

Our Ref	Respondent	Representative	Chapter	Policy	Para/ Criterion	Support /Object	Submitted Comments
ST0115	Nicola Corr		07 Planning for our town centres	R01	7.8	Comment	<p>The Hierarchy of Our Centres (Strategic Policy) 7.8 The Town and District Centre Use Needs Study (2018) states that Jarrow is generally a healthy town centre with a good retail offer, including a number of good quality independents. The offer tends towards the discount sector but this is well suited to its catchment. This sounds as though Jarrow is being written off amongst all of the town centre planning. While I recognise that South Shields is the biggest of the towns in South Tyneside, and offers more in attracting visitors with the coastline, South Tyneside Council are piling a heap of investment into South Shields and very little into the rest of the area. Jarrow and Hebburn are all too regularly the poor relations, despite it also being our Council Tax money you are spending. We have lots of areas of high deprivation in Jarrow and Hebburn and with it, high levels of anti-social behaviour. Why should the children and young people respect their communities when they are so often overlooked for investment from the council? There is nothing for young people to do in Jarrow, not so much as a swimming pool. Yet, despite the already wide array of choices for entertainment in South Shields, more money is being pumped in for further leisure and entertainment there. This really needs to be reviewed. In addition to this, Jarrow has high levels of poverty and yet its only supermarket is one of the most expensive chains!! While I am one of the fortunate ones who drives and owns a car, there are many who do not have that choice and can also not afford taxis from the cheaper supermarkets. The difference in price for a weekly shop at Morrisons and either Aldi/Lidl can be as much as £40! For a family who are struggling to get by, this is a very significant difference. Having only one supermarket in a town centre is putting poorer residents, who would have to pay to travel further, at a big disadvantage and adding to the issues of food poverty in our town. So while this statement claims that “Jarrow is generally a healthy town centre with good retail offer,”, the reality is that it is a town with very little options for discounted food and residents who are paying the price for that. Yet again, while the focus has been on making South Shields some ‘super-town’, it is at the expense of those in the smaller towns.</p>
ST2015	Jane Arthurs		07 Planning for our	R01		Comment	<p>Policy R1 The Hierarchy of our Centres – Support and amend The designation of the Cleadon village and East Boldon Village Local Centres to serve the everyday needs of our local communities must be the focus to retain and support our shops and services.</p>

			town centres				The definition of the centres on Inset Map 18 and 19 should be expanded to include those on the south side of Front Street in Cleadon and those on Langholm Road, Station Road, Front Street and Grange Terrace in East Boldon.
ST2285	Gillan Gibson		07 Planning for our town centres	R01		Support	The hierarchy of our Town centres (Strategic Policy) (Maps) - CPRE supports Policy R1
ST2285	Gillan Gibson		07 Planning for our town centres	R02		Support	Ensuring Vitality and Viability in our Retail Centres (Strategic Policy) - CPRE supports Policy R2
ST2285	Gillan Gibson		07 Planning for our town centres	R03		Support	Mixed Use Opportunities in South Shields Town Centre (Strategic Policy) - CPRE supports Policy R3
ST2285	Gillan Gibson		07 Planning for our town centres	R04		Support	South Shields Market - CPRE supports Policy R4
ST2285	Gillan Gibson		07 Planning for our town centres	R05		Support	Prioritising Centres Sequentially - CPRE supports Policy R5
ST2285	Gillan Gibson		07 Planning for our town centres	R06		Support	Proposals Requiring and Impact Assessment - CPRE supports Policy R6
ST2285	Gillan Gibson		07 Planning for our	R07		Support	Evening and Night-time Economy in South Shields Town Centre - CPRE supports R7

			town centres				
ST2285	Gillan Gibson		07 Planning for our town centres	R08		Support	Hot Food Takeaways (Use Class A5) - CPRE supports Policy R8
ST2285	Gillan Gibson		07 Planning for our town centres	R09		Support	Local Neighbourhood Hubs - CPRE supports Policy R9
ST2301	Geraldine Kilgour	Councillor	07 Planning for our town centres	R01		Object	We have not been recognised in the "Local Centres". We have substantial facilities to meet the needs of our communities, yet they are not and are not specified as such. If they are not to feature here should they not be classed as "Local Neighbourhood Hubs"? This should note Calf Close Lane and Lincoln Way/ Leicester Way.
ST2337	Peter Arthurs	Resident	07 Planning for our town centres	R01		Objection	Policy R1 The Hierarchy of our Centres – Support and amend The designation of the Cleadon village and East Boldon Village Local Centres to serve the everyday needs of our local communities must be the focus to retain and support our shops and services. The definition of the centres on Inset Map 18 and 19 should be expanded to include those on the south side of Front Street in Cleadon and those on Langholm Road, Station Road, Front Street and Grange Terrace in East Boldon.
ST2365	Delia McNally	Resident	07 Planning for our town centres	R01		Support	Policy R1 The Hierarchy of our Centres – Support and amend We support the designation of the Cleadon village and East Boldon Village Local Centres to serve the everyday needs of our local communities and be the focus to retain and support our shops and services. We propose that the definition of the centres on Inset Map 18 and 19 is expanded to include those on the south side of Front Street in Cleadon and those on Langholm Road, Station Road, Front Street and Grange Terrace in East Boldon.
ST2428	Howard Lawrence	Resident	07 Planning for our town centres	R01		Support	Policy R1 I support the designation of East Boldon Village Local Centre. However, this should also include the retail premises located at St Bede's, Front Street and Grange Terrace.

ST2428	Howard Lawrence	Resident	07 Planning for our town centres	R02	c	Comment	<p>Policy R2</p> <p>Reference to Paragraph c) and paragraph 7.16:</p> <p>For many years, the upper stories of many retail premises in King Street, South Shields (and Fowler Street to a limited extent) have been empty, unused or under utilised. The properties, many of which are of heritage value, are continuing to deteriorate and decay. The Local Plan provides an ideal opportunity to bring these upper floors back into use, for residential purposes. The potential target client group could be for younger people (possibly including students) who are not car owners. Such clients and the existing retail and leisure businesses could have a mutually beneficial co-existence.</p> <p>This will not only help to reduce housing demand elsewhere (especially on green belt sites), it would also be of great benefit in revitalising & reinvigorating this very important area, which is increasingly in decline and under-utilised.</p> <p>What is the Council doing to address this problem?</p>
ST2545	Des Dunlop	London & Cambridge Properties Limited (LCP)	07 Planning for our town centres	R01		Comment	<p>Support is given to the identification of South Shields Town Centre as shown on the Inset Map 9. LCP own and manage a number of properties at King Street, South Shields which they believe is suitable for a range of town centre and other uses. Some of these properties have been vacant for a considerable length of time and LCP believe that policies need to be sufficiently flexible to enable these properties to be brought back into beneficial use e.g. 112/114 King Street.</p>
ST2545	Des Dunlop	London & Cambridge Properties Limited (LCP)	07 Planning for our town centres	R02		Objection	<p>Objections are made to the inclusion of the properties that LCP own in King Street, South Shields within the primary shopping area of South Shields Town Centre. The majority of the properties are vacant and LCP have had considerable difficulties despite consistent marketing to attract long term tenants. LCP believe that this part of King Street is not primary in retail terms given its position in the Town Centre and the number of vacant units. Accordingly, the primary shopping area should be amended to omit these properties namely 110-116 and 117- 123 King Street.</p>
ST2545	Des Dunlop	London & Cambridge Properties Limited (LCP)	07 Planning for our town centres	R03		Objection	<p>LCP have no objection in principle to the comprehensive redevelopment of Phase 3 of the South Shields 365 Town Centre Vision. However, their concern relates to the impact on the wider town centre in terms of these long term vacant retail units and their potential to find end users. They consider that there is an oversupply of retail floorspace in South Shields and a diminishing number of retailers. Indeed, it is interesting to note that the Town Centre and District Centre Use Needs Study 2018, found no</p>

							requirement for additional convenience retail floorspace and a small requirement (16sqm net sales area). We would question the requirement for any additional floorspace given the considerable amount of vacant floorspace.
ST2545	Des Dunlop	London & Cambridge Properties Limited (LCP)	07 Planning for our town centres	R05		Objection	LCP fully support this policy which seeks to introduce a sequential assessment with regards more town centre uses which are not in a Town Centre. LCP believe that any applications should provide the necessary evidence that discussions have been held with the owners of properties in town centre to demonstrate that properties are not available. The policy should be amended accordingly.
ST2516	Dave Hutchinson		07 Planning for our town centres	R01		Objection	Support with amendments to Local Centre EBNF supports the designation of East Boldon Village Local Centre. However, this should also include retail premises located at St Bedes, Front Street and Grange Terrace. These are listed in the attached Appendix 1 and shown on the accompanying map. However there is a contradiction between Inset Map 10 and Para 7.10. EBNF considers that units in Langholm Road should be incorporated as stated in Para7.10
ST2516	Dave Hutchinson		07 Planning for our town centres	R02		Support	EBNF would seek to protect our Local Centre to maintain its vitality and viability. Reference to Paragraph c) and paragraph 7.16 of R2 For many years, the upper stories of many retail premises in King Street, South Shields (and Fowler Street to a limited extent) have been empty, unused or under utilised. The properties, many of which are of heritage value, are continuing to deteriorate and decay. The Local Plan provides an ideal opportunity to bring these upper floors back into use, for residential purposes. The potential target client group could be for younger people (possibly including students) who are not car owners. Such clients and the existing retail and leisure businesses could have a mutually beneficial co-existence. This will not only help to reduce housing demand elsewhere (especially on green belt sites), it would also be of great benefit in revitalising and

							reinvigorating this very important area, which is increasingly in decline and under-utilised. What is the Council doing to address this problem?
ST2516	Dave Hutchinson		07 Plannning for our town centres	R05		Support	Support
ST2516	Dave Hutchinson		07 Plannning for our town centres	R06		Support	EBNF would seek to protect our Local centre against edge of centre or out of centre retail development which would have a detrimental impact.
ST2516	Dave Hutchinson		07 Plannning for our town centres	R08		Support	Support