, Cherry Knowle, South Ryhope and Land at Burdon Lane) to achieve the highest possible urban design standards. The statement highest possible urban design standards is ambiguous and subjective. There are no nationally agreed standards in the National Planning Policy Framework or Planning Practice Guidance.</p>	<p>Text has been amended within document to reflect high quality design in line with the Core Strategy and Development Plan.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>The Place-Making text box continues by stating that development proposals will be required to follow the principles of Building for Life 12. The supporting text also states that development proposals should seek to achieve Building for Life accreditation. However, the Consortium has concerns about the Building for Life accreditation. Please see the response to Section 3.3 of the SPD for details of these concerns. This text states that Building for Life 12 and Secured by Design are national development standards. However, the Consortium is concerned that this text gives the impression that they are statutory requirements; however, they are nationally recognised design tools.</p> <p>The Consortium suggest that the wording beneath Objective 2, within the Place-Making text box and the supporting text to the Place-Making text box is amended as follows: Development proposals should strive for the highest standard in the design of deliver good quality buildings, public realm and landscaping. Development proposals within the SSGC will be required to deliver a scheme built to the highest possible a good urban design standard following the principles of Building for Life 12 and Secured by Design which delivers an accessible, adaptable and safe place, whilst respecting the surrounding built and landscape features within and neighbouring the site. Building for Life 12 and Secured by Design are national development standards nationally recognised design tools which promote the construction of high quality, well connected and safe communities. Building for Life 12 guides the better planning of new development through urban design standards which create safe environments that provide everything that should be expected within a new community. Development proposals should seek to achieve building for life accreditation, therefore providing a mark of a good place to live. The general Building for Life principles of creating a safe and accessible environment</p>	<p>Text amended to reflect Building for Life and Secured by Design are nationally recognised design tools.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>should be broadly accorded with, subject to viability, to provide a good place to live.</p> <p>These amendments will ensure that development is not burdened by onerous and unnecessary requirements, which would be contrary to Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations 2010; that the SSGA is deliverable, viable and accords with national planning policy; and that a consistent approach is sought for all developments in the SSGA.</p> <p>Development Layout within SSGA The Consortium suggest the following amendments are made to the Development Layout within SSGA text box and the supporting text: Proposals will be required encouraged to: Form a perimeter block development layout which makes clear distinctions between public and private space. Provide a variety of block sizes All developments should front onto the public realm, natural features of the landscape, pedestrian/multi-user routes, open space and ecological buffers, wherever possible or practical . The most appropriate form of development will therefore be a perimeter block. A perimeter block The style of development should allows for a flexible form which can accommodate a range of buildings types and densities. The style of development will should also ensure maximum natural surveillance and activation onto the public realm through buildings fronting onto a public street whilst also ensuring security to the rear of properties. Proposals which provide rear gardens or blank/inactive elevations onto the above elements will not normally be considered acceptable. There may be instances where it is not possible or practical for development to always front onto these elements and hence some flexibility is sought.</p>	<p>The existing text within this section is considered reasonable and no changes proposed.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>Architectural Design The Consortium suggests the following amendments are made to the last bullet point in the Architectural Design text box and the supporting text: Proposals which feature blank and inactive elevations which front onto areas of the public realm or areas with activity will not <u>normally</u> be considered acceptable by the council, as will those which offer a poor or weak relationship with the streetscene.</p> <p>The use of perimeter block developments development form will create include instances of corner properties which face onto the public realm. It is essential that these properties are designed to provide an appropriate level of activation and detailing onto the streetscene. Not only will this increase natural surveillance but also maintain a continuity of frontage. The inclusion of a house type with dual aspect elevations would provide an adequate response.</p> <p>Section 7.3 “Residential Development “Housing Mix and Choice Residential Development Guiding Principles and Requirements The Burdon Lane Consortium recognises that Table 6 provides an anticipated capacity of 995 dwellings for the Land North of Burdon Lane. The Consortium welcomes the recognition that the figures provided are indicative numbers and should be used as a guideline when considering the number of dwellings proposed on any of the SSGA sites and will not be used as a control total for development management purposes.</p> <p>Executive Dwellings The Consortium supports the identified need to deliver executive dwellings at the SSGA. The Consortium also welcomes the fact that the Council has not provided a specific definition of executive dwellings, given that the plot size, number of bedrooms or amount of private amenity space for executive dwellings can vary.</p>	<p>No changes proposed to the SPD.</p> <p>The capacities in table 6 have been updated to reflect the Local Plan Policy SS6.</p> <p>References to executive dwellings have been replaced throughout the document with larger family dwellings.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>Affordable Housing The Consortium broadly welcomes the recognition by the Council that 10% affordable housing should be provided at the SSGA, rather than 15% as required elsewhere. This is given that these developments have to fund a substantial amount of other social and environmental infrastructure. However, the Consortium suggests the inclusion of a mechanism to allow for instances where the delivery of affordable housing may harm the viability of a scheme, as provided for under draft Policy H4: Affordable Housing of the CSDP. The following additional text is therefore suggested: Where an applicant considers that the provision of 10% affordable housing would make a scheme unviable, they must submit a full detailed viability assessment to justify the reduced affordable housing provision on the site. This change is suggested to provide flexibility to respond to the detailed site investigations and viability appraisals that are currently being undertaken by the Consortium. These assessments will be much more detailed than the Councils high level viability appraisal in relation to the SSGA sites, given they will be based on more detailed information about sales values, build costs and any abnormal costs. It is recognised that the Chapelgarth Section 106 Agreement includes such a mechanism and the Consortium is therefore seeking a consistent approach. The Consortium welcomes the statement that the preference is for affordable housing but that off-site provision will be accepted where it can be robustly justified. The Consortium considers it is important that flexibility is provided on the tenure split of 75% social rented and 25% intermediate, for viability reasons and also in case a registered provider cannot be secured for the social rented dwellings. The Consortium therefore suggest that the following change is made to the Affordable Housing text box: 10% of residential development should be affordable with a tenure split of 75% social rented and 25% intermediate , subject to viability. The Consortium is</p>	<p>It is not considered appropriate to include reference to viability within the SPD, as this would then be repetitive for a number of sections of the SPD. Should viability issues arise these will be dealt with through the planning application. The tenure split is to remain at 75%/25% for the SPD in recognition that to introduce a different split now may impact on site viability. Notwithstanding the fact that the SPD refers to 75%/25% split, the local plan refers to utilising the most up to date SHMA.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>concerned about the reference to pepper potting the affordable housing provision within the private housing area. The affordable housing provision will naturally be provided in different locations across the Land North of Burdon Lane, given there are three house builders on board. However, registered providers consider that pepper potting makes affordable housing difficult to manage and consequently this could make finding a registered provider difficult. The Consortium suggests that this requirement is removed from the SPD to ensure a deliverable scheme and that the following amendment is made to the text: All affordable housing must be integrated seamlessly into the layout and design of the residential areas , through pepper potting within private housing areas.</p> <p>Housing Type The Consortium suggests the following change to the last sentence in the Housing Type text box: There will be variety in the housing types provided at SSGA to offer choice. Imaginative and high quality development both in terms of housing design and materials will be required. Developers will need to demonstrate how they have captured the spirit of innovation whilst moving ensured high quality and moved towards more sustainable ways of living within their proposals, subject to viability. The Consortium recognises that the Councils aim is for the SSGA to be a most sustainable development, however, viability issues should be a key consideration.</p> <p>Developments must not be required to achieve such a high level of sustainability that it harms their viability otherwise there is a risk that they will not come forward. This reflects national policy which states that supplementary planning documents should not be used to add unnecessarily to financial burdens on development (NPPF, para. 153) and that careful attention should be paid to viability and costs and that the cumulative impacts on</p>	<p>This part of the SPD has been amended to reflect the requirements of the Local plan, which refers to clusters, rather than pepper-potting.</p> <p>It is not considered appropriate to include reference to viability within each section of the SPD.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>development of all existing and proposed local and national standards, supplementary planning documents and other policies must be assessed (NPPF, paragraph 173 and 174). This change ensures consistency with national policy.</p> <p>The Consortium also requests that the following change is made to the supporting text to ensure a viable and deliverable scheme: This will help provide interest in the character and design of SSGA and should include executive housing with high specification and construction. Elsewhere imaginative the use of town houses, terraces and other forms of high quality but higher density housing types will prevail.</p> <p>Section 7.4 “Thriving Communities” Social Infrastructure Whilst the Burdon Lane Consortium welcomes the Councils approach of providing new facilities in accessible locations, the following amendment is suggested to Objective 4: Provide new facilities including local centres, primary schools and open space where the greatest number of them have good and safe access to new and existing residents can access them easily and safely. This change is suggested to provide flexibility in case there is another accessible location that is the preferred location for new facilities for design/environmental/technical reasons but that does not provide access to the greatest number of new and existing residents.</p> <p>Art The Consortium recognises that the SPD is encouraging the inclusion of art. However, the development within the SSGA must be viable, in accordance with paragraphs 153, 173 and 174 of the NPPF. The following change is therefore suggested to the text box: The inclusion of art will be actively encouraged as part of the new development or the open landscape, subject to viability.</p>	<p>No proposed changes. Objective 4 is considered appropriate as drafted to ensure new facilities are centrally located.</p> <p>It is not considered appropriate to include reference to viability within each section of the SPD.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>Healthcare This section advises that the NHS has no requirement for additional surgery provision within SSGA given there is sufficient capacity. However, the SPD goes on to state that: Although provision is not currently required, land has been identified in the form of a Neighbourhood Centre for such uses, should a need arise in the future. The council will continue to liaise with the NHS regarding Healthcare and surgery needs. The SSGA Infrastructure Delivery Study advises that as no additional healthcare facilities are required a financial contribution is not required (para. 5.4). The Consortium considers that it would be unreasonable for the Council to require land to be reserved for healthcare facilities indefinitely, given the absence of a need for further facilities. Accordingly, the Consortium suggests that the following amendment is made: Although provision is not currently required, land has been identified in the form of a Neighbourhood Centre for such uses , should a need arise in the future . The need for healthcare facilities will be reviewed at the time any planning application is submitted for developments in the SSGA.</p> <p>Section 7.5 “Movement Sustainable Communities The Burdon Lane Consortium has concerns about the Building for Life accreditation. Please see their response to Section 3.3 and Section 7.2 of the SPD for details of these concerns. They therefore suggest the following amendment to the text: To ensure the creation of a well-connected and permeable network developers should demonstrate how the application of principles from Manual for Streets and Building for Life 12 have been <u>broadly</u> incorporated into development design proposals for residential streets, <u>subject to viability</u>.</p> <p>Public Transport The Consortium broadly supports the need for bus routes to penetrate into the new development areas;</p>	<p>The healthcare section has been updated to reflect current discussions with the CCG, which sets out that any requirement for additional surgery provision may be requested through individual planning applications.</p> <p>The SPD has also been amended to specify that health centres are appropriate uses for inclusion within the neighbourhood centre, should a need arise and the reference to ‘land has been identified’ has been removed.</p> <p>The existing text refers to ‘demonstrate’, this is considered flexible enough to enable developers to undertake. No changes proposed to the SPD.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>however, the following revision is suggested: Discussions will be held with bus operators to agree the timing for and the extent of the provision of public transport services within each area of the SSGA Nexus advocate the need for public transport services to be firmly established from the outset so as to help reduce car dependency.</p> <p>This change is sought to provide flexibility regarding the timescales for delivering bus services given that a critical mass of population will need to be established to ensure a viable service and also to provide flexibility for developers to negotiate with all bus providers. This approach is consistent with the SSGA Infrastructure Delivery Study which refers to sufficient critical mass in terms of population and infrastructure to enable commercial bus service provision to be viable.</p> <p>The Consortium is concerned that the requirement for all residential properties to be within 400m of a bus stop with a frequent service is an onerous requirement and is not a national requirement. The Consortium suggest the following change to provide greater flexibility: Residential properties should have good access to frequent bus services be within 400 metres of a bus stop with a frequent service to ensure the service represents an attractive proposition for commuters. The Consortium suggest that the following sentence is deleted because it could be difficult for the developers to ensure that the buses comply with the latest standards for accessibility and environmental performance, given that they will be provided by a third party. Indeed, the bus operators will have their own requirements to meet standards which will be secured by bus operators/the local authority. The bus service should meet the latest industry standards for accessibility and environmental performance.</p>	<p>No changes proposed to SPD.</p> <p>The SPD specifies that residential properties should be within 400m, it does not specify it as a requirement.</p> <p>Deletion of the requirement for the bus service to meet the latest industry standards for accessibility and environmental performance, as outside the developer's control.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>Parking The Consortium is concerned about the reference to Building for Life for the reasons set out in their response to Section 3.3 and Section 7.2 of the SPD. The Consortium suggest that the text is amended to state: Parking must be well designed and integrated into the development and contribute to the overall quality of the public realm. Proposals should create an environment which is not dominated by car parking and follow the broad principles set out within the Residential Design Guide SPD (excluding spacing standards 10G), Manual for Streets and Building for Life¹², subject to viability.</p> <p>The Consortium considers that the comment about integrated garages in the SPD is overly restrictive and conflicts with the NPPF which advises that design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription. The following amendment is suggested to the text: A variety of methods of car parking should be provided throughout the growth area, these should be dependant upon the character area in which they sit. Appropriate arrangements may include a combination of on-street parking within well-designed public realm spaces, in curtilage parking or within a courtyard. Developments should avoid the dominant use of integrated garages and areas of hard-standing for parked vehicles which front the street in order to create a high quality public realm, creating a safer pedestrian environment.</p> <p>The Consortium is concerned that all new dwellings should be equipped to charge electric vehicles, given this is an additional financial burden above all the other SPD requirements, and also given that this has not been costed in the Councils Whole Plan Viability Assessment (August 2017). The following amendment is suggested by the Consortium: Electric vehicles and Ultra Low Emission Vehicles (ULEVs) are a more sustainable mode of transport ; their and their use within the SSGA should be</p>	<p>Existing text is considered flexible as states ‘follow the principles’. It is not considered appropriate to include reference to viability within each section of the SPD.</p> <p>The wording of the supporting text ‘should avoid’ is not considered overly restrictive.</p> <p>The SPD has been amended to reflect the requirements of the Local Plan, which states to ‘make provision for the installation of home charging apparatus on major residential schemes’.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>encouraged through provision of dedicated parking for ULEVs. ensuring new dwellings are equipped to charge electric vehicles. Proposals that link residence with a commitment to use ULEVs or membership of car clubs will be especially encouraged. This change is required to ensure the SPD accords with the NPPF through taking into account development viability (para. 153, 173 and 174).</p> <p>Burdon Lane The SPD states No access to be permitted off Burdon Lane. However, the text does not clarify when this route will be closed to vehicles. The Consortium suggests that the text is amended to state that this road is closed to vehicles once the Ryhope Doxford Link Road is completed and operational. This is to ensure that the developers are able to access their site in the interim. The Consortium suggest that the text is amended as follows: No access to be permitted off Burdon Lane. Burdon Lane is to be severed where the Ryhope Doxford Link Road (RDLR) crosses the lane at the Cherry Knowle site. The lane will no longer provide vehicular access until beyond Nettles Lane. Fig 21 details where the lane is to be severed. The access will be closed to vehicles once the RDLR is completed and operational. The severed section will then become a multiuser route for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders.</p> <p>Burdon Road The Consortium is concerned about the restriction that a maximum of 100 dwellings should take access from Burdon Road. Firstly, this would prevent the use of the primary site access from Burdon Road via the proposed link road. Secondly, they suggest that a capacity assessment exercise is undertaken to calculate the maximum number of dwellings. This will ensure that the maximum number is justified by highways modelling work. The Consortium suggest that the text is amended as follows: No access is to be taken from the section of</p>	<p>The SPD has been amended to reflect that no access will be permitted off Burdon Lane once the RDLR is complete and operational.</p> <p>The text has been amended accordingly to make clear that the section of Burdon Road where access is restricted, is that south of Lodgeside Meadows. In addition to this additional wording has been included which states that this access point will serve a maximum of 100 dwellings, unless agreed otherwise with the LPA.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>Burdon Road south of Lodgeside Meadow only, other than to serve the South West corner of Land North of Burdon Lane. This should be a localised access with no through route . The maximum number of dwellings that can take access from the section of Burdon Road south of Lodgeside Meadow is to be determined by a capacity assessment exercise that will be agreed with the Local Planning Authority . and serve a maximum of 100 dwellings.</p> <p>Route Hierarchy The Consortium considers that the requirement for the pedestrian only links to be a minimum of 3m wide seems excessively wide and queries whether this width also include cycle provision. The Consortium suggests that the text is amended to one of the following options: Pedestrian only links: Minimum 3m 2m (not attached to the highway) or Pedestrian and cycle only links: Minimum 3m (not attached to the highway).</p> <p>Section 7.6 “Sustainable Development Renewable Energy/Energy Efficiency The Burdon Lane Consortium is concerned about the requirement for their development to connect to a central energy centre with district heating or alternative. Please see their response to Section 4.6 (Sustainability) of the SPD for details of their concerns. The following amendment is suggested to the Renewable Energy/Energy Efficiency text box: Development to connect to a central energy centre with district heating or alternative.</p> <p>The Consortium broadly welcomes the orientation of properties within 30 o of south; however, the following amendment is suggested to provide flexibility: The main glazed elevation should be orientated within 30° of south (solar orientation) with a correspondingly small proportion of glazing on the north elevation, wherever practical and viable. However, it is not</p>	<p>Text has been amended to the following:- Primary Vehicle Route: 7.2 m (Plus 2m Pedestrian Footpath or 3m shared pedestrian/ Cycle route)</p> <p>This element of the SPD has been deleted.</p> <p>No changes to existing text, current wording is considered flexible.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>essential for all buildings to be orientated due south and variations of around up to 30° can be accommodated whilst still benefiting from passive solar gains.</p> <p>The following flexibility is sought in relation to green roofs and sourcing building materials: The inclusion of green roofs throughout the growth area will be encouraged, where viable, and looked favourable upon particularly in areas with issues with surface water flooding. Building materials should also be sustainable sustainably sourced and have a reduced environmental impact, whilst requiring low maintenance and are durable to the UK climate, wherever possible.</p> <p>As set out in response to Section 4.6, the Consortium does not consider that the district heating system can be delivered or is viable. The Consortium therefore recommends that the following text is deleted as it is no longer relevant: The SSGA Renewable Energy Study (2013) undertaken to inform the SSGA SPD explored opportunities for the use of renewable energy sources and identified that a central energy centre with district heating potentially fired by a lead biomass boiler would be an appropriate option for SSGA - in meeting government targets towards zero carbon development and offering an energy cost saving. The council will further explore the opportunity of District Heating at SSGA. Initial studies suggest that an area of approximately 400m² will be required for the construction of an energy centre. The location of the centre will depend upon the requirements of the energy company and fuel used. The design of the structure to house the energy centre will need to be designed to a high standard using high quality materials and ensure the building is not dominant on the landscape whilst providing an appropriate design response to the locality.</p>	<p>The existing text on green roofs is considered flexible and no changes are proposed.</p> <p>Amendment to text to include where possible in relation to sustainable sourced.</p> <p>This element of the SPD has been deleted.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>The Burdon Lane Consortium welcomes the statement that the masterplan represents the councils interpretation of how the key components of the Principles and Parameters Chapter may be released in a spatial form across the area. This is given that final masterplans will be influenced and led by the market, as well as detailed site surveys and site investigations. This statement ensures a flexible approach. The Consortium notes that the key to Figure 22 is so small it is illegible to read.</p> <p>The Consortium notes that the key to Figure 23 is so small it is illegible to read.</p> <p>Section 9.1 “Purpose and Status of Code The Burdon Lane Consortium broadly welcomes the introductory statement but suggests that the following changes are made to ensure greater flexibility and accordance with the NPPF which is clear that design polices should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail.</p> <p>This code aims to achieve a balance between a clear level of prescription to ensure ensuring high standards of design, and an appropriate degree of flexibility to allow designers freedom to bring forward innovative and imaginative proposals that improve upon the code and importantly, to accommodate changing needs, market conditions or government/local guidance over the duration of projects. Proposals should seek to generally accord with the code, where this is not achievable clear justification must be provided, detailing how the alternative design solution will not undermine key design objectives.</p> <p>Section 9.2 “Movement and Streets Pedestrians and Cyclists The Burdon Lane Consortium consider that a perimeter block development is onerous, inflexible and overly prescriptive and conflicts with paragraph 59 of the NPPF which states that design</p>	<p>Figure 22 has been enlarged.</p> <p>Figure 23 has been enlarged.</p> <p>The existing text is considered flexible to allow justification to be provided when not achievable to accord with the code.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>policies should avoid unnecessary prescription. The layout and size of the development form will partly need to adapt to take into account the location of site constraints, including archaeology and ecological features, as well as the location of the SSAANGs and neighbourhood centre. Flexibility must be allowed for the layout of the development to vary to adapt to local site characteristics. The Consortium suggests the following amendment to the text: In order to ensure that walking and cycling are the natural option the masterplan has been developed to provide a high level of permeability. through the use of perimeter block development. Where development blocks do not form this style, pedestrian only routes or green links have been provided.</p> <p>Recreational Routes The Burdon Lane Consortium recognises the Councils aim for the residents to walk/cycle through the masterplan area without needing to travel along a primary street or into the main urban environment. However, there could be various reasons why this is not possible or should be avoided, for example, ecological reasons. The following amendment is therefore suggested: It is the aim of the masterplan to create a semi-rural development where residents can walk/cycle through the entire area without needing to travel along a primary street or into the main urban environment. Should this not be possible in certain areas, a clear justification should be provided.</p> <p>Public Transport Corridors The Consortium suggests the following revision for the reasons set out in their response to Section 7.5 Movement of the SPD. The location of the corridors will provide an accessible bus service within 400m of to all residents within the SSGA.</p>	<p>No changes proposed</p> <p>No changes proposed to the SPD.</p> <p>No changes proposed to the SPD.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>Ryhope Doxford Link Road The Consortium considers that the requirement for the landscape belt to be 15-20m is overly prescriptive and the following amendment is suggested: A landscape belt of approx. 15-20m is required between the RDLR and proposed development. Its width will vary depending on the local context and masterplan proposals.</p> <p>Primary Streets, Secondary Streets, Green Streets and Shared Surface The Consortium is concerned that pages 78 “81 of the draft SPD which relate to Primary Streets, Secondary Streets, Green Streets and Shared Surface are far too onerous and prescriptive and conflict with the NPPF which states that design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail (para. 59). These sections are clearly seeking to dictate the layout of the development and it should not be the purpose of an SPD to provide such restrictive requirements. To ensure compliance with national planning policy, the Consortium suggest that the following amendments are made to this text:</p> <p>Primary Streets Primary access routes will accommodate a variety of functions including bus routes, frequent vehicle movement, multi-user routes and pedestrian footpaths. The character of the highway will be urban in nature consisting of a wide avenue. In order to prevent parked vehicles blocking the highway and pedestrian routes a 2m wide channel of parallel parking bays interspersed with landscaping will be provided on both sides of the carriageway. A multi-user route will be provided on one side and will be wide enough to provide both pedestrian and cycle movement (3m). The route will be located between the parking/landscaping channel and residential properties front garden space. A standard public footpath will be provided on the alternative side of the carriageway.</p> <p>Key dimensions: Wider feel to the highway 24-25m.</p>	<p>The existing text is considered flexible and no changes proposed to SPD.</p> <p>No changes proposed to the SPD.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>6.7m highway, allow for 2 buses to pass. 2m verge between highway and pavement, verge will include a combination of parallel on street parking and landscaping. 3m pedestrian and cycle shared paving to be provided on one side 2m pedestrian route provided on one side. Front garden or Narrow front garden set back and boundary treatment.</p> <p>Secondary Streets Providing the principal access off the primary street to residential properties, secondary streets will have a strong urban character and a supporting role to the primary street is helping to define the main vehicular routes. These streets are unlikely to carry large volumes of traffic or bus routes and consequently allows for an approach towards design which is less focussed on accommodating through movement. Properties will provide frontage and a strong building line onto the streets with direct pedestrian access to the street from the property. A design response which provides the back of properties onto public streets will not be considered appropriate. Key Dimensions: Width 17 - 19.5m 5.5m highway 2m pedestrian footpath Front garden or narrow front garden set back and boundary treatment (see set back and boundary treatment)</p> <p>Green Streets - Streets facing onto or adjoining open spaces may take various different forms depending on the type of open space which the street fronts onto. These streets should be designed for low traffic flows enabling a mix of pedestrians and vehicles. In the main, these will be located on the urban "rural fringe where development bounds green space, SANGS, green links and natural heritage features. The routes should provide a high</p>	<p>No changes proposed to the SPD.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>in a contrasting coloured material, with a 30mm kerb up stand with flush crossing points and tactile paving where required.</p> <p>Key Dimensions:</p> <p>Width "Varies</p> <p>4.5-5.5m shared surface</p> <p>Set back of the property and boundary treatment will depend upon the character of the area and the surrounding features.</p> <p>The Consortium also suggests that the diagrams on page 79 are removed.</p> <p>Car Parking The Consortium suggest the following change is made to ensure sufficient off-street parking is provided and to reduce the number of parked cars on the streets:</p> <p>All residential properties within the SSGA will be provided with at least one allocated car parking space. Executive dwellings will be provided with <u>a minimum of</u> two off street parking spaces.</p> <p>It should also be clarified whether garages are counted as a space. The Consortium considers that the requirement for garages to be located behind the building line is overly restrictive and conflicts with the NPPF which advises that design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription. Indeed, several pictures in the SPD show garages flush with the front elevations of properties and not set back (on pages 55, 56, 78 and 80). As these pictures are included as examples of good design, it is considered that there is a conflict on this matter within the SPD. The following change is therefore suggested: Where garages are provided careful consideration should be given to the size, positioning and treatment of garages to ensure that they do. Garages must be located behind the building line and not dominate the streetscene.</p>	<p>No changes proposed to the SPD.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>centre. Larger development blocks, at the upper end of the above ranges, will be more appropriate in the lower density executive style development areas of Chapelgarth. Thin development blocks, approximately 35-40m in width, are largely achievable in traditional layouts where private rear gardens back directly onto each other. Care should however, be taken to avoid numerous thin blocks in a row as this can result in little active frontage along side streets. Larger, square blocks can be achieved through the incorporation of short, direct cul-de-sac if the overall development is well connected into the surrounding area and has sufficient pedestrian. Further information and guidance on the development blocks form of the layout can be found in chapter five of the Residential Design Guide SPD.</p> <p>Building Types and Frontages The Consortium also suggests the following change to avoid an overly prescriptive approach: The building types and frontage provided within developments will determine how well streets and spaces are animated and defined. To ensure the appropriate responses to the interface between the built form and public realm is created the below guidance will need to be should generally be followed.</p> <p>Additionally, the Consortium suggests that the reference to increased vertical emphasis within the fascade for landmark buildings and the reference to increasing the building height to 2.5 storey for corner turners (page 82) are removed to avoid an overly prescriptive approach.</p> <p>The following text is therefore suggested for deletion: Landmark buildings will be used to define key gateways and provide points of reference to enhance legibility. The buildings should be defined through an alternative approach to architectural design, which makes the building stand out from the other house types.</p>	<p>No changes proposed to the SPD.</p> <p>No changes proposed to the SPD.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>This should include the materials used, the pattern of fenestration, and increased vertical emphasis within the facade and/or an increase in the overall building height up to 3 storeys. The buildings themselves will not be as prominent as landmark buildings, but will help to provide focal points , an increase in the overall building height to 2.5 storeys will also aid legibility.</p> <p>Transition of Styles For the reasons set out earlier in this section, the Consortium suggests that the text is amended as follows to remove the reference to perimeter blocks: Changes in building styles, colours, proportions, scales and streets design should be avoided where character areas meet, on either side of a street or along a perimeter block. Design Options Front Gardens, Front Garden and Narrow Front Gardens.</p> <p>The Consortium considers that the requirements of the SPD are too restrictive in relation to the depth of front gardens and height/type of boundaries. It is noted that there is a discrepancy between the height of boundary treatment referred to under the Design Options Front Gardens text of 450mm to 1000mm and the Front Garden text of 650mm to 1000mm. It is also not clear why the text is so prescriptive and requires front gardens to be provided when there is a photograph of the front of houses on the same page (page 84) which do not have any front gardens, instead a change of surface materials is used to delineate the difference between the front of the property and the street/pavement. It is recognised that this photograph relates to a Front Strip as discussed on page 85; however, the flexibility to provide a Font Strip is not provided for within the text that relates to front gardens.</p> <p>It is suggested that the three sections on front gardens are combined and that the text is amended as follows to provide greater flexibility: A front garden should normally be situated</p>	<p>No changes proposed to the SPD.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>between the plot line and the building edge. The garden can be delineated by a boundary treatment of up to between 450mm and 1000mm. The front garden for larger plots should have a depth of 5-10 m. Planting along the property line is encouraged. Bay windows or porches may project into the garden. A boundary railing or wall of brick/stone or render may be between 650 - 1000 mm with planting on the plot boundary line to reinforce it.</p> <p>The front garden should have a depth of between 5 -10m. Where the boundary treatment fencing interferes with a highway visibility splay, it may be necessary to reduce the height or demonstrate that the boundary treatment fencing is of an open design which permits adequate views to be gained through it. The plot line should be delineated by a railing or wall up to 1000mm high. The front garden should have a depth of between 1.5-4 m and should be planted with hedging. This The boundary height treatment should be no more than 600 mm in height in locations close to where children are likely to be playing or walking.</p> <p>Side Boundaries The Consortium considers that the perimeter block approach and having stepped facing as shown on the side boundaries diagram overly prescriptive. The Consortium therefore suggest that the diagram is removed and that the following text is deleted: The inclusion of perimeter block development will lead to the predominance of back-to-back gardens and corner properties with side gardens bounding the public realm. Where gardens side onto the public realm a stepped approach should be sought with the provision of a brick and timber/railing combination (see illustration).</p> <p>Section 9.4 Neighbourhood Centre/Commercial Parking The Burdon Lane Consortium is concerned about the requirement for the local centre to include a district heating central plan. Please</p>	<p>No changes proposed to the SPD.</p> <p>No changes proposed to the SPD.</p> <p>No changes proposed to the SPD.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>see their response to Section 4.6 (Sustainability) of the SPD for details of their concerns.</p> <p>The Consortium also suggests that flexibility should be provided to allow either a grass or 3G pitch to be provided, subject to viability. The following changes are suggested: The local centre will comprise of: Retail provision, Primary school, Wheeled Sports Area, Formal play space, Multi User Games Area, Grass or 3G pitch, Parking facilities capable of serving all of the above and the SANG, to be served by bus service District heating central plant. The above provisions will be subject to viability and demand.</p> <p>Multi-Functional Green Spaces The Consortium agrees with the need to retain hedgerows and woodlands, however, there may be cases where some are lost, for example should they be suffering from poor health. There may also be instances where it is not possible to use gaps in existing hedge rows for access. The following change is therefore suggested to the text to ensure flexibility: Existing hedge rows and woodlands will remain and form the basis of development proposals, wherever possible. Gaps in existing natural features such as hedge rows can be utilised to provide access and services, wherever possible.</p> <p>Design of Green Spaces The Consortium notes that the key on Figure 24: Green Infrastructure is too small to read.</p> <p>Public Art The Consortium suggests that the public art text is amended to include a reference to viability, in accordance with paragraphs 153, 173 and 174 of the NPPF, and that the word requirement is removed, given the provision of public art is not a statutory requirement: The natural environment should be a major source of ideas for place making and cultural development.</p>	<p>The pitch provision is required to be 3G, as such no changes proposed to the SPD.</p> <p>Reference to a district heating plan has been deleted from the SPD.</p> <p>No changes proposed to the SPD.</p> <p>Figure enlarged.</p> <p>No amendments made to the SPD.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>Where there are opportunities or a requirement for public art, proposals should consider the integration of public art throughout the design process, where viable.</p> <p>Section 10.1 - Introduction The Burdon Lane Consortium supports the statement that: The Indicative Masterplan is not prescriptive in limiting how the site must be developed, nor is it exhaustive in suggesting that this is the only way the site can be redeveloped. It is an interpretation of how the councils aspirations for the area can be accommodated within the physical constraints identified in this document. Other interpretations of how the site could be taken forward to meet the objectives of the masterplan may be appropriate, and the council will be open to discussions with any interested parties who wish to provide their own interpretation of the masterplan.</p> <p>The Consortium does consider that some of the design requirements set out within the SPD are overly prescriptive and trusts that the masterplan objectives will be applied with flexibility in accordance with this statement.</p> <p>Section 10.2 "Site Wide Character Areas The Burdon Lane Consortium has concerns about some of the design criteria and considers that they are overly prescriptive. The following amendments are suggested to ensure accordance with paragraph 59 of the NPPF:</p> <p>Ryhope Doxford Link Road The landscape belt <u>will vary in width depending on the local context and masterplan proposals.</u>of approx. 15-20m It will provide a pedestrian/cycle routes, low level native species planting and scattered tree planting.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>No changes proposed to the SPD.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>Urban-Rural Edge Properties to <u>generally have a minimum 5m</u> front gardens <u>which</u> to include an area of landscaped amenity space and tree planting.</p> <p>Due to the property types being executive <u>a minimum</u> of two parking spaces per property should be provided.</p> <p>Urban 4m set back from front gardens The inclusion of garages will be acceptable form of on plot parking however the garage must not dominate the street scene. The inclusion of a high proportion of integrated garages will not be considered acceptable.</p> <p>Section 10.4 “Land North of Burdon Lane The Burdon Lane Consortium suggests that the following text is included at the end of the introductory text:</p> <p><u>Figure 32: Street Network and Figure 33: Green Infrastructure are illustrative masterplans, providing one example of how the development could come forward. However, the Council recognises that the final masterplan will be in formed by the findings of detailed site surveys and investigations, as well as the characteristics of the local area, and hence the principles and parameters provided in the SPD will be applied with flexibility.</u></p> <p>This text is suggested to ensure a flexibility approach which responds to the findings of further work. Street Network. The Consortium suggests that the following changes are made to the text:</p> <p>1. Access to this section to be provided from Burdon Lane, however, this will not provide private vehicle links into the rest of the LnoBL development <u>, once the Link Road is completed and operational.</u></p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Text amended to reflect that the access can serve up to 100 dwellings, unless agreed otherwise.</p>
--	---	--

	<p><u>The maximum number of dwellings that can take access from the section of Burdon Road south of Lodgeside Meadow is to be determined by a capacity assessment exercise that will be agreed with the Local Planning Authority , and will serve up to 100 units</u></p> <p>a) A bus only link will be provided through to the larger site. The Consortiums reasons are explained in their response to Section 7.5.</p> <p>Green Infrastructure The Burdon Lane Consortium realises that the Council is seeking a minimum of 10m wide landscaping and amenity green space between the existing and new residential areas. However, this text conflicts with the Urban Edge text on page 92 of the draft SPD which refers to the proposed new properties backing onto existing areas.</p> <p>Given this conflict, and to provide flexibility to respond to the local context, the following amendment is suggested: Landscaping and amenity green space to <u>should</u> be provided between existing residential areas and the new development , <u>where appropriate</u> , a minimum of 10m will be provided.</p> <p>Pedestrian and Cycle Recreational Network The Burdon Lane Consortium suggests that the following change is made to the text:</p> <p>6. Burdon Lane to be stopped up and converted into a multi-user route , <u>once the Link Road is completed and operational</u> . At this point the green route running to the north of the hedge row will divert onto the multi-user route. The Consortiums reason is explained in their response to Section 7.5.</p>	<p>The urban edge text has been deleted and the requirement is for a minimum of 10m wide landscaping and amenity green space between existing and new residential areas.</p> <p>Text amended to reflect that Burdon lane will not be stopped up until the RDLR is complete and operational.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>Built Form The Consortium suggests that text about public art (under point 7.b) is amended to include references to viability, in accordance with paragraphs 153, 173 and 174 of the NPPF: The use of public art will also be welcomed in these locations, <u>subject to viability</u>.</p> <p>Section 11.2 The Burdon Lane Consortium notes that Table 7 provides an estimated 955 dwellings on Land North of Burdon Lane. As Table 6 in Section 7.3 of the SPD and the Councils Whole Plan Viability Assessment both relate to 995 dwellings. It is assumed that the figure should be 995 dwellings and it is suggested that the word approximately is used instead of estimated. The Consortium therefore suggests the following changes to ensure consistency: The figure in Table 6 is amended to state <u>an approximate</u> yield of 995 dwellings.</p> <p>The title of Table 7 is amended to state Estimated <u>Approximate</u> Development/Land Use Figures.</p> <p>Paragraph 11.2 is amended to state The following provides a summary of the estimated <u>approximate</u> figures for development/land use at the four sub-areas.</p> <p>Section 11.4 “Phasing The Burdon Lane Consortium queries the following statement that those site not allocated for residential should only come forward once the Core Strategy has been to examination and has been adopted. Firstly, there is no legal or planning policy basis to prevent sites coming forward until a development plan is adopted and hence this statement cannot be enforced by the Council.</p> <p>Secondly, some of the sites that are not allocated for residential development have already been approved and hence this</p>	<p>No amendments proposed to text within SPD.</p> <p>SPD has been updated throughout to reflect yields set out within the Local Plan.</p> <p>No changes proposed.</p> <p>No changes proposed.</p> <p>This text has been updated to reflect the current position with regards the sites within SSGA.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>statement is contradicting the Councils approach on other sites. For example, South Ryhope, which has an employment allocation in the UDP, has a minded to grant resolution for a residential development. The Consortium therefore suggests that this text is removed from the SPD to ensure a legal compliance with planning legislation and consistency with the other SSGA developments. Those sites not allocated for residential should only come forward once the Core Strategy has been to examination and has been adopted.</p> <p>Section 11.5 - Planning Obligations The Burdon Lane Consortium queries the Councils contribution of £70 per dwelling towards the cost of providing dedicated planning and development advice and support. It is not clear what this payment relates to and how it would differ from the pre-application, planning application or discharge of condition payments, or the proposed contribution towards staffing costs for implementing infrastructure (as referred to in Section 11.5). Furthermore, this payment is not referred to in the Planning Committee Reports for the other 4 developments at Chapelgarth, Cherry Knowle, South Ryhope and Land at Burdon Lane, neither is it assessed in the Councils Whole Plan Viability Assessment . The Consortium considers it is important that a consistent approach is followed for all developments in the SSGA. If the other developments have not made this payment, then it would be unreasonable for the Council to insist on such a payment for the Land North of Burdon Lane. Given the lack of clarify and to ensure a consistent approach, the Consortium suggests that the following text is removed from the SPD:</p> <p>In order to ensure the comprehensive delivery of the South Sunderland Growth Area a small contribution of £70 per dwelling</p>	<p>This text has been updated to reflect the current position with regards the sites within SSGA.</p> <p>Reference to this has been deleted from the SPD.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>will be sought towards the cost of providing dedicated planning and development advice and support.</p> <p>Page 111 of the SPD contains a table setting out the infrastructure requirements and associated costs. However, the Consortium is concerned about the viability implications of all these requirements. This is particularly given that a viability assessment has not been undertaken that takes into account all these costs, as well as the costs of achieving the highest standards of design and sustainability. This conflicts with paragraphs 153, 173 and 174 of the NPPF, for the reasons set out in response to Section 4.6.</p> <p>The Consortium suggests that the following text is added below the table: <u>The infrastructure requirements and associated costs are indicative figures, and will be subject to negotiation and scheme viability.</u></p> <p>Additionally, the Infrastructure Requirements table refers to the on-site provision of allotments. However, the Consortium suggests that off-site provision is also included in this table, for the reasons provided in response to Section 7.1. The Consortium therefore suggests that following change to the allotment text: Requirement Model suggests 15 plots per 1000 households, on an average size of between 250 “300 square metres. <u>The allotments can either be provided on-site by the developers or an off-site contribution is made.</u> Estimated Cost Unknown. To be implemented <u>on-site</u> by the developer <u>or an off-site contribution of £85.50 per dwelling.</u></p> <p>The Infrastructure Requirements table also refers to public art and the Consortium suggest that the following change is made, in</p>	<p>No proposed changes to the text.</p> <p>The SPD has been amended with regards allotments, with the location to be agreed in consultation with the council’s allotments officer.</p> <p>No changes proposed to text.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>the interests of scheme viability: <u>To be provided by the developer, subject to viability.</u></p> <p>Section 11.6 “Infrastructure and Delivery The Burdon Lane Consortium welcomes the statement that an element of flexibility is retained in order that development can respond to changing circumstances over time.</p> <p>Section 11.8 “Long Term Maintenance/Management The Burdon Lane Consortium recognises that the second paragraph advises that the preference is for the greenspace/SSAANNs/GI corridors/play facilities/sport pitches are implemented by the developer and adopted/maintained by the Council. The third paragraph then provides the option of a third party to manage the greenspace only and does not refer to the other features/facilities. The Consortium suggests that the third paragraph is amended as follows to provide an option for a third party to manage everything:</p> <p>Should the developer prefer to appoint a third party to manage <u>these features/facilities</u> the greenspace, rather than the council, through S106s/conditions/legal agreements the developer must be able to provide Sunderland City Council with confidence that the green space <u>these features/facilities</u> will be maintained in perpetuity to a standard <u>and timescale</u> agreed by the council.</p> <p>The Consortium is also concerned that the SPD states that a management board should be established that includes residents and council representatives for the reasons set out in response to Section 7.1. The Consortium suggests that the following text is deleted: A management board should be established that includes residents and council representatives.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>No changes proposed to the SPD. The detail of third party managing features/facilities can be discussed/agreed via the planning application.</p> <p>No changes proposed to the SPD.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>Section 11.9 “Viability The Burdon Lane Consortium supports the flexible approach to viability and provision for viability appraisals to be submitted.</p> <p>Phasing/Delivery of SSAANGs The Burdon Lane Consortium is concerned about the requirement for the SSAANGs to be operational prior to the occupation of new residential development to ensure that the interests of the SPA are not damaged. The Consortium is fully committed to delivering the SSAANG; however, it would be unreasonable for the whole SSAANG area to be completed prior to the occupation of 1 dwelling. The Consortium suggests that a phasing scheme for the delivery of the SSAANG is agreed with the Councils ecologist and Natural England. The following amendment is therefore suggested:</p> <p>SSAANGS must be operational prior to the occupation of new residential development <u>A phasing scheme for the creation and operation of the SSAANGs must be agreed by the Council prior to the commencement of development</u> to ensure that the interests of the SPA are not damaged.</p> <p>Maintenance of SSAANGs This section refers to the SSAANGS being maintained in perpetuity (minimum of 75 years). However, 75 years is an excessively long time period and requirements could change. The Burdon Lane Consortium suggests that this text is amended as follows: SSAANGs must be maintained in perpetuity for a minimum of 75 years <u>for the long-term.</u> Requires SSAANGs to be maintained and useable for the <u>long-term a minimum of 75 years</u> .</p>	<p>If the SSAANG is not in place before occupation of new residential development then bad habitats in relation to accessing the coast may start to occur, resulting in damage to the SPA. As such no changes proposed to the SPD.</p> <p>Text not amended, retain as minimum of 75 years.</p>
--	--	--

Further Preparation and amendments to the Draft South Sunderland Growth Area Supplementary Planning Document.

Further consultation

The comments received to the draft SPD were taken into consideration where possible in the preparation of the final draft SSGA Supplementary Planning Document.

Further consultation took place on the Core Strategy and Development Plan during summer 2018. Whilst this was not a further opportunity to comment on the SSGA SPD, it did allow representations to be made on the strategic policy for the SSGA, Policy SS6, and the proposed allocation of the SSGA sites as housing sites.

As part of the CSDP examination in public, which was held from 21 May 2019 to 13 June 2019 a modification to Policy SS6 was discussed and agreed between the Council, the Planning Inspector and interested parties. This modification was subject to consultation for six weeks as a proposed Main Modification to the Plan during September and October 2019. Changes to the policy as a result of these consultations and the examination in public have been reflected within the SSGA SPD where relevant.

Next Steps

The main changes that were made to the 2017 version of the SPD relate to the following:-

- Updating site capacities to reflect the draft policy within the emerging Core Strategy and Development Plan.
- Updating the text in general to reflect the passage of time.
- Updating the text to incorporate points raised through the consultation where appropriate.
- Removal of references to extra care housing facilities and replacement with accommodation for older people.
- A move away from references to executive dwellings and more towards larger family dwellings.
- Inclusion of text around the requirement for Special Educational Needs (SEND) provision in primary schools.
- Making clearer the expected requirements of the Neighbourhood centre at Land North of Burdon Lane and the possible need to undertake a retail needs assessment.
- Clarifying that the alignment of the RDLR where it joins the B1286 is indicative within the SPD.
- Deletion of the requirement for a bus only link on the B1286 between Ruswarp Drive and Tunstall Village Green.
- Deletion of the requirement for a District Heating system due to viability issues.

- Updating the estimated costs of the infrastructure requirements and Habitat Regulations (HRA) mitigation measures.

A final round of consultation will be undertaken early in 2020 before the SSGA SPD will be adopted alongside the Core Strategy and Development Plan 2015-2033.

The draft SPD document will carry limited weight in the determination of planning applications until such a time it is adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document with the Core Strategy and Development Plan.

APPENDIX 1: Draft South Sunderland Growth Area Supplementary Planning Document Consultee Letter



Commercial Development
Planning and Regeneration
Civic Centre
Burdon Road
Sunderland
Tel (0191) 520 5555
Web www.sunderland.gov.uk

Date: 28 July 2017
Our ref:
Your ref:

Dear Resident

HAVE YOUR SAY ON SUNDERLAND'S CORE STRATEGY AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN

I am writing to inform you that from 7 August to 2 October 2017, Sunderland City Council will be consulting on the first draft of the Sunderland Core Strategy and Development Plan. This Plan sets out our long-term strategy on development across the city to 2033. It will ensure that the right type of development is focused in the right places to meet the needs for local people and businesses.

By law, all local councils must prepare a long-term plan which sets out how much development should take place, and where, to meet the needs of local people and businesses. The Plan is a framework which will ensure that Sunderland can:

- deliver an additional 13,800 homes
- create 10,300 number of jobs
- create sustainable communities and deliver a mix of homes of different sizes and types to meet our needs
- support a thriving economy through the development of the Urban Core, Centres and employment sites
- improve sustainable transport
- create healthy communities
- deliver infrastructure such as schools and healthcare to support our future growth

In addition, we are also consulting on the evidence base which justifies the Plan and two additional Planning Documents;

- Draft South Sunderland Growth Area (SSGA) Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), SSGA Infrastructure Delivery Study (IDS) and associated evidence bases. SSGA has the ability to accommodate approximately 3000 homes, the draft SPD will guide the future development of the area
- Planning Obligations Scoping Report which sets out how the council has considered the need for planning obligations and established an approach which is appropriate, fair and justified.

Have your say

This Plan will shape the places where we live, work, and socialize. That is why it is important that you have your say.

The consultation will run for a period of 8 weeks, from **Monday 7 August to Monday 2 October**. All representations should be completed and received by the council no later than 5pm on the final day of consultation.

The council will be hosting a number of drop-in events, where officers will be available to answer any questions that you may have. The schedule for these events are overleaf:

Delivering services for a better future



Wednesday 9 August 2017		Monday 18 September 2017	
10 - 12pm	Springwell Village Hall, NE9 7RP	10 - 12pm	Railco Carter Sports Centre, SR2 8PD
2 - 4pm	Ryhope Community Centre, SR2	2 - 4pm	Hetton Centre, DH5 9NE
6 - 8pm	Fulwell Methodist Church, SR6 8LN	6 - 8pm	Barnwell Academy, DH4 7RT
Thursday 10 August 2017		Tuesday 19 September 2017	
10 - 12pm	Philadelphia Cricket Club, DH4 4JE	10 - 12pm	The Secret Garden, SR3 2PD
2 - 4pm	Business & Innovation Centre, SR5 2TA	2 - 4pm	Houghton Welfare Hall, DH4 5AF
6 - 8pm	Claxton Community Centre, NE38 8BQ	6 - 8pm	San Street Youth & Community Centre, SR1 1HG
Friday 11 August 2017		Wednesday 20 September 2017	
10 - 12pm	Hetton Centre, DH5 9NE	10 - 12pm	Fulwell Methodist Church, SR6 8LN
2 - 4pm	Barnwell Academy, DH4 7RT	2 - 4pm	Business & Innovation Centre, SR5 2TA
Monday 14 August 2017		6 - 8pm	Springwell Village Hall, NE9 7RP
10 - 12pm	Holy Trinity Church, NE37 1NR	Thursday 21 September 2017	
2 - 4pm	St Chad's Church, SR3 3ND	10 - 12pm	Philadelphia Cricket Club, DH4 4JE
6 - 8pm	Houghton Welfare Hall, DH4 5AF	2 - 4pm	Ryhope Community Centre, SR2 8RX
Tuesday 15 August 2017		6 - 8pm	Washington Methodist Centre, NE37 2GD
10 - 12pm	Railco Carter Sports Centre, SR2 8PD	Friday 22 September 2017	
2 - 4pm	Sunderland City Council Customer Service Centre, SR1 1RE	10 - 12pm	Hetton Centre, DH5 9NE
6 - 8pm	Washington Leisure Centre, NE38 7SS	2 - 4pm	David Lloyd Sunderland, SR3 3XN
Wednesday 16 August 2017		6 - 8pm	Lambton Street Youth Centre, SR4 6XA
6 - 8pm	Dorford Park Community Centre, SR3 2ND		

All supporting documentation will be available to view online at www.sunderland.gov.uk/evidence. Reference copies are also available in council libraries at Houghton, Washington Town Centre and City Library @ Museum & Winter Gardens (subject to opening hours) and in the Civic Centre.

The quickest and easiest way for you to respond is online at <http://sunderland-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal>. You will need to register to comment. If you have already registered during a previous consultation simply enter your username and password.

If you prefer, you can download the comments form from our website www.sunderland.gov.uk/CSDP, pick up a copy from our libraries or from a drop in event and send it to us.

Please email completed comment forms to: Planningpolicy@sunderland.gov.uk or post to: Strategic Plans, Civic Centre, Burdon Road, Sunderland, SR2 7DN.

After this consultation, the council will take into consideration all views and any additional evidence before consulting on the next version of the Plan.

If you have any queries regarding the consultation, or any other aspect of the Sunderland Local Plan, please do not hesitate to contact us on the contact details listed above.

Yours faithfully

Iain Fairlamb
Head of Planning and Regeneration

APPENDIX 2: Draft SSGA Supplementary Planning Document Scoping Report – Consultees List

E-mail Contacts

Name	Surname	Organisation
Richard	Percy	Abbott Associates
Kelly	Brooks	Accent Foundation
Kevin	Waters	Adlington
Alan	Patchett	Age UK Sunderland
Geoff	Storey	Aggregate Industries UK Ltd
		Amec Foster Wheeler
Maria	Vipond	Anchor Trust
Christopher	Whitmore	Andrew Martin Associates
Mark	Hudson	Asda
Lynn	Scott	Asda
Ashley	Godfrey	Ashley Godfrey Associates
Brian	Jackson	B Supplied Ltd
Richard	Marsden	BDN Ltd
Richard	Marsden	BDN Ltd
Tracey	Brown	BME Womens Group
Katie	Bourne	BNP Paribas Real Estate
Alex	Willis	BNP Real Estate UK
	Griffin	Bournmoor Parish Council
Michael	Hodges	British Aggregates Association
Dave	Calvert	BT (Broadband)
Alban	Cassidy	CA Planning
Chris	Irwin	Camerons Ltd
Lindsey	Hegarty	Carillion Education
Graham	Singleton	CEMEX UK Marine Limited
Mark	Kelly	CEMEX UK Operations Limited
Jeff	Boyd	Cheviot Housing
Brian	Jackson	City Centre Traders Ass
Angela	Mills	City Equals
Carol	Harrier	City Hospitals
Kathy	Bland	City Of Sunderland College
Nigel	Harrett	City Of Sunderland College
Neal	Henley	Civil Aviation Authority
		Civil Aviation Authority
		Coal Authority
Tracy	Collins	Coalfield Forum
Wendy	Socket	Colliers CRE
Pat	Burn	Community Association Federation

John A	Sample	Consultus Building Consultants Ltd
		Cornerstone Telecommunications Infrastructure Limited (CTIL)
Gillan	Gibson	CPRE Durham
		CPRE North East
Richard	Swann	Cundall
Katherine	Brooker	Cushman And Wakefield
Bryan	Attewell	Cycling Touring Club
David	Nelson	Darlington Borough Council
Jill	Davis	Davis Planning Partnership
Eamon	Mythen	DCLG
Phil	Marsh	Dene Consulting Ltd
Mark	Duggleby	Department For Transport
		DPDS
Rachel	Ford	DPP
Katherine	Brooker	DTZ
Claire	Davies	DTZ
Andy	Leas	Durham Biodiversity Partnership
Paul	Anderson	Durham Bird Club
		Durham County Council
Jason	McKewon	Durham County Council
Jim	Cokill	Durham Wildlife Trust
John	Pilgrim	Education Funding Agency
Alex	Jackman	EE
Atul	Roy	EE
		EE
Steven	Longstaff	ELG Planning
		England & Lyle Ltd For Northumbrian Water Limited
Ian	Lyle	England And Lyle
J	Hall	Entec
		Environment Agency
Steve	Staines	FFT Planning
		Four Housing Group/Three Rivers Housing Association
Lynda	Peacock	Framptons
Louisa	Cusdin	Frank Haslam Milan
Sara	Holmes	G L Hearn
Mark	Oliver	Gateshead Council
Anneliese	Hutchinson	Hall Construction Services Limited
David	Anderson	Hanson UK
Tom	Brown	Hardings Solicitors
	Jobs	Hartlepool Borough Council
Matthew	Clifford	Headlight

		Highways England
		Historic England
Ian	Parkin	HJ Banks And Co Ltd
Fiona	Brettwood	HLP Design
William	Leong	Housing 21
Suzanne	Crispin	Husband And Brown Limited
Michal	Chantkowski	International Community Organisation Of Sunderland
John	Shephard	J & J Design
Rebecca	Dawson	Jacksons Solicitors
Richard	Adams	Jones Day
Matthew	Wyatt	JWPC Limited
Keith	Reed	Keith Reed Consultancy
Claire	Norris	Lambert Smith Hampton
Helen	Ryde	Land Of The Three Rivers Local Nature Partnership
Chris	Irwin	LCS Limited
Luke	Plimmer	Martineau
Stephen	Surphlis	Mcaleer And Rushe
Charlton	Gibben	Middlesbrough Borough Council
Nick	Horsley	Mineral Products Association
D	Mckinnon	Modis
L	Armstrong	Murton Parish Council
Damien	Holdstock	National Grid c/o Entec UK Ltd.
Damien	Holdstock	National Grid Transco (British Gas)
Tim	Harrison	National Grid/Capita
Natasha	Rowland	National Trust
		Natural England
Jill	Stephenson	Network Rail
Andy	Bellwood	Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd
Margaret	Lake	Network Rail Town Planning
		Network Rail Town Planning
Pat	Ritchie	Newcastle City Council
		Newcastle City Council
Graeme/Pippa	Mason/Nelso	Newcastle International Airport
Gordon	Harrison	Nexus
Christine	Briggs	NHS South Tyneside Clinical Commissioning Group
Keith	Loraine	Nomad E5 Housing Association Limited
Claire	Jobling	North East Ambulance Service
Peter	Stoddart	North East Ambulance Service
Kevin	Tipple	North East AWP
Frances	Wilkinson	North East AWP
Rachel	Anderson	North East Chamber Of Commerce
Jules	Brown	North Of England Civic Trust

Perry	Vincent	North Of England Refugee Service
Ray	Gibson	North Star Housing Group
Laura	Hewitt	North Tyneside Borough Council
Patrick	Melia	North Tyneside Council
		North Tyneside Council
Jackie	Palmer	North Tyneside Council - Development Directorate
Micah	Boutwood	Northern Gas Networks Ltd.
Alison	Johnson	Northern Powergrid
		Northern Powergrid
Jo-Anne	Garrick	Northumberland County Council
Karen	Ledger	Northumberland County Council
Steven	Mason	Northumberland County Council
		Northumberland County Council
Clive	Coyne	Northumberland National Park Authority
Allan	Brown	Northumbria Police
Ian	King	Northumbria Police
Fiona	Snowball	Northumbria Police
Brian	Stobbs	Northumbria Police
		Northumbria Police HQ
Eamon	Hansberry	O2 And Vodafone (CTIL)
		Office Of Rail Regulation
Martin	Rankin	Open Reach
		Open Reach New Sites
		Open Reach
Doreen	Buckingham	Pallion Action Group
Matthew	Spawton	Partner Construction
R	Smith	Peacock And Smith
Peter	Cranshaw	Peter Cranshaw And Co
Charlotte	Boyes	Planning Potential
Oliver	Mitchell	Planware Ltd
		Planware
Rod	Hepplewhite	Prism Planning
Robin	Wood	R And K Wood Planning LLP
	Rapleys LLP	Rapleys LLP
Rebecca	Wren	Redcar And Cleveland Borough Council
Jonathan	Friend	Riley Consulting
Jean	Hart	Riverside And Wearmouth Housing Association
Michael	Middlemiss	Riverside And Wearmouth Housing Association
Craig	Taylor	Robertson Partnership Homes England
Jonathan	Weastell	Robertson Simpson Ltd
Jonathan	Walton	RPS
Martin	Kerby	RSPB Northern England Office

Christina	Taylor	RSPB Northern England Office
Gary	Hutchinson	SAFC
Garry	Rowley	Samaritans
Emma	Hulley	Sanderson Wetherall
		Seaham Town Council
Pamela	Tate	SHAPS
		Siemens Plc
Barry	Garside	South Hetton Parish Council
L A	Etherington	South Hylton Community Association
John	Anglin	South Tyneside Council
Rachel	Cooper	South Tyneside Council
Audrey	Huntley	South Tyneside Council
Alan	Kerr	South Tyneside Council
Geraldine	Kilgour	South Tyneside Council
Iain	Malcolm	South Tyneside Council
Clare	Rawcliffe	South Tyneside Council
Alan	Smith	South Tyneside Council
Martin	Swales	South Tyneside Council
Ruth	McKeown	South Tyneside Primary Care Trust
Caron	Walker	South Tyneside Primary Care Trust
Andrea	King	South Tyneside Spatial Planning
Liz	Reid	Springwell Village Residents Association
David	Tolhurst	St Matthew's Church
Steven	Prosser	St Modwen
Alastair	Skelton	Steven Abbott Associates
Bryanni	Cartledge	Steven Abbott Associates LLP
Laura	Ross	Stewart Ross Associates
Jane	Palmer	Stockton On Tees Borough Council
Mark	Brooker	Storeys:SSP
Richard	Newsome	Story Homes
Abu	Shama	Sunderland Bangladeshi Community Centre
Dean	Huggins	Sunderland BME Network
Val	Armstrong	Sunderland Carers Centre
Sue	Callaghan	Sunderland Carers Centre
Jill	Fletcher	Sunderland City Council
Stephen	Foster	Sunderland City Council
Gillian	Gibson	Sunderland City Council
Syed	Hussain	Sunderland City Council
John	Kelly	Sunderland City Council
Doris	MacKnight	Sunderland City Council
Barbara	McClennan	Sunderland City Council
Henry	Trueman	Sunderland City Council
Peter	Walker	Sunderland City Council

Paul	Watson	Sunderland City Council
Andrea	Watts	Sunderland City Council
Denny	Wilson	Sunderland City Council
David	Howells	Sunderland College
Gill	McDonough	Sunderland Council For Voluntary Service
Richard	Ord	Sunderland Echo
John	Lowther	Sunderland Green Party
Chris	Alexander	Sunderland Live
Nikki	Vokes	Sunderland North Community Business Centre
Jessica	May	Sunderland Partnership
Tom	Parkin	Sunderland Seafront Traders Association
David	Curtis	Sunderland Volunteer Bureau
Matthew	Pixton	Tarmac
Trish	Kelly	Tees Valley Unlimited
John	Lowther	Tees Valley Unlimited
		Tetlow King Planning
Katherine	Bone	The Bridge Project
		The Forestry Authority (Northumberland And Durham)
Richard	Pow	The Forestry Commission
Keith	Lightley	The Salvation Army
Rose	Freeman	The Theatres Trust
Richard	O'Callaghan	The Woodland Trust
Jane	Evans	Three
Jane	Evans	Three
Helen	Ryde	Three Rivers Local Nature Partnership
Claire	Thompson	Three Rivers Local Nature Partnership
David	Armstrong	Two Castles Housing
John	Allison	Tyne And Wear Fire And Rescue Service
Ian	Cuskin	Tyne And Wear Fire And Rescue Service
John	Hall	Tyne And Wear Fire And Rescue Service
Nigel	Harrison	Tyne And Wear Joint Local Access Forum
Martyn	Boak	U Student Group Ltd
Christopher	Whitfield	UK Land Estates
Trevor	Sirrell	United Utilities
Paul	Andrew	University Of Sunderland
Shirley	Atkinson	University Of Sunderland
Sue	Brady	University Of Sunderland
David	Donkin	University Of Sunderland
Suzanne	Todd	University Of Sunderland
Victor	Thompson	Village Lane Garage
Brian	Watson	Vinvolved
		Virgin Media

		Vodafone And O2
Vicki	Richardson	Walton And Co
Andrew	Moss	Ward Hadaway
		Ward Hadaway
Lucy	Mo	Wear Catchment Partnerships
Clare	Phillipson	Wearside Women In Need
Susie	Clark	We're Talking Homes (North East)
Lauren	Knox	White Green Young Planning
Chris	Creighton	Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc
Nick	Sandford	Woodland Trust
Nick	Sandford	Woodland Trust
		WYG Group
Robert	Murphy	WYG Planning
Philippa	Abbott	
Julie	Adamson	
J K	Allison	
David	Anderson	
Michael	Barrass	
Linda	Barron	
Peter	Beal	
John	Bell	
Sheila	Bell	
Eric	Blakie	
Julie	Bland	
Kevin	Bond	
Steve	Breeds	
Kayleigh	Brown	
Tracey	Brown	
Denis	Bulman	
Gary	Bunt	
Simon	Burdus	
Graham	Burt	
John	Carruth	
Chris	Checkley	
John	Cooper	
Pauline	Cooper	
Brian	Cree	
Clair	De Fries	
Alexandra	Diamond	
	Dorner	
David	Downey	
Dawn	Draper	
Adam	Eden	

Janine	Edworthy	
Julie	Elliott	
Lesley	Etherington	
Edward	Failes	
Michael	Fearn	
Edward	Flood	
Mike	Foster	
John	Fraser	
Jo-Anne	Garrick	
Ashley	Godfrey	
Matthew	Good	
Angela	Graham	
Malcolm	Graham	
Michael	Gray	
Stephanie	Gray	
A	Greenwood	
David	Gustard	
Lee	Hall	
Michael	Harding	
Alan	Hardwick	
Emma	Hardy	
Meriel	Hardy	
Claire	Harrison-Coe	
Stephen	Hepburn	
Larry	Hetherington	
Ashley	Hicks	
Sharon	Hodgson	
Susan	Hodgson	
Steve	Hopkirk	
Susan	Houghton	
Rebecca	Housam	
Julie	Howell	
R	Hughes	
Matthew	Hunt	
	Jobes	
Gavin	Johnson	
Michele	Johnson	
Kevan	Jones	
Barbara	King	
Angela	Lambton	
Chris	Lambton	
David	Lambton	
Eve	Lambton	

Maureen	Lambton	
Annabel	Lawson	
Emma	Lewell-Buck	
Michael	Lowthian	
Peter	Lynn	
George	Martin	
Jacqueline	McDonald	
E	McEvoy	
Mark	McGovern	
Nick	McLellan	
Ian	Mearns	
Simon	Mearns	
	Miles	
Susann	Miller	
Susanne	Miller	
John	Mills	
Sheila	Moffatt	
Tyler	Moore	
Jennifer	Morrison	
Hannah	Munro	
Charlotte	Nelson	
Jackie	Nicholson	
	Nornington	
Brian	O'Doherty	
Jacky	Owen	
Greg	Pearce	
Mary	Peel	
Jane	Peverley	
Bridget	Phillipson	
Lesley	Pickup	
Bob	Price	
Helen	Proud	
Jon	Quine	
Sophie	Reay	
Elizabeth	Reid	
Colin	Riley	
Bill	Robinson	
Caroline	Robinson	
	Rutherford	
Andrea	Scollen	
Hugh	Shepherd	
Claire	Simmons	
Greg	Skeoch	

Laura	Skitt	
Ken	Smithson	
Steve	Snowball	
Lizzie	Spencer	
Jayne	Stearson	
Lewis	Stokes	
Jo	Storie	
Richard	Swann	
Stephen	Taylor	
Angela	Templeman	
Martin	Terry	
Kathryn	Tew	
Brian	Thompson	
Helen	Thompson	
Peter	Thompson	
Chris	Thorp	
Martin	Tibbo	
Stuart	Timmiss	
E	Tinker	
Bernadette	Topham	
Nichola	Traverse-Healey	
Kevin	Ullah	
Geoffrey	Walker	
Joanne	Walker	
Julie	Watson	
James	Wharton	
Lisa	Wild	
Martin	Wilkes	
Linda Mary	Wood	
Helen		

Postal Contacts

Name	Surname	Organisation
		3 Network
		Action For Children
John	Murray	Aged Merchant Seamans Homes
Ernie	Thompson	Alzheimers Society
Lita	Bacon	Ashbrooke Residents Association (Treasurer)
David	Auld	Auld Brothers
		BAE Systems
Marion	McGuinness	Banardos

Michael	Jenkins	Bank Top Residents Association
		Barclays Bank
G	Kellett	Boundary CA
		British Airport Association Property
		British Gas
R	O'Neil	British Gas Trans Co
C	Herbert	British Geological Survey
		British Telecom
		British Telecommunications Group Plc
		Cable & Wireless
Michelle	Quinn	Castletown Community Association
		Centric Telecom
Rita	Nelson	Chief Officer Relate North East
		Citizens Advice Bureau
J	Nichols	Columbia Community Association
Anee	Ramshaw	Community Access Point
		Co-Operative Group
		Council For Voluntary Service- Sunderland
		DEFRA
N	Dorward	Deptford And Millfield CA
Jillian	Pate	Dickinson Dees
Matthew	Hard	DLP Consultants
		Doxford Park Community Association
Pauline	Yorke	Durham Aged Mineworkers Homes Association
		Durham Constabulary
S	Brown	Easington Lane Access Point
		East End Community Association
Ben	Thurgood	Energis Communications Ltd.
K	Lorraine	Enterprise 5
Allen	Creedy	Ethical Partnership
		Everything Everywhere Limited
Brenda	Browell	Farringdon Residents Association
		Faultbasic Ltd.
Brian	Stobbs	Force Architectural And Planning Liaison Officer
		Fujitsu Service
J	Martin	Gilley Law/Lakeside CA
		Gladman Developments
		God TV
		Grangetown Community Association
Roy	Chamberlain	Haig Homes
P	Kendall	Harraton Community Association
		Help The Aged
Syed Musaddique	Ahmed	Hendon Islamic Society

Linda	Brewis	Hendon Young Peoples Project
		Hercules Unit Trust
		Hetton Town Council
Anne	Ramshaw	Houghton Racecourse Community Access Point
A	Birkbeck	Houghton Racecourse Community Association
		Hutchinson 3G UK Limited
Norah	Brown	Hylton Castle Residents Association
Gillian	Walker	Jane Gibson Almshouses
Michael	Armstrong	Job Centre Plus
		John Martin Associates
		Jomast Developments
P	Razaq	Kans And Kandy
Allen	Close	Kepier Almshouses
		Lambton Community Association
K	Mayman	Little Lumley Parish Council
		Lord Durham Estates
		Lord Lambton's VS
		M&G Real Estate
v		M Nicol & Company
		Mill Telecom Ltd.
Eddie	Arnold	Millfield CORPS Salvation Army
		Mobile Operators Association
		Mono Consultants Ltd
		N Power
		N Power Renewables
		National Farmers' Union
		NEDL
		Network Rail
		New Herrington WMC And Institute
		New Herrington Working Men's Club
		NHS Commissioning Board
		NHS South Tyneside CCG
Kevin	Fitzpatrick	Nissan Motor Manufacturing (UK)
		North East Ambulance Service
		North East Building And Development Ltd.
		North East Electric Traction Trust
vJohn	Barnham	North Regional Association For Sensory Support
Anne	Ambrose	North Welfare Rights Service
		Northern Electric Distribution Ltd.
		Northern Gas Networks Ltd.
		Northumbria Police HQ
		Northumbria Water Ltd.
		Npower

Andy	Bower	Npower Renewables
		O H Properties
Pippa	Cheetham	O&H Properties
		O&H Properties Ltd
		O2
		O2 (UK) Ltd.
		Oakapple Group Ltd
Wood	Frampton	Orange Communications
M	Maddocks	Ouston Parish Council
		Pele Housing Association
Edna	Rochester	Pennywell Community Association
	Shale	Penshaw Community Association
		Pittington Parish Council
		Powergen Retail Ltd.
		Public Health England
Marion	Gibb	Redhouse And District Community Association
		Rickleton Community Association
Donald	Cholston	Rotary Club Of Bishopwearmouth
P	Hadley	Ryhope Community Association
		Save The Trident Group
		Scope London Offices
		SHAW Support Services
Angela	Doige	Shiney Advice And Resource Project
J	Mawston	Shiney Row Community Association
P	Burn	Silksworth Community Association
Linda	Parker	Social Enterprise Sunderland
Mike	Brunning	Sound Waves
Martin	Swales	South Tyneside Council
		South Tyneside Primary Care Trust
I	Maw	Southwick Youth And Community Association
Denise	Wilson	Springboard Sunderland Trust
Suzanne	Shaftoe	Springwell Community Association
Timothy F	Evershed	Springwell Gospel Hall Trust
A	Templeman	Springwell Village Residents Association
M	Lydiatt	St Matthews (Newbottle)
		Stirling Investment Properties
Gina	Smith	Sunderland Carers Centre
David	Bridge	Sunderland Civic Society
		Sunderland Clinical Commissioning Group
Tony	Compton	Sunderland Deaf Society Limited
		Sunderland Federation Of Community Associations
Pat	Burn	
		Sunderland Maritime Heritage

		Sunderland Mosque
		Sungate
Stewart	Tag	Tees Valley Trust Limited
		The Bridges
		The Crown Estate
	Bulmer	The Fulwell Society
Steve	Carnaby	The Planning Inspectorate
		The Trustees Of Lord Durham's 1989
		Thompson Park Community Association
Ryan	Molloy	Thompsons Of Prudhoe
		Thorney Grove Ltd
Peter	Ottowell	Three Rivers Housing Group
		T-Mobile Customer Services
		Trilogy Developments
		TWRI
		Tyne And Wear Passenger Transport Authority
Ian	Ayris	Tyne And Wear Specialist Conservation Team
Philip	Marsh	University Of Sunderland
Annette	Guy	Village Community Association
		Vodafone
		Vodafone Ltd.
Simon	Williamson	Washington Millennium Centre
A	Godfrey	Wearside Gateway
Anita	Lord	Wearside Women In Need
J	Hicks	West Community Association
Chris	Francis	Wildfowl And Wetlands Trust
		Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc
John	Turnbull	Youngs RPS
Richard & Janette	Abdu	
John	Adamson	
V	Adgar	
A & M	Ainslie	
P & K	Aitken	
Balal	Ali	
Paul	Alison	
A M	Amour	
Beverley Anne	Andersen	
Ava	Anderson	
George & Caroline	Anderson	
R	Anderson	
S	Anderson	
Rachel	Andrews	
P H	Anthony	

Constance	Applegarth	
P & K H	Appleton	
Carol	Armstrong	
J M	Armstrong	
M	Arnott	
S	Ashford	
Joan	Ashman	
A	Askew	
Ian Marley	Baltal	
Dan & Matt	Banning	
Cally, Gwen & Jodie	Bannister	
Lawrence	Barnaby	
John & Margaret	Barnes	
Peter Michael	Barras	
Mark	Barton	
M	Bates	
J K	Baxter	
Christopher	Bell	
I T	Bell	
J	Bell	
J & F M R	Bell	
Paul	Bell	
A	Beresford	
J	Bewick	
Donna & Christopher	Bishop	
H J	Bishop	
W	Black	
N	Blackburn	
Katelynn	Bland	
I C & F P	Blue	
Susie	Blyth	
Joe	Bonalie	
Adrian	Bonner	
Susan	Booker	
S	Boyd	
A M & T E	Bradford	
Lynn	Bridnall	
C	Brown	
Geoffrey Raymond	Brown	
Joseph	Brown	
K	Brunger	
C	Buddle	
Gracie	Burn	

Kathleen	Burns	
Samantha, Max & Eve	Burns	
M	Burrows	
Fred	Burton	
J U & Maureen	Byron	
A	Cairns	
Alison	Campbell	
Mrs T	Campbell	
Ada, John, Jacob & Carolyn & James	Carr	
David	Carr	
R	Carr	
W	Carrick	
John	Carruth	
Mary	Cartwright	
Morgan, Jennifer & Graham	Chantler	
Jason & Dawn	Charlton	
Nicholas	Charlton	
George	Chicken	
Ingrid	Chidgey	
R W & J	Chilton	
Charlie	Clapp	
Allison, Joseph & John	Clarke	
John & Alwynne	Clarke	
Edward James	Cleary	
Tom	Cleary	
Barry Howard & Marian Ann	Clegg	
Paula Jayne	Clegram-Brown	
A & N D	Clements	
John	Colclough	
A & D M	Coleclough	
David	Colley	
J	Common	
Sean Joseph	Conlan	
Lisa	Conlon	
Rachel	Cooper	
A	Cope	
Margaret	Copeland	
M	Corrigan	
D, P & B	Coulson	
Frances	Cowie	
	Coyle	

Paul & Debbie	Craig	
Linda	Cryan	
J D, P W & P J	Cullen	
J	Cullinson	
K J	Curran	
Alice	Curtis	
Joan	Cuthbertson	
S	Cuthbertson	
I & T	Dalby	
	Darwin	
Alan C	Davidson	
Elaine	Davidson	
Gavin	Davis	
John George, Linda, Donald & Angela	Davis	
Mark	Davis	
George & Kathleen	Davison	
Irene Elizabeth & Nicholas John	Davison	
M	Dawson	
C	De Frie	
A	Deary	
K	Deary	
Sharon	Deehan	
R	Delaney	
A	Dinning	
Kevin	Dobson	
G	Dodsworth	
E	Dorans	
Hugo Denis & Deborah Elaine	Dowd	
John	Dowson	
Paul, Natalie & Sharnie	Drew	
Simon Anthony George	Driver	
M	Duke	
Stephanie	Dunn	
Kay	Elder	
T	Elliott	
	Ellis	
Carol Anne	Elmy	
Kate Jane	Elmy-Tolic	
C & Y	Embleton	
C	Etheridge	
William	Evans	

Sean Patrick	Evennett	
James	Ewing	
Maureen	Failes	
Craig	Falcus	
Laurence	Fanin	
K	Farrah	
K, J, E, K & N	Faulkner	
Amy, Grahame & Helen	Fife	
E	Fife	
Terry	Firman	
James Donnison, D & O	Fletcher	
D & C A	Flinn	
R & H	Florance	
D	Flynn	
N I	Foggin	
Alan	Foley	
Brenda & F D	Footie	
Colin	Ford	
Colin	Ford	
Michael Ronald	Ford	
J	Forster	
G D	Foster	
A	Franklin	
R C	Fraser	
M	Freeman	
S	Gair	
P	Gale	
Alan & Kathleen	Galsworthy	
Alan Anthony	Galsworthy	
Sharon Louise	Galsworthy	
Gordon	Gardner	
A	George	
Stuart & Paula	Gibbons	
D	Gilhespy	
Z	Gillbanks	
G	Gilligan	
Denise	Gillott	
M E & J	Glaister	
Donald	Glynn	
Wayne & Deborah	Godfrey	
S	Goodrick	
Sarah	Gordon	
E, D & J	Graham	

Beverley Anne	Gray	
S	Gray	
Peter & Sandra	Greig	
Watson	H	
Alan & Bridget	Hall	
Alison Ann	Hall	
Anthony & Elizabeth	Hall	
N	Hall	
Peter	Hall	
Stephen	Hall	
W & A	Hall	
Sam	Hamed	
Frank, Denise & Mark	Hannan	
Keith & Angela	Hardy	
Lisa & Ian	Harris	
Michael	Hartnack	
Lynn	Hartridge	
Amanda & Jordan	Hauxwell	
Deborah Lynn	Haynes	
George	Haynes	
Kathleen	Haynes	
Margaret	Haywood	
E	Henderson	
John	Henderson	
John William & Elaine	Henderson	
R J	Hephurn	
A G	Heslop	
R	Hewitt	
P J	Hibbery	
R	Hillier	
Mark	Holland	
Gavin I	Holmes	
S M	Holt	
Barbara	Hope	
E & W	Hopkirk	
S	Hopkirk	
Stephen	Hopkirk	
David, Sarah, Jane & Keith	Horrigan	
Daniel	Horvath	
Stefan	Horvath	
B	Houghton	
Norma	Houghton	

Margaret	Hovarth	
K	Hughes	
Richard & Sandra Maria	Humphrey	
Ann	Huntley	
Bert	Huntley	
Nicola	Hurst	
Jawid	Iqbal	
E	Irwin	
J B	Irwin	
R	Jackson	
Brett	Jacobson	
Marilyn Margaret	Jacobson	
Wesley Terence	Jacobson	
S	Jacques	
C	Jamasa	
Raymond	Jary	
Marie	Jasper	
Paul	Jefferson	
Terry & M A	Jennings	
Gary & Susan	Johnson	
Jennifer	Johnson	
Lyndsey	Johnson	
M	Johnson	
Robert	Johnson	
Mark	Jones	
Christian	Kerr	
K	King	
A	Kirton	
C	Knight	
Sam	Lake	
Dennis	Lambton	
M	Lambton	
Ellie	Land	
Neil	Latkin	
Jan	Lawson	
Patricia	Lawson	
John	Lee	
R A	Lee	
Z	Lend	
A & J	Leng	
G	Lennox	
Anthony	Leonard	

M	Lewins	
Joanne	Lisgo	
Mary	Lisle	
M	Livingstone	
Alexander	Logan	
Alison Jane	Logan	
Annabel	Logan	
Marcus	Logan	
Stuart	Logan	
P & H	Lowery	
John Austen	Lowrie	
Richard & Gemma	Lumsdon	
Carol	Lynn	
James	Magree	
Gillian Alfreda	Main	
Jeffrey Alexander	Main	
Joyce	Mallon	
Fiona	Marran	
Scott	Marshall	
E & W	Martin	
Mavis	Martin	
L	McAllister	
Malcolm & Margaret	McArthur	
T & D	McCartney	
	McConnell	
S	McDougall	
Steven, Karen, Lee & Craig	McGill	
K	McGlen	
Joyce	McInnes	
G	McIntyre	
N	McIver	
A E	McKeon	
J	McKeon	
W	McKeon	
Lynne	McKevitt	
Jill	McKnight	
Angela	McLeish	
Patrick	McLoughlin	
C	Meek	
D	Meek	
Rebecca	Mello	
Diane	Merchant Brown	

Joe	Merrigan	
I	Metcalf	
Robin	Midson	
James	Midwood	
L	Midwood	
Donald / Linda	Miles	
Audrey	Miller	
R & F	Miller	
S & K	Miller	
Clive	Milner	
John Stuart	Moor	
John D	Moore	
Marilyn	Moore	
L	Morgan	
Marian	Morgan	
E E	Morris	
K	Morris	
Maureen	Morrow	
D	Mulholland	
Jean & James	Mulholland	
L	Mulholland	
Peter	Mullen	
	MURLEY	
M	Murphy	
Raymond	Murphy	
Mr & Mrs D	Murray	
C	Nelson	
Catherine	Nelson	
Diane	Nelson	
I	Nelson	
J	Nelson	
M P	Nelson	
P	Nelson	
D	Nesbitt	
H	Nesbitt	
J	Nesbitt	
J	Nesbitt	
M	Nesbitt	
Susan	Nesbitt	
V	Nesbitt	
Richard	Nichol	
George	Nicholson	
Gladys	Nicholson	

J	Nicholson	
Patrick	O'Hare	
Elizabeth	Oliver	
Eric	Oliver	
Gwenyth	Oliver	
S	Oliver MRICS	
S W	O'Neill	
Elizabeth	O'Sullivan	
Kevin	O'Sullivan	
E & W	Oxley	
Lily	Oxley	
Catherine	Parker	
Grahame	Parker	
Keith	Parker	
Kevin Gerard	Parker	
D	Parkin	
M	Parkin	
E & W	Parkinson	
M	Parkinson	
M	Paterson	
Alan	Patrick	
R	Patterson	
A	Pattison	
W A	Pattison	
J P	Pearson	
Jennifer	Pearson	
Joan	Pearson	
M E	Peel	
P	Peele	
D	Percival	
M	Perriam	
Bruce	Perrie	
Mavis	Perrie	
R	Phillips	
S	Phillips	
A	Pickering	
A	Pickering	
J	Pickering	
K	Pickup	
T	Pickup	
S	Pinder	
E	Pleasants	
K	Pleasants	

M	Pleasants	
S	Pleasants	
V A	Pleasants	
Muriel	Plemper	
Audrey	Polkinghorn	
R	Polkinghorn	
W	Portsmouth	
Evelyn	Postlethwaite	
L	Potter	
N	Potter	
N	Potter	
S	Potter	
Eileen	Potts	
R	Prest	
Hazel	Pringle	
L	Purvis	
Shirelle	Quinn	
Tony	Quinn	
D	Rae	
L	Rae	
L	Rafferty	
L	Rafferty	
Wendy	Ramsey	
Anne	Rathbone-Wells	
Luke	Raymond	
Mohammed	Razaq	
A	Rennie	
M B	Rennie	
Alex	Reynolds	
Margaret	Richards	
Robert	Richards	
Lisa	Riley	
S	Riley	
Felicity	Ripley	
Philip	Ritzema	
R	Ritzema	
Katie	Roberts	
A	Robertson	
Gillian	Robertson	
K	Robinson	
M	Robinson	
Ruth	Robinson	
Leslie	Robson	

Pat	Robson	
R J	Robson	
Sandra Jacqueline	Robson	
Thomas William	Robson	
Lucy	Rouse	
D	Routledge	
Robert Henderson	Ryan	
Claire	Scott	
Conner	Scott	
Kevin	Scott	
L	Scott	
M	Scott	
Samantha	Scott	
Shay	Scott	
T	Scott	
M A	Scott-Gray	
Betty	Senior	
Ronnie	Senior	
T D	Seymour	
Lee	Sharpe	
Lesley	Sharpe	
Kevin	Sheppard	
Robert William	Shield	
Christine Eileen	Shovlin	
Janice	Simm	
David	Simpson	
M	Simpson	
Stephanie Pamela	Simpson	
Ronnie	Singh	
Doreen	Smith	
Judith Mary	Smith	
M	Smith	
Ray	Smith	
Lucy	Snowden	
Beatrice	Snowdon	
D	Southern	
C	Spence	
Albert	Spencer	
William	Spencer	
Anna	Steanson	
Mark	Steanson	
Olivia	Steanson	
Penelopy	Steanson	

D	Steel	
Carole	Stephenson	
Foster	Stephenson	
G	Stephenson	
M	Stephenson	
A	Stevens	
D	Stoker	
V	Stothard	
J	Strong	
Pauline	Stubbings	
A	Swan	
D	Swan	
Michelle	Sweeney	
Stephen	Swinburn	
Dianne	Talbot	
B	Tate	
J	Tate	
Linzi	Tate	
David	Tatters	
Audrey	Taylor	
B	Taylor	
Barry	Taylor	
Ben	Taylor	
Christine	Taylor	
G	Taylor	
Gordon	Taylor	
Graham	Taylor	
Jean	Taylor	
P & H	Taylor	
Brian	Teggert	
Mitchell	Templeman	
S C	Templeman	
John	Thew	
F J	Thirlaway	
I	Thirlaway	
A & E	Thompson	
C	Thompson	
Delice V	Thompson	
G J	Thompson	
J	Thompson	
J	Thompson	
Malcolm	Thurgood	
Rosina	Thurgood	

Carol Ann	Tierney	
Michael	Tierney	
A	Tiffen	
Terry	Tiffen	
Wilfred	Tindale	
A	Todnor	
M	Trewhitt	
S	Trewhitt	
L	Tuff	
D	Tunstall	
Clare	Turnbull	
J H	Turnbull	
John	Turnbull	
M	Turnbull	
E	Tweedy	
Beverley Anne	Tyson	
John George	Tyson	
Amy	Tyzack	
John Anthony	Valente	
Carole	Vorley	
Edith	Waites	
Lynn	Wales	
Michael	Wales	
C J	Walker	
M	Walker	
Christina	Ward	
Matilda Natalie	Ward	
William James	Ward	
Maxine	Warrener	
J	Watson	
Maureen	Watson	
P	Weatherburn	
L & S	Webb	
Michael	Webb	
Xenia	Webster	
David	Weir	

Helen	Weir	
Ann	White	
R A	White	
W	White	
D	Whitfield	
F	Whitfield	
John Denis	Whittaker	
Jeremy	Wicking	
Brian	Wilkinson	
D	Wilkinson	
S	Wilkinson	
C	Williams	
Caitlyn	Williams	
Glynis	Williams	
L	Williams	
Lee	Williams	
Lesley	Williams	
William	Williams	
David	Wilson	
J	Wilson	
George	Wind	
Janet	Wind	
Anthony Charles	Winstanley	
Carole	Winstanley	
Mark	Wiper	
J	Wiseman	
A	Wombwell	
Clare	Wood	
Dale Royce	Wood	
J	Wood	
L W	Wood	
M	Wood	
R	Wood	
Mr & Mrs M	Wright	
John	Young	
S	Young	

