

Our Ref	Respondent	Representative	Chapter	Policy	Para/ Criterion	Support /Object	Submitted Comments
ST0137	Wendy Fawcus		08 Regeneration	RG05		Object	I am concerned about the proposal to build on the existing industrial site at East Boldon. There are thriving businesses on this site, what will happen to those jobs? To replace these with houses is not logical, you need a job to buy a house and live in it.
ST0310	Helen Marks	Port of Tyne	09 Regeneration	RG01		Comment	<p>South Shields Riverside / Policy RG1</p> <p>Policy RG1 allocates Holborn Middle Dock and Windmill Hill (identified in inset map 24 in the STLPPPD) for mixed use residential and office development. The site is adjacent to the Port of Tyne and is located directly to the north of McNulty's Yard.</p> <p>The strategic policy goes onto state that the site "will deliver a mixed-use residential (approximately 400 homes) and office (approximately 200,000 sq. ft.) development". The Port have actively engaged with the Council to discuss the potential noise conflict with the Ports existing and proposed activities, the potential impact for any new residential properties within proximity to the northern boundary of McNulty's Yard. Historically, the Council and the Port came to the agreement that the land on the southern boundary of Holborn Middle Dock would only be used for commercial office space.</p> <p>The discussions between the Port and the Council are acknowledged at paragraph 2.11 of the South Shields Town Centre and Waterfront Area Action Plan, 2008, which states;</p> <p>'The precise distribution of land uses in the Riverside Regeneration area can only be finalised in the light of further study including examination of the relationships between the proposed uses themselves and between the proposed uses and existing land uses in and around the riverside area. The Council will seek mixed-use development on the 'neighbourhood' sites. However, it may be found that, for a variety of environmental and other reasons, some 'neighbourhoods' may not be suitable for all of the uses specified by the Policy. Further study and consultation will lead to the production of a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD8) which will specify the final detailed distribution of land uses through the Riverside Regeneration area.'</p> <p>Accordingly, SPD8 South Shields Riverside Regeneration shows landscaping on the southern boundary of the Middle Docks site at Figure 5.</p>

						<p>It is understood that the Port has continued to advocate for a dense vegetation and tree buffer zone at the boundary with McNulty's Yard and that any houses at the southern end of the allocation be orientated with windows looking away from McNulty's Yard. However, in the emerging policy the residential yield has increased and the allocated office space decreased, presumably to offset the inherent cost of developing brownfield land.</p> <p>RG1 criterion 1 (a) requests that the developer provides a comprehensive masterplan to address key issues, however this does not include any noise considerations. As stated, the Port have actively engaged with the planning authority to ensure necessary noise mitigation is incorporated into the scheme. We request that Policy RG1 be reworded as follows; '...In taking forward the allocation we will require the developer to provide a comprehensive masterplan to address ecology, flooding, environmental remediation, transport [and noise].'</p> <p>In addition, paragraphs 8.5 to 8.9 discusses the sustainability credentials of the site, however, fundamentally fails to expand on some of the key issues as identified within this policy. In particular, Holborn Middle Dock's proximity to McNulty's Yard, a key specialist employment allocation, and the potential impact this could have on it's continued effective use as for port and marine uses, should appropriate mitigation measures not be put in place. This should be addressed within the text.</p>
ST0060	Margaret Mills		08 Regeneration	RG05		<p>Object</p> <p>Objection to the developments planned in South Shields, Cleadon, Whitburn and Boldon H3.2, H3.3, H3.7, H3.1, RG5</p> <p>The following report was compiled by my son John Mills – Senior Project Director Middle East who will eventually together with my daughter Jane Mills of 2 Cleadon Hill Drive, South Shields, NE34 8DU (her objections have already been registered) will inherit this property.</p> <p><b>OBJECTION TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF GREENBELT LAND</b></p> <p><b>INTRODUCTION</b></p> <p>The following commentary may come across as something from a typical NIMBY (Not In My Back Yard). I can assure you that this is not the case. I am a Civil Engineer who is very proud of my profession and the great good it has brought. Without the construction industry I would not have been able to make the living that I have made so it would be fair to assume that I would welcome further development.</p>

						<p>This is not the case in this instance.</p> <p>I firmly believe that development is required but ONLY where there is an end goal in sight and a clear demand for that development.</p> <p>I do not see that there is a clear demand for the proposed scheme and in fact I see this as detrimental to the region as a whole. It will cause irreversible damage to a natural green belt, which provides not only homes for a large variety of birds, flora and fauna, but also keeps separate the historic identities of Boldon Flats, Cleadon and South Shields.</p> <p>LACK OF DEMAND WITHIN THE SOUTH TYNESIDE PROPOSAL</p> <p>According to the South Tyneside Pre-Publication Draft, the aim is to provide for:</p> <p>“future development of the Borough up until 2036. It will ensure that new development and growth is delivered in the right places.”</p> <p>This all sounds very laudable. However, South Tyneside has NEITHER published a statement demonstrating the DEMAND for this development NOR a plan for developing the DEMAND that will necessitate the development, on GREENBELT, of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. A new Metro Station at Tiledsheds.</li><li>2. A road bridge crossing the rail line at Tiledsheds.</li><li>3. 477 houses on 3 areas of green belt adjacent each other, effectively removing all green belt between Tiledsheds and Cleadon Hills, and “merging” Cleadon and South Shields.</li></ol> <p>In relation to item 1 above, why is there a need to build a new metro station, when Boldon Station is less than 1 km away? When combined with item 2 and the subsequent need to build car parking, the development of items 1 &amp; 2 will cause extensive destruction to a wetland area of greenbelt. Neither will it relieve any traffic congestion in Boldon.</p> <p>In relation to items 2 and 3 above, the Tiledsheds area and the Boldon Flats are areas of great environmental significance. The area is home to a large variety of birds, flora and fauna, as well as acting as the flood plain for the area. Indeed, in 2016, a report on whether the above green belt land should be developed for housing was rejected by South Tyneside. So what has changed?</p> <p>The clear answer to this is “nothing has changed”. In fact, if anything the demand for housing has dropped. In 2016 there were reported to be 500 empty housing units in South Tyneside. It is understood that the recent</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>census reports this figure has increased. So clearly there is no urgency to build houses.</p> <p>In relation to item 3, there is confusion as to whether or not this housing is to be affordable housing, or indeed social housing. We would all like to see affordable housing. However, why does it have to be built on Green Belt land?</p> <p><b>GREENBELT LAND</b></p> <p>The purpose of the Green Belt land is stated in the Strategic Land Review as necessary to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Reduce urban sprawl</li><li>• Protect neighbouring towns from merging</li><li>• Protect the character of historic settlements</li><li>• Encourage urban regeneration</li><li>• Assist with safeguarding the countryside</li></ul> <p>It is untenable for South Tyneside to make a plan to go against ALL of the above tenets, particularly when there is clearly no demand and given the large areas of brown field sites within South Tyneside and given the large areas of brown field sites within South Tyneside and given the already clear surfeit of housing units.</p> <p>Surely the efforts of South Tyneside would be better spent identifying industries which could move into the area, and then developing the infrastructure that would help those industries grown. Then the argument could at least be put that there is a need for more housing. That argument still does not justify the destruction of green belt land in an area where there are so many brown field sites.</p> <p><b>DEVELOPMENT PLAN</b></p> <p>It is incumbent on South Tyneside to prove their case and in doing so they must prepare a report and plans which are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Positively prepared</li><li>• Justified</li><li>• Effective</li><li>• Consistent with National policy</li></ul> <p>The plan is clearly not Positively Prepared. It goes, without any reasoning, against the study carried out in 2016 which concluded that the areas now planned for housing should not be touched.</p> <p>There has been no justification provided for this scheme; where is the DEMAND?</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>The plan is not effective; it provides no sustainable goals and satisfies no stated and proven demands.</p> <p>The National Policy for developing affordable housing is a clear and commendable aim, but that National Policy does not state that the goal should be met at all costs and certainly not by developing on Green Belt land.</p> <p><b>SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT</b></p> <p>“Sustainable Development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs”</p> <p>There is no doubt that South Tyneside and the North East in general would benefit from the development of new industry and enterprise. It therefore follows that all development should be sustainable.</p> <p>Sustainable developments must be clearly thought out, and not just be a “development for development’s sake”.</p> <p>I have spent many years working in Dubai. Dubai is not oil rich, and in recognition of this Dubai has marketed itself successfully as a place which encourages entrepreneurship and has developed its tourism industry to be extremely successful. Dubai has a clear and documented development goal and strategy on how it should be achieved. This is lacking in South Tyneside, and until South Tyneside can demonstrate to the public of South Shields, Cleadon and Boldon that there is a clear demand which necessitates the destruction of the green belt, then my advice is “IF IT IS NOT BROKEN, THEN DO NOT FIX IT!</p> <p><b>CONCLUSION</b></p> <p>There are far more qualified people than I who will be able to provide more details on the environmental damage caused to developing on flood plains and greenbelt where there is a diversity of birdlife, flora and fauna.</p> <p>All the residents of Cleadon and South Shields should be concerned over the effective merging of these historically separated areas, and are certainly concerned over the impact on the values of their properties, particularly when the type of housing has not been clarified.</p> <p>All the residents of Cleadon and South Shields should be concerned over the effective merging of these historically separate areas, and are certainly concerned over the impact on the values of their properties, particularly when the type of housing has not been clarified.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

							<p>The South Tyneside plan for developing on the Greenbelt land which separates Cleadon from South Shields is not justified. There is no clear demand for such a development. The plan even goes against the 2016 findings of South Tyneside, with no reasons given.</p> <p>I hope that, when the independent assessor carries out their review, the conclusion reiterates the 2016 decision on this greenbelt is not justified.</p>
ST0072	Ann Wright		08 Regeneration	RG05		Object	<p>I write to you with serious concerns about the number of new houses proposed in the Draft Local Plan, in particular the following areas:-</p> <p>H3.2 Land south of Cleadon Park 90  H3.3 Land south of Occupation Rd. East 156  H3.70 Land at West Hall Farm 231  H3.59 Land at North Farm 588  H3.61 Land south of St John's Terr &amp; Natley Ave. 63  H3.65 Land west of Boldon Cemetery 54  RG5 Land at Cleadon Lane Ind. Est. 245</p> <p>My objections are as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a disproportionate number of houses compared to those proposed elsewhere.</li> <li>• Such numbers will result in increased traffic flow and therefore increased air pollution.</li> <li>• There will inevitably be even worse parking problems.</li> <li>• There will be an unsustainable strain on both infrastructure and facilities.</li> <li>• This proposal will lead to an unacceptable loss of green belt and natural habitat.</li> <li>• All of the above will result in a negative impact on the villages of Cleadon and East Boldon and all who live in them.</li> <li>• Any proposals for new housing within our villages should prioritise use of brownfield sites.</li> </ul>
ST0294	Mark Goodwill	Highways England	08 Regeneration	RG01		Comment	<p>In relation to individual impacts, we previously commented on your Local Plan sites as part of the Strategic Land Review consultation in July 2016 and identified the sites which were expected to have impacts on the SRN, and which would require further assessment as part of site Transport Assessments. As part of the current consultation, we have also identified a further two sites for which this applies.</p> <p>Hence, we would request the following wording changes in the Local Plan document related to these sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An update to 'Key considerations' wording to ensure that the focus of</li> </ul>

							<p>the Transport Assessment includes reference to assessment of the A19 for the following housing sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- H3.10 Former Brinkburn Comprehensive School</li> <li>- H3.59 Land at North Farm</li> <li>- R1 Holborn – South Shields Riverside</li> <li>- R5 Land at Cleadon Lane Industrial Estate</li> <li>- H3.12 Land at Chuter Ede Education Centre (excluding Brydon Court)</li> </ul>
ST0294	Mark Goodwill	Highways England	08 Regeneration	RG05		Comment	<p>In relation to individual impacts, we previously commented on your Local Plan sites as part of the Strategic Land Review consultation in July 2016 and identified the sites which were expected to have impacts on the SRN, and which would require further assessment as part of site Transport Assessments. As part of the current consultation, we have also identified a further two sites for which this applies.</p> <p>Hence, we would request the following wording changes in the Local Plan document related to these sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An update to ‘Key considerations’ wording to ensure that the focus of the Transport Assessment includes reference to assessment of the A19 for the following housing sites:</li> <li>- H3.10 Former Brinkburn Comprehensive School</li> <li>- H3.59 Land at North Farm</li> <li>- R1 Holborn – South Shields Riverside</li> <li>- R5 Land at Cleadon Lane Industrial Estate</li> <li>- H3.12 Land at Chuter Ede Education Centre (excluding Brydon Court)</li> </ul>
ST0299	Mark Pattison		08 Regeneration	RG05		Objection	<p>I wish to OBJECT to the number of new homes, on GREENFIELD sites, proposed for development in and adjacent to Cleadon village.</p> <p>Proposed new greenfield developments within Cleadon itself: H3.2, H3.3, H3.70 total 477 homes (plus a further 245 at RG5 which, whilst brownfield and so in isolation less of an issue, add to the issues of sheer volume as described below).</p> <p>Plus 588 new homes at H3.59 North Farm (New Road) East Boldon, the occupants of which are likely to regularly pass through and use facilities of Cleadon village.</p> <p>Plus 397 new homes in Whitburn, the occupants of many of which are very likely to use Cleadon village as a route to the main transport links at the A19</p>
ST0323	Gilbert Johnston		08 Regeneration	RG05		Objection	<p>Policy RG 5 states:</p> <p>“iv Consideration should be given to the removal of the culverted section of the watercourse.</p>

						<p>v Proposals should be supported by a site-specific flood risk assessment.”</p> <p>I understand this means opening up the “culverted section of the watercourse” to help mitigate flooding problems on this site. This would be an environmental disaster as the land is contaminated with asbestos, draining this land into the River Don would pose a serious, long term health risk to people and animals and the surrounding land.</p> <p>Developing RG 5 is in direct conflict with policy Policy NE6 which is concerned with flood risk and water management. Policy NE6 states “Flood risk will be taken into account at all stages in the planning process to avoid inappropriate development in areas at current or future risk of flooding... Where applicable, development proposals will be expected to be designed to mitigate against urban creep and adapt to climate change, taking account of flood risk...”</p> <p>This clearly is not the case at Cleadon Lane Industrial Estate (RG5). Proposing to develop RG5 with at least 245 houses in an area at risk of flooding on land which is also contaminated is not avoiding “inappropriate development in areas at current or future risk of flooding”.</p> <p>Developing RG5 contradicts Policy NE11 as it will cause a rise in water pollution in the River Don. Paragraph 11.59 relating to this policy states: “Pollution is the release of substances into the environment that can cause harm to human health, property and any other living organism supported by the wider environment. Pollution can affect our quality of life, our health and wellbeing and the wider environment.”</p> <p>Any development at site RG5 totally contradicts this statement.</p> <p>Are STC putting the need to develop before public health and potential harm to the environment?</p> <p>Developing RG5 conflicts with Policy NE7 which sets out to protect water quality. This policy states:</p> <p>The rivers in the Borough, their banks and tributaries will be protected from damaging development and, where appropriate, enhanced. The quantity and quality of surface and groundwater bodies shall be protected and where possible enhanced.</p> <p>New development that discharges into a watercourse or is adjacent to a watercourse or discharges to ground will be required to incorporate appropriate water pollution</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>control measures and consider opportunities to reduce detrimental impacts including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Naturalising watercourse channels;</li> <li>b) Improving the biodiversity and ecological connectivity of watercourses;</li> <li>c) Safeguarding and enlarging river buffers with appropriate habitat;</li> <li>d) Mitigating diffuse agricultural and urban pollution;</li> <li>e) Progressively reducing the pollution of groundwater and prevent or limit the entry of pollutants, particularly in high vulnerability areas;</li> <li>f) Seeking opportunities to incorporate creation of wetland habitat in designs where appropriate;</li> <li>g) Ensuring that development does not fragment a wildlife corridor;</li> <li>h) Preventing introduction of non-native species via construction or other works and managing present invasive non-native species where practical; and</li> <li>i) Contributing towards achieving good status for all water bodies or, for heavily modified water bodies and artificial water bodies, good ecological potential and good surface water chemical status.</li> </ul> <p>Watercourses should be left with an appropriately sized, development-free buffer zone on both sides of the channel. The width required will be dependent on the specifics of the site and the nature of the development.</p> <p>Consideration must be given to current and future mine water and groundwater levels and the interaction with SuDS.</p> <p>Where the drainage will be connected to a watercourse or to groundwater all development will need to carry out a site specific water quality risk assessment which may identify the need for SuDS to treat the run off from the development. The simple index approach in the CIRIA SuDs Manual is the minimum required assessment. This is to ensure that there is no detrimental impact to the watercourse or groundwater.</p> <p>Where other developments are proposed in the same vicinity, a coordinated approach to surface water management will be encouraged and applicants should explore the feasibility of installing shared outfalls to reduce detrimental impacts.</p> <p>Development will not be permitted where it would have an adverse impact on water dependent Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) and Natura 2000 sites.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>Developing RG 5 will have a negative impact on everything Policy NE7 seeks to protect. In particular any development and opening of water culverts at RG 5 will have an “adverse impact on water dependent Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) and Natura 2000 sites.’ at nearby Boldon Flats (SSSI) and also at Nature reserves at Tiledsheds and Netwon Garths which are situated at very close proximity to this site and in the same water course channel. To implement Policy NE7 development at site RG 5 should “not be permitted”</p> <p>Developing RG 5 will reduce the gap, in terms of distance, between Boldon and South Shields and would increase pressure on the remainder. If the gap were to be reduced here then it would become more difficult to reduce pressure to eliminate it completely between Newton Garths and Shields Road, thereby merging Boldon and Cleadon with South Shields thus contradicting Policy S1.</p>
ST0368	Jill Farish		08 Regeneration	RG05	Object	<p>I feel there will be a distinct loss of village identity with any of the proposed developments and specifically with regard to H3.65 and H3.69. In addition, the loss of greenbelt which, cannot/will not be reversed, will result in the loss of habitat for a range of wildlife, which in turn will have a detrimental effect on generations to come.</p> <p>The congestion in the villages is already at a serious level, resulting in many bottlenecks and the introduction of many traffic calming measures throughout the villages. This has a 'knock-on' effect and a significant negative impact on all key services in the area. Additional traffic will also lead to additional levels of pollution again causing a further negative impact in the area, this time regarding the health of both the immediate and surrounding areas and populations.</p> <p>A loss of recreational and local open spaces will have a detrimental impact on the mental health and well-being of the community, as there will be nowhere to escape and breathe on top of the previously mentioned loss of village identities.</p> <p>As a lifelong Boldon resident I have seen the villages eroded by development and have witnessed the impact of all the above mentioned points. I therefore strongly object to all the proposed developments for Boldon and the surrounding areas ie. H03.59, H03.60, H03.061, H03.62, H03.63, H03.64, H03.65, H03.66, H03.67, H03.68, H03.69, RG5, H3.1 and H3.12.</p>

ST1919	Andrew Rose	Barratt David Wilson Homes (North East)	08 Regeneration	RG05		Support	<p>3.1. BDW supports the identification of Land at Cleadon Lane Industrial Estate for housing (Plan Ref RG5). Test of Soundness</p> <p>3.2. BDW considers that in relation to Policy H3 the Local Plan is currently sound. Justification</p> <p>3.3. BDW supports the proposed allocation of housing at Cleadon Lane Industrial Estate for circa 245 new homes on this brownfield site.</p> <p>3.4. BDW considers this is an efficient use of land and reflects the Frameworks principles of making effective use of land. Paragraph 117 states: Planning policies and decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions. Strategic policies should set out a clear strategy for accommodating objectively assessed needs, in a way that makes as much use as possible of previously-developed or 'brownfield' land.</p> <p>3.5. BDW supports the Site Selection Topic Paper (August 2019), which states in allocating the site: This is a key regeneration site which is considered to be an achievable site within an accessible and sustainable location. Flood Risk issues and impacts upon biodiversity can be mitigated through design and environmental enhancements. It is within 400m of a public transport network and a local centre and within close proximity to existing health care facilities.</p> <p>3.6. However, BDW do have some concerns in relation to the site specific policy RG5, which are made in relation to this policy later on in these representations.</p> <p>3.7. BDW considers that the proposed redevelopment of Cleadon Lane Industrial Estate is an available, suitable and achievable site and therefore in accordance with the Framework a deliverable site able to come forward in the short term. Overview of Proposals</p> <p>3.8. The site is located on the edge of Boldon, within an established residential area. The allocation is being promoted in an area that is already well served and has easy access to a full range of services and facilities located within Boldon and Cleadon. The site lies adjacent to the Metro which provides good accessibility to Newcastle and Sunderland and is close to the A184, which provides access to the A19 and</p>
--------	-------------	---	-----------------	------	--	---------	--

						<p>Sunderland. The site could accommodate in the region of 245 new homes alongside employment uses.</p> <p>Availability</p> <p>3.9. The land is being promoted by BDW on behalf of the landowner. The site is therefore available in accordance with the Framework and the National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).</p> <p>3.10. The proposed development can make an efficient and attractive use of the land. The site represents an excellent opportunity for future housing and associated development. This site allows housing to be delivered within an appropriate and sustainable location within South Tyneside.</p> <p>Suitability</p> <p>3.11. The site is located in a highly sustainable location and has residential development to the south and north, as well as East Boldon Metro Station adjacent to the site. The site is within easy walking distance to shops, including Sainsbury's Local to the south and schools and leisure facilities in the vicinity.</p> <p>3.12. The site is well served by buses with stops on the B1299 near the site frontage, providing opportunities for sustainable travel. East Boldon Metro Station is adjacent to the site providing access to Newcastle and Sunderland.</p> <p>3.13. The Strategic Land Review, January 2018, summary states that the land at Cleadon Lane is considered suitable for new homes. The Strategic Land Review Summary, January 2018, states that brownfield land at Cleadon Lane Industrial Estate (BC36a &amp; b, 37) is considered potentially suitable for new homes dependent on the need and viability for retaining employment land in this area. This is also reflected in the SHLAA which states that the site has housing potential within the next five years.</p> <p>3.14. The Draft Plan states in para 8.18 that the site "is not a planned estate but rather a large cluster of industrial and warehouse buildings to the East of the Metro line at East Boldon. Although residential component of the allocation represents a loss of employment land, the environment of the estate is not high quality".</p> <p>3.15. The site itself is no longer appropriate for businesses. The site is a mix of hardstanding and soil, which becomes wet in the winter and in the summer creates a very dusty environment. The majority of businesses are relocating to sites that offer full hardstanding surfaces, which are much more appropriate for storage of materials, equipment and</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>machinery.</p> <p>3.16. Furthermore, the site access is not appropriate for modern industrial uses, particularly for large HGV's coming through the village of Cleadon or inadequate turning facilities within the site. Noise complaints have also been an issue historically, particularly given the proximity of the site to nearby residential areas.</p> <p>3.17. Redevelopment of the site for housing is therefore a good opportunity to regenerate this brownfield site, which is no longer suitable or viable for employment uses. The site is situated in a residential area, adjacent to a Metro Station, and the redevelopment will decontaminate a poor quality site. Such an approach is in accordance with the Framework which encourages the re-use of industrial sites which are not fit for purpose. The development will provide additional quality development that will benefit South Tyneside and the wider region with economic, environmental and social benefits. It is therefore considered that the development is suitable.</p> <p>Achievable</p> <p>3.19. There are no known constraints, that could not be suitably mitigated, that would prevent this site coming forward within the plan period. Technical work is ongoing and from the information available all technical matters could be addressed through a detailed planning application. As such, the development of the site is considered achievable.</p> <p>3.20. The Councils own assessment concludes that the site is achievable with the Strategic Land Review stating that the site is urban in character and that the development will have a low impact on the surrounding landscape/townscape.</p> <p>3.21. Other areas where zero/low impact – no or minimal mitigation is concluded include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Archaeology it is concluded that there is no known onsite historical/archaeological significance.</li><li>• Green Infrastructure – public right of way adjacent to the metro line which would need to be taken into account. It is considered that developing this site would have a low impact and mitigation would be required where appropriate.</li><li>• Flood Risk and Drainage - Site mostly lies in Flood Zone 1 so is developable, however there are areas in Flood Zones 2 or 3. The site is however culverted such that the impacts of these flood zones is much</li></ul>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>reduced. EA would strongly recommend against development proposed within 5 metres of both the watercourses on the grounds of maintenance and biodiversity'. There is the possibility of opening up the watercourses/culverts within any future scheme. BDW do not anticipate any insurmountable constraints to bringing forward the site. Developing the site for housing would improve the drainage system and reduce surface water run-off.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Ground conditions and contamination – the site is within an area for further investigation in relation to contamination with former uses including brick manufacture (c1898-1921), road haulage (c1987) and infilling. It is within a Mineral Safeguarding Area, and therefore the potential presence of minerals and their extraction would need to be considered further. BDW do not anticipate any insurmountable constraints to bringing forward the site. The site would be fully remediated as part of a future scheme.</li><li>• Infrastructure and services – it has good access to some existing services and would increase critical mass, the scale of development would put pressure on local capacity, particularly roads. New infrastructure and services would be required. BDW do not anticipate any insurmountable constraints to bringing forward the site. The provision of infrastructure and services could be discussed as part of a detailed planning application.</li><li>• Ecology – The site is of low ecological interest, however there are some mature trees and the site is directly adjacent to Local Wildlife Sites. Mitigation measures will therefore need to be incorporated into any future scheme. Such mitigation could include buffer zones, landscaping and incorporation of green infrastructure within the proposed development.</li></ul> <p>3.22. Therefore, there are no insurmountable constraints and the site is deliverable. The site is therefore considered to be achievable and therefore deliverable in accordance with national guidance.</p> <p>Deliverability</p> <p>3.23. The site is available, suitable, achievable and deliverable in accordance with the Framework and represents a sustainable residential opportunity within East Boldon.</p> <p>3.24. The SLR states that 'it is considered that the site is within a viable area for residential, and is within an established employment area'. Therefore the Strategic Land Review recognises that the site is suitable</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>for residential development.</p> <p>The Key Objectives of the Framework</p> <p>3.25. The Framework sets out sites must be allocated with the principle aim of supporting the Government’s key housing policy goal of boosting significantly the supply of housing. The Framework explains the supply of new homes can be best achieved through planning for sustainable communities with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure. Sites should also make effective use of land and existing infrastructure.</p> <p>3.26. In relation to the Framework: The proposal responds positively towards national guidance; The site is in a sustainable location and appropriate for accommodating housing development;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The site has been assessed and is available, suitable and achievable for development;</li><li>• There are no insurmountable constraints to development. The site is therefore deliverable;</li><li>• The site is a brownfield site, so would enable South Tyneside to make as much use as possible of previously-developed or ‘brownfield’ land;</li><li>• Achieve net environment gains through improving the natural environment for biodiversity;</li><li>• Support an appropriate opportunity to remediate despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated or unstable land.</li></ul> <p>Benefits of Cleadon Lane Industrial Estate</p> <p>3.27. The development of the site would provide significant economic, social and environmental benefits. The site would provide housing that would meet the needs of the South Tyneside.</p> <p>3.28. In accordance with the Framework this representation has shown that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The delivery of circa 245 new homes in a range of house types, sizes and tenure;</li><li>• The proposal will deliver high quality housing;</li><li>• The proposal will deliver affordable housing;</li><li>• The scheme uses land efficiently and effectively;</li><li>• The proposal is in line with planning for housing objectives;</li><li>• The provision of modern employment premises alongside new housing;</li><li>• The remediation of a brownfield contaminated site; Environmental enhancement and therefore the opportunity for biodiversity net-gain;</li><li>• Removal of an underutilised and dilapidated site, creating a positive impact on local landscape.</li></ul>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The scheme will create direct and indirect job opportunities both during and after construction.</li></ul> <p>3.29. The proposal is an appropriate site to provide for the housing needs of South Tyneside in the short term. Confirmation of the allocation will contribute positively to a balanced housing supply in a sustainable location. The site can deliver a full range and mix of housing as part of a sustainable community. Development of the site would deliver affordable housing. South Tyneside needs to have a robust housing trajectory with a sufficient supply of deliverable sites. The site at Cleadon Lane Industrial Estate will assist with this delivery in the short term. The site is situated within a prime location suitable for residential development and as such would facilitate the development of land in an effective and efficient manner.</p> <p>3.30. The site is available, suitable and achievable and therefore deliverable in accordance with the Framework.</p> <p>Proposed Change 3.31. No Change</p> <p>3.25. The Framework sets out sites must be allocated with the principle aim of supporting the Government's key housing policy goal of boosting significantly the supply of housing. The Framework explains the supply of new homes can be best achieved through planning for sustainable communities with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure. Sites should also make effective use of land and existing infrastructure.</p> <p>3.26. In relation to the Framework: The proposal responds positively towards national guidance; The site is in a sustainable location and appropriate for accommodating housing development;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The site has been assessed and is available, suitable and achievable for development;</li><li>• There are no insurmountable constraints to development. The site is therefore deliverable;</li><li>• The site is a brownfield site, so would enable South Tyneside to make as much use as possible of previously-developed or 'brownfield' land;</li><li>• Achieve net environment gains through improving the natural environment for biodiversity;</li><li>• Support an appropriate opportunity to remediate despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated or unstable land.</li></ul> <p>Benefits of Cleadon Lane Industrial Estate</p> <p>3.27. The development of the site would provide significant economic, social and environmental benefits. The site would provide housing that would meet the needs of the South Tyneside.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>3.28. In accordance with the Framework this representation has shown that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The delivery of circa 245 new homes in a range of house types, sizes and tenure;</li> <li>• The proposal will deliver high quality housing;</li> <li>• The proposal will deliver affordable housing;</li> <li>• The scheme uses land efficiently and effectively;</li> <li>• The proposal is in line with planning for housing objectives;</li> <li>• The provision of modern employment premises alongside new housing;</li> <li>• The remediation of a brownfield contaminated site; Environmental enhancement and therefore the opportunity for biodiversity net-gain;</li> <li>• Removal of an underutilised and dilapidated site, creating a positive impact on local landscape.</li> <li>• The scheme will create direct and indirect job opportunities both during and after construction.</li> </ul> <p>3.29. The proposal is an appropriate site to provide for the housing needs of South Tyneside in the short term. Confirmation of the allocation will contribute positively to a balanced housing supply in a sustainable location. The site can deliver a full range and mix of housing as part of a sustainable community. Development of the site would deliver affordable housing. South Tyneside needs to have a robust housing trajectory with a sufficient supply of deliverable sites. The site at Cleadon Lane Industrial Estate will assist with this delivery in the short term. The site is situated within a prime location suitable for residential development and as such would facilitate the development of land in an effective and efficient manner. 3.30. The site is available, suitable and achievable and therefore deliverable in accordance with the Framework. Proposed Change 3.31. No Change</p>
ST1919	Andrew Rose	Barratt David Wilson Homes (North East)	08 Regeneration	RG05		<p>Objection</p> <p>Policy RG5: Cleadon Lane Mixed Use Regeneration Site</p> <p>4.1. BDW is supportive of the allocation of Cleadon Lane Industrial Estate, but have some concerns in relation to site specific policy requirements.</p> <p>Test of Soundness</p> <p>4.2. BDW considers that the Local Plan is currently unsound.</p> <p>Justification</p> <p>4.3. The Draft Local Plan confirms that Cleadon Lane Industrial Estate be allocated for a mixed-use development comprising: Approximately 245 homes and 2.1ha of employment land (B1/B8).</p>

						<p>4.4. Policy RG5 continues stating that key considerations for the developer are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i. The design and layout should actively seek to create and preserve, clear and defensible boundaries between the edge of the site and the Green Belt to which it is adjacent.</li><li>ii. Formal connections to East Boldon metro station should be established.</li><li>iii. Proposals should be supported by a site specific transport assessment, with particular focus on Station Road, Station Approach, A184, Cleadon Lane, New Road and the level crossings at East Boldon village and Tiledshed Lane level crossings.</li><li>iv. Consideration should be given to the removal of the culverted section of the watercourse.</li><li>v. Proposals should be supported by a site-specific flood risk assessment.</li></ul> <p>4.5. BDW supports the allocation, however objects to the restrictive approach to the policy, which seeks approximately 245 homes but also 2.1ha of employment land. BDW considers that flexibility is required around the disposition of uses in order to achieve the most appropriate form of development.</p> <p>4.6. The policy appears to fix the level of employment as a minimum to be achieved, but the flexibility is on the housing offer. BDW considers that to achieve the most appropriate masterplan for the site, based on the commissioned technical evidence that the employment land should also be referred to as “approximate”.</p> <p>4.7. Furthermore, the policy refers to the delivery of employment land, however an enhanced employment offer can be created through the type size and quality of units. This is most profound in this location where it may be more appropriate to focus on smaller but higher quality business units.</p> <p>4.8. Such an approach would be consistent and in accordance with national guidance in order to ensure the deliverability of this new housing site.</p> <p>4.9. Furthermore, a number of the key considerations appear vague and not evidenced and further clarity is required, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i. The design and layout should actively seek to create and preserve, clear and defensible boundaries between the edge of the site and the Green Belt to which it is adjacent.</li><li>ii. Formal connections to East Boldon metro station should be</li></ul>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>established.</p> <p>4.10. BDW consider that policy requirements should be evidenced with clear reporting and sources in accordance with the Framework and PPG.</p> <p>Proposed Change</p> <p>4.11. To overcome the objection and address soundness matters, the Council should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incorporate flexibility within the policy.</li> <li>• Refer to “approximately 245 homes and circa 2.1ha of employment land”.</li> </ul>
ST1935	Rachael Milne		08 Regeneration	RG04	objection	<p>Regeneration sites STTAG are objecting to:</p> <p>RG 2 (This land is suitable for regeneration but many mature Trees are positioned throughout the site. STTAG would like these Trees must be offered full protection from developers)</p> <p>RG 4 (This site has hundreds of Trees throughout the site. Rich bird life, insect life and possibly bats, foxes, hedgehogs and owls, should be a nature reserve)</p> <p>Proposed Bridge</p> <p>Subsections 4.14</p> <p>The 2012 South Tyneside landscape character study which provides guidance on local character types and key sensitivities for each area states:</p> <p>‘Planning applications to deliver good quality design which enhances the diverse character of the area, and ensures our landscape is maintained and enhanced’</p> <p>Site RG4 between St Aloysius RC School and the B1297 is not suitable for development. This is an area full of trees and is crucial to the areas biodiversity. A good mix of Tree species are present of varying ages. The area has rich bird and insect life. Locked between heavy industry of the river Tyne area and housing estates and a school this wonderful nature reserve area must be maintained and enjoyed to its full potential. Local Schools have an opportunity to educate children on the flora and fauna present. The Trees help mask the heavy industry that otherwise school children would be in direct conflict with. 300+ Trees will be at risk on this site.</p> <p>4.19</p> <p>Consider the potential impact on the landscape and natural environment should be carefully considered through the design process by applicants. (Are developers even aware of this?)</p>

							The Bridge that will be built near the Tiledshed nature reserve in Boldon will have a negative effect on the character of the local area. Noise levels, increased speed are a big concern along with the height of the bridge which must be to a height high enough to go over the train/metro lines. The width of the road will mean more trees and hedgerows will be felled to accommodate it. STTAG is against the idea of closing off the 2 level crossings. We propose simply installing a double barrier as safety concerns have been raised. The predicted waiting times at the crossing using this option will only increase by approx 90 seconds.
ST1935	Rachael Milne		08 Regeneration	RG01		Support	STTAG proposes only house building on the following Brown Field sites; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Holborn site RG1.a,b and c</li> </ul> As that site currently stands proposed plans are for mainly offices with houses to be built on a small section of trees and grass land. The grasses area should be left and existing Trees onsite must be retained. There is enough land along the River Tyne Holborn site to build hundreds of houses. Offices must not be built here;
ST1935	Rachael Milne		08 Regeneration	RG02		Objection	Regeneration sites STTAG are objecting to: RG 2 (This land is suitable for regeneration but many mature Trees are positioned throughout the site. STTAG would like these Trees must be offered full protection from developers) RG 4 (This site has hundreds of Trees throughout the site. Rich bird life, insect life and possibly bats, foxes, hedgehogs and owls, should be a nature reserve)
ST1947	Christopher Mordain	Resident	08 Regeneration	RG05		Comment	Assessment Summary. Your summary states that overall the use of this GREENBELT site for building 231/234 houses would have an overall neutral impact. (On what?). On Cleadon Village residents it would have a MASSIVELY NEGATIVE impact. (On East Boldon residents it would have a lesser but still significant NEGATIVE impact.) Cleadon Village has got to the point where the facilities and infrastructure of a village have been saturated (schools, medical facilities, shops, parking, road accessibility, unmaintained parks, roads and pavements etc.) Adding even more load to this infrastructure just cannot be accommodated (together with major planned housing developments at

							neighbouring sites H3.2,H3.3 and RG5, H3.59 this is 1310 households being added in (477) or within 200 metres (833) of the Cleadon Parish boundary). I respectfully suggest you abandon this part of your building plan on H3.70.
ST1959	Anna Preston	Resident	08 Regeneration	RG05		Comment	<p>Assessment Summary.</p> <p>Your summary states that overall the use of this GREENBELT site for building 231/234 houses would have an overall neutral impact. (On what?).</p> <p>On Cleadon Village residents it would have a MASSIVELY NEGATIVE impact.</p> <p>(On East Boldon residents it would have a lesser but still significant NEGATIVE impact.)</p> <p>Cleadon Village has got to the point where the facilities and infrastructure of a village have been saturated (schools, medical facilities, shops, parking, road accessibility, unmaintained parks, roads and pavements etc.)</p> <p>Adding even more load to this infrastructure just cannot be accommodated (together with major planned housing developments at neighbouring sites H3.2,H3.3 and RG5, H3.59 this is 1310 households being added in (477) or within 200 metres (833) of the Cleadon Parish boundary).</p> <p>I respectfully suggest you abandon this part of your building plan on H3.70.</p>
ST1960	Matt Preston	Resident	08 Regeneration	RG05		Comment	<p>Assessment Summary.</p> <p>Your summary states that overall the use of this GREENBELT site for building 231/234 houses would have an overall neutral impact. (On what?).</p> <p>On Cleadon Village residents it would have a MASSIVELY NEGATIVE impact.</p> <p>(On East Boldon residents it would have a lesser but still significant NEGATIVE impact.)</p> <p>Cleadon Village has got to the point where the facilities and infrastructure of a village have been saturated (schools, medical facilities, shops, parking, road accessibility, unmaintained parks, roads and pavements etc.)</p> <p>Adding even more load to this infrastructure just cannot be accommodated (together with major planned housing developments at</p>

							neighbouring sites H3.2,H3.3 and RG5, H3.59 this is 1310 households being added in (477) or within 200 metres (833) of the Cleadon Parish boundary). I respectfully suggest you abandon this part of your building plan on H3.70.
ST1961	Andy Swan	Resident	08 Regeneration	RG05		Comment	<p>Assessment Summary.</p> <p>Your summary states that overall the use of this GREENBELT site for building 231/234 houses would have an overall neutral impact. (On what?).</p> <p>On Cleadon Village residents it would have a MASSIVELY NEGATIVE impact.</p> <p>(On East Boldon residents it would have a lesser but still significant NEGATIVE impact.)</p> <p>Cleadon Village has got to the point where the facilities and infrastructure of a village have been saturated (schools, medical facilities, shops, parking, road accessibility, unmaintained parks, roads and pavements etc.)</p> <p>Adding even more load to this infrastructure just cannot be accommodated (together with major planned housing developments at neighbouring sites H3.2,H3.3 and RG5, H3.59 this is 1310 households being added in (477) or within 200 metres (833) of the Cleadon Parish boundary).</p> <p>I respectfully suggest you abandon this part of your building plan on H3.70.</p>
ST1962	Carol Cramman	Resident	08 Regeneration	RG05		Comment	<p>Assessment Summary.</p> <p>Your summary states that overall the use of this GREENBELT site for building 231/234 houses would have an overall neutral impact. (On what?).</p> <p>On Cleadon Village residents it would have a MASSIVELY NEGATIVE impact.</p> <p>(On East Boldon residents it would have a lesser but still significant NEGATIVE impact.)</p> <p>Cleadon Village has got to the point where the facilities and infrastructure of a village have been saturated (schools, medical facilities, shops, parking, road accessibility, unmaintained parks, roads and pavements etc.)</p> <p>Adding even more load to this infrastructure just cannot be accommodated (together with major planned housing developments at</p>

							neighbouring sites H3.2,H3.3 and RG5, H3.59 this is 1310 households being added in (477) or within 200 metres (833) of the Cleadon Parish boundary). I respectfully suggest you abandon this part of your building plan on H3.70.
ST1963	Lisa Murphy	Resident	08 Regeneration	RG05		Comment	<p>Assessment Summary.</p> <p>Your summary states that overall the use of this GREENBELT site for building 231/234 houses would have an overall neutral impact. (On what?).</p> <p>On Cleadon Village residents it would have a MASSIVELY NEGATIVE impact.</p> <p>(On East Boldon residents it would have a lesser but still significant NEGATIVE impact.)</p> <p>Cleadon Village has got to the point where the facilities and infrastructure of a village have been saturated (schools, medical facilities, shops, parking, road accessibility, unmaintained parks, roads and pavements etc.)</p> <p>Adding even more load to this infrastructure just cannot be accommodated (together with major planned housing developments at neighbouring sites H3.2,H3.3 and RG5, H3.59 this is 1310 households being added in (477) or within 200 metres (833) of the Cleadon Parish boundary).</p> <p>I respectfully suggest you abandon this part of your building plan on H3.70.</p>
ST1965	John Cramman		08 Regeneration	RG05		Comment	<p>Assessment Summary.</p> <p>Your summary states that overall the use of this GREENBELT site for building 231/234 houses would have an overall neutral impact. (On what?).</p> <p>On Cleadon Village residents it would have a MASSIVELY NEGATIVE impact.</p> <p>(On East Boldon residents it would have a lesser but still significant NEGATIVE impact.)</p> <p>Cleadon Village has got to the point where the facilities and infrastructure of a village have been saturated (schools, medical facilities, shops, parking, road accessibility, unmaintained parks, roads and pavements etc.)</p> <p>Adding even more load to this infrastructure just cannot be accommodated (together with major planned housing developments at</p>

							neighbouring sites H3.2,H3.3 and RG5, H3.59 this is 1310 households being added in (477) or within 200 metres (833) of the Cleadon Parish boundary). I respectfully suggest you abandon this part of your building plan on H3.70.
ST1966	Chrstian James		08 Regeneration	RG05		Comment	<p>Assessment Summary.</p> <p>Your summary states that overall the use of this GREENBELT site for building 231/234 houses would have an overall neutral impact. (On what?).</p> <p>On Cleadon Village residents it would have a MASSIVELY NEGATIVE impact.</p> <p>(On East Boldon residents it would have a lesser but still significant NEGATIVE impact.)</p> <p>Cleadon Village has got to the point where the facilities and infrastructure of a village have been saturated (schools, medical facilities, shops, parking, road accessibility, unmaintained parks, roads and pavements etc.)</p> <p>Adding even more load to this infrastructure just cannot be accommodated (together with major planned housing developments at neighbouring sites H3.2,H3.3 and RG5, H3.59 this is 1310 households being added in (477) or within 200 metres (833) of the Cleadon Parish boundary).</p> <p>I respectfully suggest you abandon this part of your building plan on H3.70.</p>
ST1972	Iain Paterson		08 Regeneration	RG05		Comment	<p>Assessment Summary.</p> <p>Your summary states that overall the use of this GREENBELT site for building 231/234 houses would have an overall neutral impact. (On what?).</p> <p>On Cleadon Village residents it would have a MASSIVELY NEGATIVE impact.</p> <p>(On East Boldon residents it would have a lesser but still significant NEGATIVE impact.)</p> <p>Cleadon Village has got to the point where the facilities and infrastructure of a village have been saturated (schools, medical facilities, shops, parking, road accessibility, unmaintained parks, roads and pavements etc.)</p> <p>Adding even more load to this infrastructure just cannot be accommodated (together with major planned housing developments at</p>

							neighbouring sites H3.2,H3.3 and RG5, H3.59 this is 1310 households being added in (477) or within 200 metres (833) of the Cleadon Parish boundary). I respectfully suggest you abandon this part of your building plan on H3.70.
ST1977	Steven Lee		08 Regeneration	RG05		Comment	<p>Assessment Summary.</p> <p>Your summary states that overall the use of this GREENBELT site for building 231/234 houses would have an overall neutral impact. (On what?).</p> <p>On Cleadon Village residents it would have a MASSIVELY NEGATIVE impact.</p> <p>(On East Boldon residents it would have a lesser but still significant NEGATIVE impact.)</p> <p>Cleadon Village has got to the point where the facilities and infrastructure of a village have been saturated (schools, medical facilities, shops, parking, road accessibility, unmaintained parks, roads and pavements etc.)</p> <p>Adding even more load to this infrastructure just cannot be accommodated (together with major planned housing developments at neighbouring sites H3.2,H3.3 and RG5, H3.59 this is 1310 households being added in (477) or within 200 metres (833) of the Cleadon Parish boundary).</p> <p>I respectfully suggest you abandon this part of your building plan on H3.70.</p>
ST1978	Michelle Lee		08 Regeneration	RG05		Comment	<p>Assessment Summary.</p> <p>Your summary states that overall the use of this GREENBELT site for building 231/234 houses would have an overall neutral impact. (On what?).</p> <p>On Cleadon Village residents it would have a MASSIVELY NEGATIVE impact.</p> <p>(On East Boldon residents it would have a lesser but still significant NEGATIVE impact.)</p> <p>Cleadon Village has got to the point where the facilities and infrastructure of a village have been saturated (schools, medical facilities, shops, parking, road accessibility, unmaintained parks, roads and pavements etc.)</p> <p>Adding even more load to this infrastructure just cannot be accommodated (together with major planned housing developments at</p>

							neighbouring sites H3.2,H3.3 and RG5, H3.59 this is 1310 households being added in (477) or within 200 metres (833) of the Cleadon Parish boundary). I respectfully suggest you abandon this part of your building plan on H3.70.
ST1980	Ahsan Ahmed		08 Regeneration	RG05		Comment	<p>Assessment Summary.</p> <p>Your summary states that overall the use of this GREENBELT site for building 231/234 houses would have an overall neutral impact. (On what?).</p> <p>On Cleadon Village residents it would have a MASSIVELY NEGATIVE impact.</p> <p>(On East Boldon residents it would have a lesser but still significant NEGATIVE impact.)</p> <p>Cleadon Village has got to the point where the facilities and infrastructure of a village have been saturated (schools, medical facilities, shops, parking, road accessibility, unmaintained parks, roads and pavements etc.)</p> <p>Adding even more load to this infrastructure just cannot be accommodated (together with major planned housing developments at neighbouring sites H3.2,H3.3 and RG5, H3.59 this is 1310 households being added in (477) or within 200 metres (833) of the Cleadon Parish boundary).</p> <p>I respectfully suggest you abandon this part of your building plan on H3.70.</p>
ST1993	Christine Crake		08 Regeneration	RG08		Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The draft Local Plan identifies the potential for the development of a brownfield site within the Forum Area at Cleadon Lane Industrial Estate. I believe that this area of brownfield land should be used in preference to Green Belt land and that its use should be prioritised (along with other brownfield sites throughout the Borough) in preference to existing Green Belt sites. This should be an explicit requirement of the Local Plan.</li> </ul>
ST1994	Jane Drummond		08 Regeneration	RG08		Support	<p>4.2 The draft Local Plan identifies the potential for the development of a brownfield site within the Forum Area at Cleadon Lane Industrial Estate. I believe that this area of brownfield land should be used in preference to Green Belt land and that its use should be prioritised (along with other brownfield sites throughout the Borough) in preference to existing Green Belt sites. This should be an explicit requirement of the Local Plan.</p>

ST2009	Eileen Thompson		08 Regeneration	RG05		Support	<p>Policy RG5 Cleadon Lane Mixed –Use Regeneration Site – Support with reservations</p> <p>I support the regeneration of the Cleadon Lane Industrial Estate, especially to replace the worn out and under used land and buildings. However it is vitally important to protect and support the viable businesses trading there as well.</p> <p>So we support the allocation of employment land and this allocation should contain the existing viable businesses.</p> <p>I support the allocation of some of the brown field land for housing; however the number and type of homes provided should be to meet local needs only.</p> <p>Any development must be sensitive to the Green Belt and Tiledsheds Burn Local Wildlife Site to the north of the allocation. I would support the removal of the culverted section of the watercourse to restore the Tiledsheds Burn through the site.</p>
ST2010	Joe Thompson		08 Regeneration	RG08		Support	<p>4.2 The draft Local Plan identifies the potential for the development of a brownfield site within the Forum Area at Cleadon Lane Industrial Estate. I believe that this area of brownfield land should be used in preference to Green Belt land and that its use should be prioritised (along with other brownfield sites throughout the Borough) in preference to existing Green Belt sites. This should be an explicit requirement of the Local Plan.</p>
ST2015	Jane Arthurs		08 Regeneration	RG05		Comment	<p>Policy RG5 Cleadon Lane Mixed –Use Regeneration Site</p> <p>I support the regeneration of the Cleadon Lane Industrial Estate, replacing the worn- out and under-used land and buildings. However, it is vitally important to protect and support the viable businesses trading there as well. I support the allocation of some of the brown field land for housing with the proviso that the number and type of homes provided should be to meet local needs only.</p> <p>Any development must be sensitive to the Green Belt and Tiledsheds Burn Local Wildlife Site to the north of the allocation. I would support the removal of the culverted section of the watercourse to restore the Tiledsheds Burn through the site.</p>
ST2104	Andrew Hodgson		08 Regeneration	RG05		Comment	<p>Assessment Summary.</p> <p>Your summary states that overall the use of this GREENBELT site for building 231/234 houses would have an overall neutral impact. (On what?).</p> <p>On Cleadon Village residents it would have a MASSIVELY NEGATIVE impact.</p>

							<p>(On East Boldon residents it would have a lesser but still significant NEGATIVE impact.)</p> <p>Cleadon Village has got to the point where the facilities and infrastructure of a village have been saturated (schools, medical facilities, shops, parking, road accessibility, unmaintained parks, roads and pavements etc.)</p> <p>Adding even more load to this infrastructure just cannot be accommodated (together with major planned housing developments at neighbouring sites H3.2,H3.3 and RG5, H3.59 this is 1310 households being added in (477) or within 200 metres (833) of the Cleadon Parish boundary).</p> <p>I respectfully suggest you abandon this part of your building plan on H3.70.</p>
ST2105	Gillian Hodgson		08 Regeneration	RG05		Comment	<p>Assessment Summary.</p> <p>Your summary states that overall the use of this GREENBELT site for building 231/234 houses would have an overall neutral impact. (On what?).</p> <p>On Cleadon Village residents it would have a MASSIVELY NEGATIVE impact.</p> <p>(On East Boldon residents it would have a lesser but still significant NEGATIVE impact.)</p> <p>Cleadon Village has got to the point where the facilities and infrastructure of a village have been saturated (schools, medical facilities, shops, parking, road accessibility, unmaintained parks, roads and pavements etc.)</p> <p>Adding even more load to this infrastructure just cannot be accommodated (together with major planned housing developments at neighbouring sites H3.2,H3.3 and RG5, H3.59 this is 1310 households being added in (477) or within 200 metres (833) of the Cleadon Parish boundary).</p> <p>I respectfully suggest you abandon this part of your building plan on H3.70.</p>
ST2111	Nicola Reed		08 Regeneration	RG01		Observation	<p>It is considered that in order to make policy RG1 effective, the information contained within Policy H3 with regard to the number of dwellings and area for residential development, should be included within Policy RG1.</p> <p>The policy wording and supporting text does not identify which areas of the each regeneration site is best placed for residential and it is assumed</p>

							<p>that this will be decided following full technical assessment of the site. Including an approximate number of units and area for residential should assist with this however the policy should include for sufficient flexibility to ensure applications can make best use of the site without unnecessary limitations.</p> <p>Paragraph 8.6 of the supporting text states that the Council have undertaken or facilitated a range of site investigations for the majority of the sites. The outcome of this and any viability considerations are not publically available in order to demonstrate that sites remain deliverable and viable.</p> <p>As mentioned in our representation to policy H1, Smith's Dock, over the opposite side of the river took approximately 20 years to provide remediation sufficient for development on site. Persimmon Homes consider that significant time and developer expenses should be factored into the projection of housing coming from the site.</p>
ST2111	Nicola Reed		08 Regeneration	RG02		Observation	As a general comment, this policy requires the submission of a Transport Assessment for a scheme of 65 and 48 dwellings. This conflicts with the South Tyneside Council Validation Checklist which suggests that a scheme of this size should only submit a Transport Statement.
ST2111	Nicola Reed		08 Regeneration	RG03		Observation	As a general comment, this policy requires the submission of a Transport Assessment for a scheme of 65 and 48 dwellings. This conflicts with the South Tyneside Council Validation Checklist which suggests that a scheme of this size should only submit a Transport Statement.
ST2112	Neil Westwick		08 Regeneration	R05		Objection	<p>Whilst our client recognises the importance of re-using brownfield land, draft Policy S5 and paragraph 4.32 of the supporting text state that the re-use of such land will be prioritised. However, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (February 2019, amended June 2019) does not prioritise the redevelopment of brownfield land over greenfield sites. The NPPF instead refers to making as much use as possible of brownfield land (para. 117). Further, it would be illogical to prioritise a brownfield site that is unsuitable for the proposed use.</p> <p>To ensure a sound Plan that is consistent with the NPPF (para. 35) and which does not limit the development of other sustainable sites, our client suggests the following changes:</p> <p>Policy S5:  “Wherever viable, we will support prioritise the re-use of brownfield land (including despoiled, degraded, derelict and contaminated land) within</p>

							or immediately adjoining the Main Urban Area or Villages provided proposals are appropriate in scale, size and role of the settlement and are consistent with the other policies of this Plan.”
ST2112	Neil Westwick		08 Regeneration	4.32		Objection	<p>Whilst our client recognises the importance of re-using brownfield land, draft Policy S5 and paragraph 4.32 of the supporting text state that the re-use of such land will be prioritised. However, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (February 2019, amended June 2019) does not prioritise the redevelopment of brownfield land over greenfield sites. The NPPF instead refers to making as much use as possible of brownfield land (para. 117). Further, it would be illogical to prioritise a brownfield site that is unsuitable for the proposed use.</p> <p>To ensure a sound Plan that is consistent with the NPPF (para. 35) and which does not limit the development of other sustainable sites, our client suggests the following changes:</p> <p>Paragraph 4.32:  “The use of suitable brownfield sites within the built up areas should always be supported given priority over less sustainable greenfield sites.”</p>
ST2170	Natasha Rowland		08 Regeneration	RG07		support	<p>NT strongly supports proposals that maximise the use of existing developed sites within the Foreshore Area, where there are opportunities for regeneration and improvements to provide new opportunities for the residents of South Tyneside. This is reinforced through the regeneration policies of the plan and we specifically lend our support to policy RG6 Foreshore Improvement Area which identifies a need for Public realm improvements and development of sporting leisure facilities at Gypsies Green, (as defined on the Policies Map); There are significant opportunities that could be realised here for the health and well-being of residents in South Tyneside.</p>
ST2170	Natasha Rowland		08 Regeneration	8.22		comment	<p>Whilst para 8.22 recognises the importance of the Gypsies Green facility, we consider that the Plan could be more aspirational in seeking to drive the desired improvements in this area. For example, it could recognise the significant opportunity which exists to bring Stakeholders together in a collaborative approach to work in partnership to bring about the desired change in the site. The policy could also helpfully provide more explicit guidance in this foreshore location. Outlining development parameters which would guide future development in this location together with a guide on uses which might support the improvement of the sporting facilities. We would highlight that the RG6 designation does</p>

							not appear to be identified on the policies map which appears to be an error in printing.
ST2181	Cleadon and East Boldon Branch Labour Party		08 Regeneration	R01		support	<p>We support the regeneration of the Cleadon Lane Industrial Estate, especially to replace the worn out and under used land and buildings. However it is vitally important to protect and support the viable businesses trading there as well.</p> <p>So we support the allocation of employment land and this allocation should contain the existing viable businesses.</p> <p>We support the allocation of some of the brown field land for housing; however the number and type of homes provided should be to meet local needs only.</p> <p>Any development must be sensitive to the Green Belt and Tiledsheds Burn Local Wildlife Site to the north of the allocation. We would support the removal of the culverted section of the watercourse to restore the Tiledsheds Burn through the site.</p>
ST2191	Una Goodman	Resident	08 Regeneration	RG05		Objection	The site labelled RG 5, currently an absolute eyesore as it has been ever since O'Briens occupied and then abandoned the place. This is surely a site that should be purchased by the council on behalf of S. Tyneside residents and made in to a car park. However the plan indicates 245 new houses, 245!!!
ST2223	Roy Wilburn	Resident	08 Regeneration	RG05		Comment	10.0'Brien site could be better utilized.
ST2239	Neale Thompson	Resident	08 Regeneration	RG05		Comment	<p>Assessment Summary: Your summary states that overall the use of this GREENBELT site for building 231/234 houses would have an overall neutral impact. (On what?). On Cleadon Village residents it would have a MASSIVELY NEGATIVE impact. (On East Boldon residents it would have a lesser but still significant NEGATIVE impact.) Cleadon Village has got to the point where the facilities and infrastructure of a village have been saturated (schools, medical facilities, shops, parking, road accessibility etc.) Adding even more load to this infrastructure just cannot be accommodated (together with major planned housing developments at neighbouring sites H3.2,H3.3 and RG5, H3.59 this is 1310 households being added in (477) or within 200 metres (833) of the Cleadon Parish boundary). I respectfully suggest you abandon this part of your building plan on H3.70.</p>
ST2273	Kevin Griffiths	Resident	08 Regeneration	RG05		Comment	<p>Assessment Summary.</p> <p>Your summary states that overall the use of this GREENBELT site for building 231/234 houses would have an overall neutral impact. (On</p>

						<p>what?).</p> <p>On Cleadon Village residents it would have a MASSIVELY NEGATIVE impact.</p> <p>(On East Boldon residents it would have a lesser but still significant NEGATIVE impact.)</p> <p>Cleadon Village has got to the point where the facilities and infrastructure of a village have been saturated (schools, medical facilities, shops, parking, road accessibility etc.)</p> <p>Adding even more load to this infrastructure just cannot be accommodated (together with major planned housing developments at neighbouring sites H3.2,H3.3 and RG5, H3.59 this is 1310 households being added in (477) or within 200 metres (833) of the Cleadon Parish boundary).</p> <p>I respectfully suggest you abandon this part of your building plan on H3.70.</p>
ST2277	Luisa Mordain	Resident	08 Regeneration	RG05	Comment	<p>Assessment Summary.</p> <p>Your summary states that overall the use of this GREENBELT site for building 231/234 houses would have an overall neutral impact. (On what?).</p> <p>On Cleadon Village residents it would have a MASSIVELY NEGATIVE impact.</p> <p>(On East Boldon residents it would have a lesser but still significant NEGATIVE impact.)</p> <p>Cleadon Village has got to the point where the facilities and infrastructure of a village have been saturated (schools, medical facilities, shops, parking, road accessibility, unmaintained parks, roads and pavements etc.)</p> <p>Adding even more load to this infrastructure just cannot be accommodated (together with major planned housing developments at neighbouring sites H3.2,H3.3 and RG5, H3.59 this is 1310 households being added in (477) or within 200 metres (833) of the Cleadon Parish boundary).</p> <p>I respectfully suggest you abandon this part of your building plan on H3.70.</p>
ST2285	Gillan Gibson		08 Regeneration	RG05	Object	<p>RG5 Land at Cleadon Lane Industrial Estate and Policy RG5: Cleadon Lane Mixed-Use Regeneration Site - Objection to this site being developed under Policies H3 and RG5.</p> <p>Developing site RG5 for housing is in direct conflict with Policy NE9 which</p>

						<p>focuses on contaminated land and ground stability which states:</p> <p>“ Where the future users or occupiers of a proposed development would be affected by contamination or ground stability issues, applicants must:</p> <p>a) Carry out investigations to assess the nature and extent of contamination or ground stability issues and the effect it may have on the development and its future users, biodiversity, the natural and built environment; and</p> <p>b) Set out detailed measures, as appropriate, to allow the development to go ahead without adverse effect, including:</p> <p>i. Removing the contamination;</p> <p>ii. Treating the contamination;</p> <p>iii. Protecting the development from the effects of the contamination;</p> <p>iv. Validation of mitigation measures; and</p> <p>v. Addressing land stability issues.</p> <p>Where measures are needed to allow the development to go ahead safely and without adverse effect, these will be required as a condition of any planning permission.”</p> <p>The land proposed for development is the site previously occupied by O’Briens Waste Management Contractors and also demolition contractors who are licensed to remove asbestos, their website states “We have held a full HSE removal licence since 1983 and are full members of the Asbestos Removal Contractors Association (ARCA). The proposed development of some housing on Cleadon Lane Industrial Estate (RG 5 SBC010) will also have a negative impact on health and wellbeing so contradicts Policy S3 as this land is believed to be contaminated, most recently by asbestos which was stored at this site. Building on this site risks posing a long term health risk to the community, and to any future resident of this site. CPRE is aware that at least 12 feet of land has already been removed from this site and replaced, even so it is essential the land is fully assessed to ensure it will be suitable for development.</p> <p>Policy RG 5 states:</p> <p>“iv Consideration should be given to the removal of the culverted section of the watercourse.</p> <p>v Proposals should be supported by a site-specific flood risk assessment.”</p> <p>CPRE understands this means opening up the “culverted section of the watercourse” to help mitigate flooding problems on this site. This risks an environmental disaster as CPRE understands the land is contaminated</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>with asbestos, draining this land into the River Don would pose a serious, long term health risk to people and animals and the surrounding land.</p> <p>RG 5 is in direct conflict with policy NE6 which is concerned with flood risk and water management. Policy NE6 states</p> <p>“Flood risk will be taken into account at all stages in the planning process to avoid inappropriate development in areas at current or future risk of flooding... Where applicable, development proposals will be expected to be designed to mitigate against urban creep and adapt to climate change, taking account of flood risk...”</p> <p>This clearly is not the case in proposing to develop this sites] with at least 245</p> <p>Developing RG5 contradicts Policy NE11 as it will cause a rise in water pollution in the River Don. Paragraph 11.59 relating to this policy states:</p> <p>“Pollution is the release of substances into the environment that can cause harm to human health, property and any other living organism supported by the wider environment. Pollution can affect our quality of life, our health and wellbeing and the wider environment.”</p> <p>Any development at site RG5 totally contradicts this statement.</p> <p>Are STC putting the need to develop before public health and potential harm to the environment?</p> <p>Developing RG5 conflicts with Policy NE7 which sets out to protect water quality. This policy states:</p> <p>The rivers in the Borough, their banks and tributaries will be protected from damaging development and, where appropriate, enhanced. The quantity and quality of surface and groundwater bodies shall be protected and where possible enhanced. New development that discharges into a watercourse or is adjacent to a watercourse or discharges to ground will be required to incorporate appropriate water pollution control measures and consider opportunities to reduce detrimental impacts including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a) Naturalising watercourse channels;</li><li>b) Improving the biodiversity and ecological connectivity of watercourses;</li><li>c) Safeguarding and enlarging river buffers with appropriate habitat;</li><li>d) Mitigating diffuse agricultural and urban pollution;</li><li>e) Progressively reducing the pollution of groundwater and prevent or limit the entry of pollutants, particularly in high vulnerability areas;</li><li>f) Seeking opportunities to incorporate creation of wetland habitat in</li></ul>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>designs where appropriate;</p> <p>g) Ensuring that development does not fragment a wildlife corridor;</p> <p>h) Preventing introduction of non-native species via construction or other works and managing present invasive non-native species where practical; and</p> <p>i) Contributing towards achieving good status for all water bodies or, for heavily modified water bodies and artificial water bodies, good ecological potential and good surface water chemical status.</p> <p>Watercourses should be left with an appropriately sized, development-free buffer zone on both sides of the channel. The width required will be dependent on the specifics of the site and the nature of the development. Consideration must be given to current and future mine water and groundwater levels and the interaction with SuDS.</p> <p>Where the drainage will be connected to a watercourse or to groundwater all development will need to carry out a site specific water quality risk assessment which may identify the need for SuDS to treat the run off from the development. The simple index approach in the CIRIA SuDs Manual is the minimum required assessment. This is to ensure that there is no detrimental impact to the watercourse or groundwater.</p> <p>Where other developments are proposed in the same vicinity, a coordinated approach to surface water management will be encouraged and applicants should explore the feasibility of installing shared outfalls to reduce detrimental impacts. Development will not be permitted where it would have an adverse impact on water dependent Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) and Natura 2000 sites.</p> <p>Developing RG 5 will have a negative impact on everything Policy NE7 seeks to protect. In particular any development and opening of water culverts at RG 5 will have an “adverse impact on water dependent Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) and Natura 2000 sites.’ at nearby Boldon Flats (SSSI) also Nature reserves at Tiledsheds and Netwon Garths which are situated at very close proximity to this site and in the same water course channel. To implement Policy NE7 development at site RG 5 should “not be permitted”</p> <p>Developing RG 5 will reduce the gap, in terms of distance, between Boldon and South Shields and would increase pressure on the remainder. If the gap were to be reduced here then it would become more difficult to reduce pressure to eliminate it completely between Newton Garths and Shields Road, thereby merging Boldon and Cleadon with South</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>Shields thus contradicting Policy S1.</p> <p>Land at Cleadon Lane Industrial Estate - Whilst CPRE promotes the use of brownfield sites. There are concerns about housing on this site:</p> <p>In addition CPRE considers:</p> <p>Developing site RG5 for housing is in direct conflict with Policy NE9 which focusses on contaminated land and ground stability which states:</p> <p>“ Where the future users or occupiers of a proposed development would be affected by contamination or ground stability issues, applicants must:</p> <p>a) Carry out investigations to assess the nature and extent of contamination or ground stability issues and the effect it may have on the development and its future users, biodiversity, the natural and built environment; and</p> <p>b) Set out detailed measures, as appropriate, to allow the development to go ahead without adverse effect, including:</p> <p>i. Removing the contamination;</p> <p>ii. Treating the contamination;</p> <p>iii. Protecting the development from the effects of the contamination;</p> <p>iv. Validation of mitigation measures; and</p> <p>v. Addressing land stability issues.</p> <p>Where measures are needed to allow the development to go ahead safely and without adverse effect, these will be required as a condition of any planning permission.”</p> <p>The land proposed for development is the site previously occupied by O’Briens Waste Management Contractors and also demolition contractors who are licensed to remove asbestos, their website states “We have held a full HSE removal licence since 1983 and are full members of the Asbestos Removal Contractors Association (ARCA). The proposed development of some housing on Cleadon Lane Industrial Estate (RG 5 SBC010) will also have a negative impact on health and wellbeing so contradicts Policy S3 as this land is believed to be contaminated, most recently by asbestos which was stored at this site. Building on this site risks posing a long term health risk to the community, and to any future resident of this site. CPRE is aware that at least 12 feet of land has already been removed from this site and replaced, even so it is essential the land is fully assessed to ensure it will be suitable for development.</p> <p>Policy RG 5 states:</p> <p>“iv Consideration should be given to the removal of the culverted section</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>of the watercourse.</p> <p>v Proposals should be supported by a site-specific flood risk assessment.” CPRE understands this means opening up the “culverted section of the watercourse” to help mitigate flooding problems on this site. This risks an environmental disaster as CPRE understands the land is contaminated with asbestos, draining this land into the River Don would pose a serious, long term health risk to people and animals and the surrounding land. RG 5 is in direct conflict with policy Policy NE6 which is concerned with flood risk and water management. Policy NE6 states “Flood risk will be taken into account at all stages in the planning process to avoid inappropriate development in areas at current or future risk of flooding... Where applicable, development proposals will be expected to be designed to mitigate against urban creep and adapt to climate change, taking account of flood risk...”</p> <p>This clearly is not the case in proposing to develop this sites] with at least 245</p> <p>Developing RG5 contradicts Policy NE11 as it will cause a rise in water pollution in the River Don. Paragraph 11.59 relating to this policy states: “Pollution is the release of substances into the environment that can cause harm to human health, property and any other living organism supported by the wider environment. Pollution can affect our quality of life, our health and wellbeing and the wider environment.”</p> <p>Any development at site RG5 totally contradicts this statement. Are STC putting the need to develop before public health and potential harm to the environment?</p> <p>Developing RG5 conflicts with Policy NE7 which sets out to protect water quality. This policy states:</p> <p>The rivers in the Borough, their banks and tributaries will be protected from damaging development and, where appropriate, enhanced. The quantity and quality of surface and groundwater bodies shall be protected and where possible enhanced.</p> <p>New development that discharges into a watercourse or is adjacent to a watercourse or discharges to ground will be required to incorporate appropriate water pollution control measures and consider opportunities to reduce detrimental impacts including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a) Naturalising watercourse channels;</li><li>b) Improving the biodiversity and ecological connectivity of watercourses;</li></ul>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>c) Safeguarding and enlarging river buffers with appropriate habitat; d) Mitigating diffuse agricultural and urban pollution; e) Progressively reducing the pollution of groundwater and prevent or limit the entry of pollutants, particularly in high vulnerability areas; f) Seeking opportunities to incorporate creation of wetland habitat in designs where appropriate; g) Ensuring that development does not fragment a wildlife corridor; h) Preventing introduction of non-native species via construction or other works and managing present invasive non-native species where practical; and i) Contributing towards achieving good status for all water bodies or, for heavily modified water bodies and artificial water bodies, good ecological potential and good surface water chemical status.</p> <p>Watercourses should be left with an appropriately sized, development-free buffer zone on both sides of the channel. The width required will be dependent on the specifics of the site and the nature of the development. Consideration must be given to current and future mine water and groundwater levels and the interaction with SuDS. Where the drainage will be connected to a watercourse or to groundwater all development will need to carry out a site specific water quality risk assessment which may identify the need for SuDS to treat the run off from the development. The simple index approach in the CIRIA SuDs Manual is the minimum required assessment. This is to ensure that there is no detrimental impact to the watercourse or groundwater. Where other developments are proposed in the same vicinity, a coordinated approach to surface water management will be encouraged and applicants should explore the feasibility of installing shared outfalls to reduce detrimental impacts. Development will not be permitted where it would have an adverse impact on water dependent Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) and Natura 2000 sites.</p> <p>Developing RG 5 will have a negative impact on everything Policy NE7 seeks to protect. In particular any development and opening of water culverts at RG 5 will have an “adverse impact on water dependent Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) and Natura 2000 sites.’ at nearby Boldon Flats (SSSI) also Nature reserves at Tiledsheds and Netwon Garths which are situated at very close proximity to this site and in the same</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>water course channel. To implement Policy NE7 development at site RG 5 should “not be permitted”</p> <p>Developing RG 5 will reduce the gap, in terms of distance, between Boldon and South Shields and would increase pressure on the remainder. If the gap were to be reduced here then it would become more difficult to reduce pressure to eliminate it completely between Newton Garths and Shields Road, thereby merging Boldon and Cleadon with South Shields thus contradicting Policy S1.</p> <p>Cleadon Lane Mixed-use Regeneration Site (Strategic Policy) (Map) - CPRE supports Policy RG5</p> <p>RG5 Land at Cleadon Lane Industrial Estate and Policy RG5: Cleadon Lane Mixed-Use Regeneration Site - Objection to this site being developed under Policies H3 and RG5.</p> <p>Developing site RG5 for housing is in direct conflict with Policy NE9 which focusses on contaminated land and ground stability which states:</p> <p>“ Where the future users or occupiers of a proposed development would be affected by contamination or ground stability issues, applicants must:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Carry out investigations to assess the nature and extent of contamination or ground stability issues and the effect it may have on the development and its future users, biodiversity, the natural and built environment; and</li> <li>b) Set out detailed measures, as appropriate, to allow the development to go ahead without adverse effect, including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Removing the contamination;</li> <li>ii. Treating the contamination;</li> <li>iii. Protecting the development from the effects of the contamination;</li> <li>iv. Validation of mitigation measures; and</li> <li>v. Addressing land stability issues.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p>Where measures are needed to allow the development to go ahead safely and without adverse effect, these will be required as a condition of any planning permission.”</p> <p>The land proposed for development is the site previously occupied by O’Briens Waste Management Contractors and also demolition contractors who are licensed to remove asbestos, their website states “We have held a full HSE removal licence since 1983 and are full members of the Asbestos Removal Contractors Association (ARCA). The proposed development of some housing on Cleadon Lane Industrial Estate (RG 5 SBC010) will also have a negative impact on health and</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>wellbeing so contradicts Policy S3 as this land is believed to be contaminated, most recently by asbestos which was stored at this site. Building on this site risks posing a long term health risk to the community, and to any future resident of this site. CPRE is aware that at least 12 feet of land has already been removed from this site and replaced, even so it is essential the land is fully assessed to ensure it will be suitable for development.</p> <p>Policy RG 5 states:</p> <p>“iv Consideration should be given to the removal of the culverted section of the watercourse.</p> <p>v Proposals should be supported by a site-specific flood risk assessment.”</p> <p>CPRE understands this means opening up the “culverted section of the watercourse” to help mitigate flooding problems on this site. This risks an environmental disaster as CPRE understands the land is contaminated with asbestos, draining this land into the River Don would pose a serious, long term health risk to people and animals and the surrounding land.</p> <p>RG 5 is in direct conflict with policy Policy NE6 which is concerned with flood risk and water management. Policy NE6 states</p> <p>“Flood risk will be taken into account at all stages in the planning process to avoid inappropriate development in areas at current or future risk of flooding... Where applicable, development proposals will be expected to be designed to mitigate against urban creep and adapt to climate change, taking account of flood risk...”</p> <p>This clearly is not the case in proposing to develop this sites] with at least 245</p> <p>Developing RG5 contradicts Policy NE11 as it will cause a rise in water pollution in the River Don. Paragraph 11.59 relating to this policy states:</p> <p>“Pollution is the release of substances into the environment that can cause harm to human health, property and any other living organism supported by the wider environment. Pollution can affect our quality of life, our health and wellbeing and the wider environment.”</p> <p>Any development at site RG5 totally contradicts this statement.</p> <p>Are STC putting the need to develop before public health and potential harm to the environment?</p> <p>Developing RG5 conflicts with Policy NE7 which sets out to protect water quality. This policy states:</p> <p>The rivers in the Borough, their banks and tributaries will be protected from damaging development and, where appropriate, enhanced. The</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>quantity and quality of surface and groundwater bodies shall be protected and where possible enhanced. New development that discharges into a watercourse or is adjacent to a watercourse or discharges to ground will be required to incorporate appropriate water pollution control measures and consider opportunities to reduce detrimental impacts including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a) Naturalising watercourse channels;</li><li>b) Improving the biodiversity and ecological connectivity of watercourses;</li><li>c) Safeguarding and enlarging river buffers with appropriate habitat;</li><li>d) Mitigating diffuse agricultural and urban pollution;</li><li>e) Progressively reducing the pollution of groundwater and prevent or limit the entry of pollutants, particularly in high vulnerability areas;</li><li>f) Seeking opportunities to incorporate creation of wetland habitat in designs where appropriate;</li><li>g) Ensuring that development does not fragment a wildlife corridor;</li><li>h) Preventing introduction of non-native species via construction or other works and managing present invasive non-native species where practical; and</li><li>i) Contributing towards achieving good status for all water bodies or, for heavily modified water bodies and artificial water bodies, good ecological potential and good surface water chemical status.</li></ul> <p>Watercourses should be left with an appropriately sized, development-free buffer zone on both sides of the channel. The width required will be dependent on the specifics of the site and the nature of the development. Consideration must be given to current and future mine water and groundwater levels and the interaction with SuDS. Where the drainage will be connected to a watercourse or to groundwater all development will need to carry out a site specific water quality risk assessment which may identify the need for SuDS to treat the run off from the development. The simple index approach in the CIRIA SuDs Manual is the minimum required assessment. This is to ensure that there is no detrimental impact to the watercourse or groundwater. Where other developments are proposed in the same vicinity, a coordinated approach to surface water management will be encouraged and applicants should explore the feasibility of installing shared outfalls to reduce detrimental impacts. Development will not be permitted</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

							<p>where it would have an adverse impact on water dependent Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) and Natura 2000 sites.</p> <p>Developing RG 5 will have a negative impact on everything Policy NE7 seeks to protect. In particular any development and opening of water culverts at RG 5 will have an “adverse impact on water dependent Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) and Natura 2000 sites.’ at nearby Boldon Flats (SSSI) also Nature reserves at Tilesheds and Netwon Garths which are situated at very close proximity to this site and in the same water course channel. To implement Policy NE7 development at site RG 5 should “not be permitted”</p> <p>Developing RG 5 will reduce the gap, in terms of distance, between Boldon and South Shields and would increase pressure on the remainder. If the gap were to be reduced here then it would become more difficult to reduce pressure to eliminate it completely between Newton Garths and Shields Road, thereby merging Boldon and Cleadon with South Shields thus contradicting Policy S1.</p>
ST2285	Gillan Gibson		08 Regeneration	RG01		Support	<p>RG5 Land at Cleadon Lane Industrial Estate and Policy RG5: Cleadon Lane Mixed-Use Regeneration Site - Objection to this site being developed under Policies H3 and RG5.</p> <p>Developing site RG5 for housing is in direct conflict with Policy NE9 which focusses o</p>
ST2285	Gillan Gibson		08 Regeneration	RG02		Support	<p>Tyne Dock housing -led Regeneration site - CPRE supports Policy RG2</p>
ST2285	Gillan Gibson		08 Regeneration	RG03		Support	<p>Winchester Street housing-led Regeneration site - CPRE supports Policy RG3</p>
ST2285	Gillan Gibson		08 Regeneration	RG04		Support	<p>Argyle Street housing-led Regeneration site - CPRE supports Policy RG4</p>
ST2285	Gillan Gibson		08 Regeneration	RG01		Support	<p>RG5 Land at Cleadon Lane Industrial Estate and Policy RG5: Cleadon Lane Mixed-Use Regeneration Site - Objection to this site being developed under Policies H3 and RG5.</p> <p>Developing site RG5 for housing is in direct conflict with Policy NE9 which focusses o</p>
ST2285	Gillan Gibson		08 Regeneration	RG02		Support	<p>Tyne Dock housing -led Regeneration site - CPRE supports Policy RG2</p>
ST2285	Gillan Gibson		08 Regeneration	RG03		Support	<p>Winchester Street housing-led Regeneration site - CPRE supports Policy RG3</p>

ST2285	Gillan Gibson		08 Regeneration	RG04		Support	Argyle Street housing-led Regeneration site - CPRE supports Policy RG4
ST2285	Gillan Gibson		08 Regeneration	RG06		Support	Fowler Street Improvement Area - CPRE supports Policy RG6
ST2285	Gillan Gibson		08 Regeneration	RG07		Support	Foreshore Improvement Area - CPRE supports RG7
ST2337	Peter Arthurs	Resident	08 Regeneration	RG05		Objection	<p>Policy RG5 Cleadon Lane Mixed –Use Regeneration Site</p> <p>I support the regeneration of the Cleadon Lane Industrial Estate, replacing the worn- out and under-used land and buildings. However, it is vitally important to protect and support the viable businesses trading there as well. I support the allocation of some of the brown field land for housing with the proviso that the number and type of homes provided should be to meet local needs only.</p> <p>Any development must be sensitive to the Green Belt and Tilesheds Burn Local Wildlife Site to the north of the allocation. I would support the removal of the culverted section of the watercourse to restore the Tilesheds Burn through the site.</p>
ST2365	Delia McNally	Resident	08 Regeneration	RG05		Support	<p>Policy RG5 Cleadon Lane Mixed –Use Regeneration Site – Support with reservations</p> <p>We support the regeneration of the Cleadon Lane Industrial Estate, especially to replace the worn out and under used land and buildings. However it is vitally important to protect and support the viable businesses trading there as well.</p> <p>So we support the allocation of employment land and this allocation should contain the existing viable businesses.</p> <p>We support the allocation of some of the brown field land for housing; however the number and type of homes provided should be to meet local needs only.</p> <p>Any development must be sensitive to the Green Belt and Tilesheds Burn Local Wildlife Site to the north of the allocation. We would support the removal of the culverted section of the watercourse to restore the Tilesheds Burn through the site.</p>
ST2366	Ian Palmer	Resident	08 Regeneration	RG05		Objection	<p>Assessment Summary.</p> <p>All of these building proposals should be rejected.</p> <p>Your summary states that overall the use of this GREENBELT site for building 231/234 houses would have an overall neutral impact. I disagree. On Cleadon Village residents it would have a MASSIVELY NEGATIVE impact. (On East Boldon residents it would have a lesser but</p>

							still significant NEGATIVE impact.) Cleadon Village has got to the point where the facilities and infrastructure of a village have been saturated (schools, medical facilities, shops, parking, road accessibility etc.) Adding even more load to this infrastructure just cannot be accommodated (together with major planned housing developments at neighbouring sites H3.2,H3.3 and RG5, H3.59 this is 1310 households being added in (477) or within 200 metres (833) of the Cleadon Parish boundary). I respectfully suggest you abandon your building plan on H3.2 and H3.3 and H3.70.
ST2367	Pauline Palmer	Resident	08 Regeneration	RG05		Objection	<p>Assessment Summary.</p> <p>All of these building proposals should be rejected Your summary states that overall the use of this GREENBELT site for building 231/234 houses would have an overall neutral impact. I disagree. On Cleadon Village residents it would have a MASSIVELY NEGATIVE impact. (On East Boldon residents it would have a lesser but still significant NEGATIVE impact.) Cleadon Village has got to the point where the facilities and infrastructure of a village have been saturated (schools, medical facilities, shops, parking, road accessibility etc.) Adding even more load to this infrastructure just cannot be accommodated (together with major planned housing developments at neighbouring sites H3.2,H3.3 and RG5, H3.59 this is 1310 households being added in (477) or within 200 metres (833) of the Cleadon Parish boundary). I respectfully suggest you abandon your building plan on H3.2 and H3.3 and H3.70.</p>
ST2368	Vicki Elsey	Resident	08 Regeneration	RG05		Objection	<p>Assessment Summary.</p> <p>Your summary states that overall the use of this GREENBELT site for building 231/234 houses would have an overall neutral impact. (On what?).</p> <p>On Cleadon Village residents it would have a MASSIVELY NEGATIVE impact.</p> <p>(On East Boldon residents it would have a lesser but still significant NEGATIVE impact.)</p> <p>Cleadon Village has got to the point where the facilities and infrastructure of a village have been saturated (schools, medical facilities, shops, parking, road accessibility etc.)</p> <p>Adding even more load to this infrastructure just cannot be accommodated (together with major planned housing developments at neighbouring sites H3.2,H3.3 and RG5, H3.59 this is 1310 households being added in (477) or within 200 metres (833) of the Cleadon Parish</p>

						boundary).  I respectfully suggest you abandon this part of your building plan on H3.70.
ST2369	Ian Tufts	Resident	08 Regeneration	RG05		<p>Objection</p> <p>Assessment Summary. Your summary states that overall the use of this GREENBELT site for building 231/234 houses would have an overall neutral impact. (On what?). On Cleadon Village residents it would have a MASSIVELY NEGATIVE impact. (On East Boldon residents it would have a lesser but still significant NEGATIVE impact.) Cleadon Village has got to the point where the facilities and infrastructure of a village have been saturated (schools, medical facilities, shops, parking, road accessibility etc.) Adding even more load to this infrastructure just cannot be accommodated (together with major planned housing developments at neighbouring sites H3.2,H3.3 and RG5, H3.59 this is 1310 households being added in (477) or within 200 metres (833) of the Cleadon Parish boundary).</p> <p>I respectfully suggest you abandon this part of your building plan on H3.70.</p>
ST2370	Ashley Thirlwell	Resident	08 Regeneration	RG05		<p>Objection</p> <p>Assessment Summary. Your summary states that overall the use of this GREENBELT site for building 231/234 houses would have an overall neutral impact. (On what?). On Cleadon Village residents it would have a MASSIVELY NEGATIVE impact. (On East Boldon residents it would have a lesser but still significant NEGATIVE impact.) Cleadon Village has got to the point where the facilities and infrastructure of a village have been saturated (schools, medical facilities, shops, parking, road accessibility etc.) Adding even more load to this infrastructure just cannot be accommodated (together with major planned housing developments at neighbouring sites H3.2,H3.3 and RG5, H3.59 this is 1310 households being added in (477) or within 200 metres (833) of the Cleadon Parish</p>

						boundary).  I respectfully suggest you abandon this part of your building plan on H3.70.
ST2377	Louise Bulmer	Resident	08 Regeneration	RG05		<p>Objection</p> <p>Assessment Summary. Your summary states that overall the use of this GREENBELT site for building 231/234 houses would have an overall neutral impact. (On what?). On Cleadon Village residents it would have a MASSIVELY NEGATIVE impact. (On East Boldon residents it would have a lesser but still significant NEGATIVE impact.) Cleadon Village has got to the point where the facilities and infrastructure of a village have been saturated (schools, medical facilities, shops, parking, road accessibility etc.) Adding even more load to this infrastructure just cannot be accommodated (together with major planned housing developments at neighbouring sites H3.2,H3.3 and RG5, H3.59 this is 1310 households being added in (477) or within 200 metres (833) of the Cleadon Parish boundary).</p> <p>I respectfully suggest you abandon this part of your building plan on H3.70.</p>
ST2379	Kathleen Clingly	Resident	08 Regeneration	RG05		<p>Objection</p> <p>Assessment Summary. Your summary states that overall the use of this GREENBELT site for building 231/234 houses would have an overall neutral impact. (On what?). On Cleadon Village residents it would have a MASSIVELY NEGATIVE impact. (On East Boldon residents it would have a lesser but still significant NEGATIVE impact.) Cleadon Village has got to the point where the facilities and infrastructure of a village have been saturated (schools, medical facilities, shops, parking, road accessibility etc.) Adding even more load to this infrastructure just cannot be accommodated (together with major planned housing developments at neighbouring sites H3.2,H3.3 and RG5, H3.59 this is 1310 households being added in (477) or within 200 metres (833) of the Cleadon Parish</p>

							boundary).  I respectfully suggest you abandon this part of your building plan on H3.70.
ST2395	Julie Allison	Resident	08 Regeneration	RG05		Comment	<p>Assessment Summary.</p> <p>Your summary states that overall the use of this GREENBELT site for building 231/234 houses would have an overall neutral impact. (On what?).</p> <p>On Cleadon Village residents it would have a MASSIVELY NEGATIVE impact.</p> <p>(On East Boldon residents it would have a lesser but still significant NEGATIVE impact.)</p> <p>Cleadon Village has got to the point where the facilities and infrastructure of a village have been saturated (schools, medical facilities, shops, parking, road accessibility etc.)</p> <p>Adding even more load to this infrastructure just cannot be accommodated (together with major planned housing developments at neighbouring sites H3.2,H3.3 and RG5, H3.59 this is 1310 households being added in (477) or within 200 metres (833) of the Cleadon Parish boundary).</p> <p>I respectfully suggest you abandon this part of your building plan on H3.70.</p>
ST2404	Rachael Tobin	Resident	08 Regeneration	RG05		Objection	<p><b>4.2</b> The draft Local Plan identifies the potential for the development of a brownfield site within the Forum Area at Cleadon Lane Industrial Estate. I believe that this area of brownfield land should be used in preference to Green Belt land and that its use should be prioritised (along with other brownfield sites throughout the Borough) in preference to existing Green Belt sites. This should be an explicit requirement of the Local Plan. (Ref: draft Local Plan policies RG5 and S5)</p>
ST2426	Philip Ramsey	Resident	08 Regeneration	RG08		Objection	<p>Assessment Summary.</p> <p>Your summary states that overall the use of this GREENBELT site for building 231/234 houses would have an overall neutral impact. (On what?).</p> <p>On Cleadon Village residents it would have a MASSIVELY NEGATIVE impact.</p> <p>(On East Boldon residents it would have a lesser but still significant NEGATIVE impact.)</p>

							<p>Cleadon Village has got to the point where the facilities and infrastructure of a village have been saturated (schools, medical facilities, shops, parking, road accessibility etc.) Adding even more load to this infrastructure just cannot be accommodated (together with major planned housing developments at neighbouring sites H3.2,H3.3 and RG5, H3.59 this is 1310 households being added in (477) or within 200 metres (833) of the Cleadon Parish boundary).</p> <p>I respectfully suggest you abandon this part of your building plan on H3.70.</p>
ST2427	Maria Ramsey	Resident	08 Regeneration	RG08		Objection	<p>Assessment Summary. Your summary states that overall the use of this GREENBELT site for building 231/234 houses would have an overall neutral impact. (On what?). On Cleadon Village residents it would have a MASSIVELY NEGATIVE impact. (On East Boldon residents it would have a lesser but still significant NEGATIVE impact.) Cleadon Village has got to the point where the facilities and infrastructure of a village have been saturated (schools, medical facilities, shops, parking, road accessibility etc.) Adding even more load to this infrastructure just cannot be accommodated (together with major planned housing developments at neighbouring sites H3.2,H3.3 and RG5, H3.59 this is 1310 households being added in (477) or within 200 metres (833) of the Cleadon Parish boundary).</p> <p>I respectfully suggest you abandon this part of your building plan on H3.70.</p>
ST2428	Howard Lawrence	Resident	08 Regeneration	RG08		Support	<p>c) Many of the Policies in the Draft Plan make reference to the development of Brownfield sites, in preference to Greenbelt / green field sites – these principles must be implemented at the Cleadon Lane Industrial Estate regeneration site, by the delivery of 245 homes on the north western part of the site (formerly occupied by O’Brien’s reclamation business). This view is overwhelmingly supported by the East Boldon community, as demonstrated at public consultation events held by EBNF.</p>

							d) This site could deliver all of the new homes required for East Boldon, based upon the findings of an independent Housing Needs Analysis report carried out on behalf of EBNF earlier this year.
ST2428	Howard Lawrence	Resident	08 Regeneration	RG08		Objection	<p>Policy H3 Housing Allocations H3.59, H3.61, H3.65 and RG5 provide for 950 homes and I object to this number.</p> <p>I also object to the location of the proposed allocations within the existing Green Belt. Community consultations have shown strong objections to the development of Green Belt sites. I consider that the exceptional circumstances case has not been made in the Stage One Green Belt Review.</p> <p>I object to the proposed development on Green Belt land, &amp; would comment on the proposed housing allocations as follows:</p>
ST2428	Howard Lawrence	Resident	08 Regeneration	RG05		Comment	<p>Policy RG5</p> <p>a) The draft Local Plan identifies the potential for the development of a brownfield site within the Forum Area at Cleadon Lane Industrial Estate. I believe that this area of brownfield land should be used in preference to Green Belt land and that its use should be prioritised (along with other brownfield sites throughout the Borough) in preference to existing Green Belt sites. This should be an explicit requirement of the Local Plan.</p> <p>b) I fully support the re-use of brownfield sites for housing within the plan area. This has been overwhelmingly confirmed in community consultations. Using some of this site for housing (former O'Briens reclamation premises) will help divert development away from Green Belt land. Unlike the other housing sites proposed in the draft LP, this site has the advantage of close proximity to transport links (Metro &amp; buses) and local shopping facilities.</p> <p>c) However, the Plan does not provide sufficient information about the Council's full, specific &amp; detailed intentions for this strategic site – this information must be provided as a priority.</p> <p>There should be a site specific policy in the Local Plan for this site which requires:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Development to be comprehensively master-planned</li> </ol>

							<p>2. A design code to ensure development of a distinctive neighbourhood that is in keeping with the local area and is sensitive to the proximity of residential and business use.</p> <p>3. The range, size, type and tenure of housing expected on the site to meet housing needs.</p> <p>d) The Site Specific Sustainability Appraisal concludes that this site has a POSITIVE impact. It should therefore be developed in preference to other proposed housing sites (in the Green Belt) which have a NEGATIVE impact.</p> <p>e) The Plan does not adequately deal with the major parking problems which currently exist in the streets around &amp; adjacent to the Metro station. This, coupled with associated traffic issues, is a major concern for most local residents &amp; has been acknowledged &amp; recognised by Council Planners (recent Planning Application for Mayflower Glass Site). This problem will be exacerbated by the addition of 950 homes &amp; 2,000 residents. If the Metro station car park is to be extended, instead of using further Green Belt or green field land, could part of this site on Station Approach (former O'Briens showrooms) not be utilised for this purpose?</p>
ST2441	Ann Walker		08 Regeneration	RG08		Objection	<p>Assessment Summary.</p> <p>Your summary states that overall the use of this GREENBELT site for building 231/234 houses would have an overall neutral impact. (On what?).</p> <p>On Cleadon Village residents it would have a MASSIVELY NEGATIVE impact.</p> <p>(On East Boldon residents it would have a lesser but still significant NEGATIVE impact.)</p> <p>Cleadon Village has got to the point where the facilities and infrastructure of a village have been saturated (schools, medical facilities, shops, parking, road accessibility etc.)</p> <p>Adding even more load to this infrastructure just cannot be accommodated (together with major planned housing developments at neighbouring sites H3.2,H3.3 and RG5, H3.59 this is 1310 households being added in (477) or within 200 metres (833) of the Cleadon Parish boundary).</p>

							I respectfully suggest you abandon this part of your building plan on H3.70.
ST2548	Beryl Massam	Resident	08 Regeneration	RG05		Objection	11) It is most likely that the residents of RG5 and the current new-build opposite RG5 will travel up Station Road, and with H3.61 will travel along the A184 towards the A19. This road is already bumper-to-bumper at certain times of the day, so the increased traffic will no doubt add to air pollution. Given that there have recently been media reports about the damage being done to young lungs as children walk to/from school, it seems that the children walking to from East Boldon Infants and Juniors will be at higher risk. This will also apply to Boldon Comprehensive as New Road will have a considerably increased bumper-to-bumper traffic flow from H3.59 and H3.68.
ST2583	A Blythman	Resident	08 Regeneration	RG05		Comment	<p>Assessment Summary.</p> <p>All of these building proposals should be rejected. Your summary states that overall the use of this GREENBELT site for building 231/234 houses would have an overall neutral impact. I disagree. On Cleadon Village residents it would have a MASSIVELY NEGATIVE impact. (On East Boldon residents it would have a lesser but still significant NEGATIVE impact.) Cleadon Village has got to the point where the facilities and infrastructure of a village have been saturated (schools, medical facilities, shops, parking, road accessibility etc.) Adding even more load to this infrastructure just cannot be accommodated (together with major planned housing developments at neighbouring sites H3.2,H3.3 and RG5, H3.59 this is 1310 households being added in (477) or within 200 metres (833) of the Cleadon Parish boundary).</p> <p>I respectfully suggest you abandon your building plan on H3.2 and H3.3 and H3.70.</p>
ST0195	Joan Mortsen	Resident	08 Regeneration	RG05		Comment	<p>Assessment Summary.</p> <p>All of these building proposals should be rejected. Your summary states that overall the use of this GREENBELT site for building 231/234 houses would have an overall neutral impact. I disagree. On Cleadon Village residents it would have a MASSIVELY NEGATIVE impact. (On East Boldon residents it would have a lesser but still significant NEGATIVE impact.) Cleadon Village has got to the point where the facilities and infrastructure of a village have been saturated (schools, medical facilities, shops, parking, road accessibility etc.) Adding even more load to this infrastructure just cannot be accommodated (together with major planned housing developments at neighbouring sites H3.2,H3.3 and RG5,</p>

							<p>H3.59 this is 1310 households being added in (477) or within 200 metres (833) of the Cleadon Parish boundary).</p> <p>I respectfully suggest you abandon your building plan on H3.2 and H3.3 and H3.70.</p>
ST2443	Mr T. and Mrs M. Betteridge		08 Regeneration	ROG5		Objection	<p>We object to the large number of new homes proposed for Cleadon and East Boldon. Section 5 of your South Tyneside Pre-Publication Draft sates ‘... the quality of the immediate surroundings, is one of the most important factors affecting quality of life’. It also says that the Plan aims to ‘to support healthy, safe and sustainable communities’ by providing accommodation ‘in attractive, safe and sustainable neighbourhoods’. In Cleadon Village and East Boldon where we live, 1127 new homes are proposed for four large sites, H3.70 (231), RG5 (245), H3.59 (588), and H3.61 (63), three of which are green belt. We think that such a large number of new homes is unnecessary in the relatively small area (as compared with South Tyneside) of Cleadon and the Boldons. Such a large housing increase is bound to cause the aforementioned quality of life in the community to deteriorate significantly in a number of ways. Elsewhere in the Draft (paragraph 4.35), it is acknowledged that ‘The NPPF states that the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt is inappropriate’. We think this applies just as much in Cleadon and East Boldon as elsewhere, and we consider that building on green belt land is neither necessary nor desirable, in this case. Preference should be given to the reuse of all ‘brownfield’ sites before considering any green belt areas.</p>
ST2460	Sonia Ali		08 Regeneration	ROG5		Objection	<p>Policy S3 conflicts with Policy NE9 which deals with contaminated land. The proposed development of some housing on Cleadon Lane Industrial Estate (RG 5 SBC010) will also have a negative impact on health and wellbeing as this land is contaminated most recently by asbestos which was stored at this site. This land was owned by O’Briens, a demolition contractor who licensed to remove asbestos, their website states “We have held a full HSE removal licence since 1983 and are full members of the Asbestos Removal Contractors Association (ARCA)”. Building on this site will pose a long term health risk to the community.</p> <p>Policy S5 does not enhance biodiversity as Cleadon Lane Industrial Estate until very recently stored asbestos. As asbestos is a naturally found mineral it doesn’t pose a threat until broken or disturbed. Once released into the air, the toxin becomes extremely harmful for humans if ingested</p>

						<p>or inhaled. I understand that a culvert, which flows into the River Don, is to be reopened on this site to accommodate housing, this will have a negative impact on the biodiversity of this river as the River Don will become contaminated by asbestos from this site, if it has not already done so by attempt of owner to remove soil to depth of 12ft to make this site suitable for housing. Policy S5 is not legal in its choice of sites to regenerate. This site cannot be delivered.</p> <p>Policy S5 does not promote healthier communities because the proposed development of some housing on Cleadon Lane Industrial Estate (RG 5 SBC010) will also have a negative impact on health and wellbeing as this land is contaminated, most recently by asbestos which was stored at this site. This land was own by O'Briens, a demolition contractor who licensed to remove asbestos, their website states "We have held a full HSE removal licence since 1983 and are full members of the Asbestos Removal Contractors Association (ARCA)". Building on this site will pose a long term health risk to the community.</p> <p>Many of the sites put forward are not deliverable as they are within Flood Zone 3b. It has been suggested in Strategic Flood Assessment Risk (October 2018) Undertaken by Jeremy Benn Associates Limited at JBA that certain sites should not be built on which are:</p> <p>RG 5 - BC37 in Strategic Land review (SLR) Land at Cleadon Lane Industrial Estate.</p> <p>H3.62 - BC18 in SLR Land North Of Town End Farm</p> <p>H3.74 - WH9a in SLR Land to the North of Shearwater</p> <p>H3.72 - WH19 Land to the North of Cleadon Lane (former Charley Hurley Centre)</p> <p>Building on site H3.1; H3.12; H3.59 and RG 5 is in direct conflict with Policy NE1 Strategic Approach for the Natural Environment which states "Contribute to the mitigation of the likely effects of climate change, taking full account of flood risk, water supply and demand"</p> <p>Building on sites H3.59 along with H3.1; H3.12 and RG 5 is in direct conflict with Policy NE6 which is concerned with flood risk and water management. Policy NE6 states</p> <p>"Flood risk will be taken into account at all stages in the planning process to avoid inappropriate development in areas at current or future risk of flooding... Where applicable, development proposals will be expected to be designed to mitigate against urban creep and adapt to climate change, taking account of flood risk..."</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

							<p>This clearly is not the case in proposing to develop these sites with a total of at least 1,141 houses in a small area at flood risk sites.</p> <p>Developing site H3.59 Land at North Farm conflicts with Policy S1 paragraph (h) which aims to protect:</p> <p>“the openness and permanence of the Green Belt... Check the unrestricted sprawl of the Borough’s urban areas... Preserve the special and separate characters of the villages of West Boldon, East Boldon, Cleadon and Whitburn...”</p> <p>Developing H3.59 along with H3.12 H3.1 and RG 5 will reduce the gap, in terms of distance, between Boldon and South Shields and would increase pressure on the remainder. If the gap were to be reduced here then it would become more difficult to reduce pressure to eliminate it completely between Newton Garths and Shields Road, thereby merging Boldon and Cleadon with South Shields thus contradicting Policy S1.</p>
ST2462	Brian Navi		08 Regeneration	ROG5		Support	<p>The draft Local Plan identifies the potential for the development of a brownfield site within the Forum Area at Cleadon Lane Industrial Estate. I believe that this area of brownfield land should be used in preference to Green Belt land and that its use should be prioritised (along with other brownfield sites throughout the Borough) in preference to existing Green Belt sites. This should be an explicit requirement of the Local Plan.</p>
ST2516	Dave Hutchinson		08 Regeneration	RG05		Support	<p>RG5</p> <p>Support with reservations</p> <p>EBNF supports development of some housing on Cleadon Lane Industrial Estate, should the need arise, in order to prevent development on Green Belt land.</p> <p>Should the need for new housing in the area arise, EBNF supports only the re-use of brownfield sites for housing within the plan area. This has been overwhelmingly confirmed in our community consultations.</p> <p>Using some of this site for housing will help divert development away from Green Belt land. Unlike the other housing sites proposed in the draft LP, this site has the advantage of close proximity to transport (Metro) links and local shopping facilities.</p>
ST2516	Dave Hutchinson		08 Regeneration	RG05		Objection	<p>However, the allocation of 5.45 ha for 245 homes may represent over provision in terms of our Housing Needs Assessment, when taking into account other commitments.</p> <p>EBNF will make a specific proposal as part of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>EBNF supports the allocation of 2.1ha for B1 And B8 uses to retain and</p>

						<p>support the vibrant local businesses located towards the south of the estate.</p> <p>The proposed boundary shown on Inset Map 30 requires clarification. It includes within it two residential properties, a barbers premises, a restaurant, a food take away premises and two vacant showroom premises.</p> <p>It excludes a large warehouse adjoining the metro line.</p> <p>There should be a site specific policy in the Local Plan for this site which requires:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Development to be comprehensively masterplanned.</li> <li>2. A design code to ensure development of a distinctive neighbourhood that is in keeping with the local area and is sensitive to the proximity of residential and business use.</li> <li>3. The range, size, type and tenure of housing expected on the site to meet housing needs.</li> </ol> <p>EBNF is working with Aecom to prepare a design code for the neighbourhood area which should inform the site specific policy requirements for this site.</p> <p>The Site Specific Sustainability Appraisal concludes that this site has a POSITIVE impact. It should therefore be developed in preference to other proposed housing sites which have a NEGATIVE impact.</p>
ST2536	Sonia Ali and Gillian Johnston		08 Regeneration	RG05	Objection	<p>Developing site RG5 for housing is in direct conflict with Policy NE9 which focusses on contaminated land and ground stability which states:</p> <p>“ Where the future users or occupiers of a proposed development would be affected by contamination or ground stability issues, applicants must:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Carry out investigations to assess the nature and extent of contamination or ground stability issues and the effect it may have on the development and its future users, biodiversity, the natural and built environment; and</li> <li>b) Set out detailed measures, as appropriate, to allow the development to go ahead without adverse effect, including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Removing the contamination;</li> <li>ii. Treating the contamination;</li> <li>iii. Protecting the development from the effects of the contamination;</li> <li>iv. Validation of mitigation measures; and</li> </ol> </li> </ol>

						<p>v. Addressing land stability issues.</p> <p>Where measures are needed to allow the development to go ahead safely and without adverse effect, these will be required as a condition of any planning permission.”</p> <p>The land proposed for development is the site previously occupied by O’Briens Waste Management Contractors who are also demolition contractors licensed to remove asbestos. Their website states “We have held a full HSE removal licence since 1983 and are full members of the Asbestos Removal Contractors Association (ARCA) The proposed development of some housing on Cleadon Lane Industrial Estate (RG 5 SBC010) will also have a negative impact on health and wellbeing so contradicts Policy S3 as this land is contaminated, most recently by asbestos which was stored at this site. Building on this site will pose a long term health risk to the community. and to any future resident of this site. I am aware that at least 12 feet of land has already been removed from this site and replaced which means the land will not be treated properly to be suitable for development.</p> <p>Policy RG 5 states:</p> <p>“iv Consideration should be given to the removal of the culverted section of the watercourse.</p> <p>v Proposals should be supported by a site-specific flood risk assessment.”</p> <p>I understand this means opening up the “culverted section of the watercourse” to help mitigate flooding problems on this site. This would be an environmental disaster as the land is contaminated with asbestos, draining this land into the River Don would pose a serious, long term health risk to people and animals and the surrounding land.</p> <p>Developing RG 5 is in direct conflict with policy Policy NE6 which is concerned with flood risk and water management. Policy NE6 states “Flood risk will be taken into account at all stages in the planning process to avoid inappropriate development in areas at current or future risk of flooding... Where applicable, development proposals will be expected to be designed to mitigate against urban creep and adapt to climate change, taking account of flood risk...”</p> <p>This clearly is not the case at Cleadon Lane Industrial Estate (RG5). Proposing to develop RG5 with at least 245 houses in an area at risk of flooding on land which is also contaminated is not avoiding “inappropriate development in areas at current or future risk of flooding”.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>Developing RG5 contradicts Policy NE11 as it will cause a rise in water pollution in the River Don. Paragraph 11.59 relating to this policy states: "Pollution is the release of substances into the environment that can cause harm to human health, property and any other living organism supported by the wider environment. Pollution can affect our quality of life, our health and wellbeing and the wider environment." Any development at site RG5 totally contradicts this statement. Are STC putting the need to develop before public health and potential harm to the environment?</p> <p>Developing RG5 conflicts with Policy NE7 which sets out to protect water quality. This policy states: The rivers in the Borough, their banks and tributaries will be protected from damaging development and, where appropriate, enhanced. The quantity and quality of surface and groundwater bodies shall be protected and where possible enhanced. New development that discharges into a watercourse or is adjacent to a watercourse or discharges to ground will be required to incorporate appropriate water pollution control measures and consider opportunities to reduce detrimental impacts including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a) Naturalising watercourse channels;</li><li>b) Improving the biodiversity and ecological connectivity of watercourses;</li><li>c) Safeguarding and enlarging river buffers with appropriate habitat;</li><li>d) Mitigating diffuse agricultural and urban pollution;</li><li>e) Progressively reducing the pollution of groundwater and prevent or limit the entry of pollutants, particularly in high vulnerability areas;</li><li>f) Seeking opportunities to incorporate creation of wetland habitat in designs where appropriate;</li><li>g) Ensuring that development does not fragment a wildlife corridor;</li><li>h) Preventing introduction of non-native species via construction or other works and managing present invasive non-native species where practical; and</li><li>i) Contributing towards achieving good status for all water bodies or, for heavily modified waterbodies and artificial water bodies, good ecological potential and good surface water chemical status.</li></ul> <p>Watercourses should be left with an appropriately sized, development-free buffer zone on both sides of the channel. The width required will be</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>dependent on the specifics of the site and the nature of the development.</p> <p>Consideration must be given to current and future mine water and groundwater levels and the interaction with SuDS.</p> <p>Where the drainage will be connected to a watercourse or to groundwater all development will need to carry out a site specific water quality risk assessment which may identify the need for SuDS to treat the run off from the development. The simple index approach in the CIRIA SuDs Manual is the minimum required assessment. This is to ensure that there is no detrimental impact to the watercourse or groundwater.</p> <p>Where other developments are proposed in the same vicinity, a coordinated approach to surface water management will be encouraged and applicants should explore the feasibility of installing shared outfalls to reduce detrimental impacts.</p> <p>Development will not be permitted where it would have an adverse impact on water dependent Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) and Natura 2000 sites.</p> <p>Developing RG 5 will have a negative impact on everything Policy NE7 seeks to protect. In particular any development and opening of water culverts at RG 5 will have an “adverse impact on water dependent Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) and Natura 2000 sites.’ at nearby Boldon Flats (SSSI) and also at Nature reserves at Tiledsheds and Netwon Garths which are situated at very close proximity to this site and in the same water course channel. To implement Policy NE7 development at site RG 5 should “not be permitted”</p> <p>Developing RG 5 will reduce the gap, in terms of distance, between Boldon and South Shields and would increase pressure on the remainder. If the gap were to be reduced here then it would become more difficult to reduce pressure to eliminate it completely between Newton Garths and Shields Road, thereby merging Boldon and Cleadon with South Shields thus contradicting Policy S1.</p>
ST2537	Laverck Hall Park Limited	Neil Morton	08 Regeneration	RG1		<p>Objection</p> <p>Regeneration Sites</p> <p>4.51. Whilst we acknowledge the DLP’s efforts to bring forward Regeneration Sites, these sites account for a significant proportion of the total housing allocation and inevitably face significant viability and delivery challenges. In our view the below regeneration sites have not been demonstrated as deliverable and therefore we must object to their draft allocation. This is compounded by the fact that the DLP does not</p>

						<p>publish any viability evidence in support of the draft allocations. We reserve the right to comment on any viability evidence in respect of these sites in due course.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RG1 Holborn (400 dwellings) – The site has been vacant for circa 40 years. Over a number of years the Council has marketed the site in an attempt to find a delivery partner. To-date no delivery partner has been found which is reflective of the delivery constraints associated with the site. There are significant abnormal costs associated with bringing the site forward. Clear viability and deliverability evidence, which has not been produced, is required in order to demonstrate that the site is viable and deliverable. Until such time that it may be, we object to this draft housing allocation.</li> <li>• RG5 Cleadon Lane Industrial Estate (245 dwellings) – The site is a successful existing industrial estate providing numerous jobs which are proposed to be lost from the site by the DLP. There is no evidence on how the existing jobs will be relocated, if at all, when and to where. The site is in multiple-ownerships creating land assembly constraints. There is no evidence presented that all of the land has been assembled and therefore we question if the site is available for housing. Approximately 50% of the site is in Flood Zone 2 and 3 (unlike Laverick Park which is wholly within Flood Zone 1) and therefore any allocation of the site should be subject to the Sequential Test at the plan-making stage. There are known significant viability constraints due to ground conditions from the historic industrial uses and no viability evidence has been produced to demonstrate that the site is viable and deliverable. Again until such time that such evidence may be produced, we object to this draft housing allocation.</li> </ul>
ST2537	Laverck Hall Park Limited	Neil Morton	08 Regeneration	RG5		<p>Objection</p> <p>Regeneration Sites</p> <p>4.51. Whilst we acknowledge the DLP’s efforts to bring forward Regeneration Sites, these sites account for a significant proportion of the total housing allocation and inevitably face significant viability and delivery challenges. In our view the below regeneration sites have not been demonstrated as deliverable and therefore we must object to their draft allocation. This is compounded by the fact that the DLP does not publish any viability evidence in support of the draft allocations. We reserve the right to comment on any viability evidence in respect of these sites in due course.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RG1 Holborn (400 dwellings) – The site has been vacant for circa 40</li> </ul>

						<p>years. Over a number of years the Council has marketed the site in an attempt to find a delivery partner. To-date no delivery partner has been found which is reflective of the delivery constraints associated with the site. There are significant abnormal costs associated with bringing the site forward. Clear viability and deliverability evidence, which has not been produced, is required in order to demonstrate that the site is viable and deliverable. Until such time that it may be, we object to this draft housing allocation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• RG5 Cleadon Lane Industrial Estate (245 dwellings) – The site is a successful existing industrial estate providing numerous jobs which are proposed to be lost from the site by the DLP. There is no evidence on how the existing jobs will be relocated, if at all, when and to where. The site is in multiple-ownerships creating land assembly constraints. There is no evidence presented that all of the land has been assembled and therefore we question if the site is available for housing. Approximately 50% of the site is in Flood Zone 2 and 3 (unlike Laverick Park which is wholly within Flood Zone 1) and therefore any allocation of the site should be subject to the Sequential Test at the plan-making stage. There are known significant viability constraints due to ground conditions from the historic industrial uses and no viability evidence has been produced to demonstrate that the site is viable and deliverable. Again until such time that such evidence may be produced, we object to this draft housing allocation.</li></ul> <p>Loss of Employment Land</p> <p>4.52. The DLP is proposing the loss sites which appear to be in active employment use. This is noting that the Employment Land Review identifies a shortfall of general employment land (17.5 hectares) in the Borough and the DLP is proposing Green Belt release to meet employment need (this would clearly be reduced if existing employment sites were retained). This includes sites: H3.48 (117 dwellings) and RG5 (245 houses). We object to this approach.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---