

| Our Ref | Respondent | Representative | Chapter | Policy | Para/ Criterion | Support /Object | Submitted Comments |
|---------|---|----------------|----------------------|--------|--------------------|--------------------|---|
| ST2385 | Philip Jordan | | 12 Infrastructure | IN01 | | Comment | <p>The Shack Field East</p> <p>The loss of "Sports" fields to housing will vastly reduce the amount of available facilities for the playing of field sports. The government and local authorities, I believe, place a high emphasis on sports for all including young girls & boys. This aids health & awareness as well as encouraging sport to be available to assist in the reduction of obesity in the population as a whole, not only in children but adults too. There are a number of "sports" fields earmarked for development which are currently used for boys & girls' football. Removing these opportunities can only have a massive impact on where sport can be played and how many teams can access what remains at any one time. This is without due concern over the potential loss of health benefits which may ultimately exasperate the already stretched local Health Services. This area is already overloaded with traffic for the local community as well as retail and leisure outlets so to increase traffic through housing development will have a huge impact on services.</p> |
| ST2446 | John Graham Fogg and Rosalind Mary Maria | Resident | 12 Infrastructure | IN07 | kv | Objection | <p>Proposed Development at TILESHEDES</p> <p>We have just heard about your proposed above development. We would like to OBJECT to the proposed development of a new Road Bridge, Metro Station and Car Park at Tilesheds. The authorities seem to be attempting to plough on with their relentless quest to amalgamate the small individual areas of Boldon, East Boldon, Cleadon, Boldon Colliery and South Shields.</p> <p>The construction of a road bridge and Metro Station</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|--------------|----------|----------------------|------|--|-----------|--|
| | | | | | | | and associated Car Park which would be situated on GREEN BELT, pastures and arable land at the centre of communities. This would lead to even further Urban Sprawl and worse, an even greater loss of habitat and wildlife corridors in the area. The effect on the Nature Reserve and surrounding area could be devastating. On television recently, a report published by The National Trust highlighted the loss of 130 species from the United Kingdom since 1970 with many more on the brink of extinction. South Tyneside Council seem to be trying to turn a semi-rural area into an urban jungle. |
| ST2456 | Kevin Curtis | Resident | 12 Infrastructure | IN04 | | Objection | <p>* Whilst I welcome the support for renewable energy, I would like to see the plan offer a concrete pathway towards increased renewable energy generation within our borough. Best practice would be to conduct a survey (determining renewable energy generation capacity and then physical and policy constraints for all sites across the borough), the results of which would be published within the local plan. As a consequence of gathering this data, 'suitable sites for energy generation' would be identified in the plan. This would act to highlight the potential of key sites, thereby inviting energy companies to seriously consider our area for their projects.</p> <p>*As policy IN4 does not identify 'suitable sites for onshore wind energy generation' it , in effect, bans it for the lifetime of the plan. Given that we're in a climate emergency, I'd ask the council to reverse this decision.</p> |
| ST2463 | Shirley Ford | Resident | 12 Infrastructure | IN04 | | Objection | <p>* While there is welcome support for renewable energy in the Draft Local Plan, the Local Plan must offer a concrete pathway towards increased</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|-------------|--|----------------------|-----|--|-----------|--|
| | | | | | | | <p>renewable energy generation within our borough. Best practice would be to conduct a survey (determining renewable energy generation capacity and then physical and policy constraints for all sites across the borough), the results of which would be published within the Local Plan. As a consequence of gathering this data, 'suitable sites for energy generation' would be identified in the Local Plan. This would act to highlight the potential of key sites, thereby inviting energy companies to seriously consider our area for their projects.</p> <p>* As policy IN4 does not identify 'suitable sites for onshore wind energy generation', in effect, it bans it for the lifetime of the plan. Given that this Council recognises we are in a climate emergency, this policy needs to include suitable onshore sites.</p> |
| ST2527 | Story Homes | | 12 Infrastructure | IN1 | | Objection | <p>Policy IN(b) refers to "where appropriate, [seeking] to improve any deficiencies in existing provision". However, Story Homes considers that it would be unreasonable for a development to have to rectify / improve existing deficiencies in provision in an area. Such an approach would conflict with the tests for planning obligations as set out in the Community Infrastructure Regulations (Regulation 122(2)) and the NPPF (para. 56). To ensure a sound Plan that is consistent with national legislation and policy, it is requested that this text is deleted from the policy.</p> <p>Policy IN1(d) refers to 'world class' digital infrastructure; however, its exact definition and the cost implications of providing such infrastructure is unclear. It is therefore suggested that this word is deleted from the policy.</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|-------------|--|----------------------|-----|----|-----------|--|
| ST2527 | Story Homes | | 12 Infrastructure | IN2 | 2b | Objection | <p>Story Homes supports draft Policy IN2 (1) which states that regard will be given to the impact of contributions on the economic viability of the scheme. However, our client is concerned about the reference to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) within Policy IN2. Whilst this may be an appropriate method of capturing contributions, the Council has not tested the cost implications of CIL within their Local Plan viability work. As such, it would be premature and inappropriate to refer to CIL in this policy. It is therefore requested that reference to CIL is deleted from this policy.</p> <p>Our client is also concerned about part 2(b) of this policy which advises that the council may “consider alternative phasing, through the development period, of any contributions where to do so would sufficiently improve the viability of the scheme to enable payment.”</p> <p>The development industry requires certainty and including a review mechanism in any Section 106 Agreement which could potentially trigger an unforeseen payment at a later date would create an uncertain approach. Indeed, the council has not suggested including a review mechanism that would enable a lower contribution to be paid in the future there be an economic downturn. Once the level of contributions are agreed and a Section 106 Agreement is signed, the development industry then has to accept any up or down turns in the market. It would not be fair and reasonable if they have to accept the risk of downturns but are not in turn rewarded should there be an economic upturn.</p> <p>Our client therefore requests that part 2(b) of Policy</p> |
|--------|-------------|--|----------------------|-----|----|-----------|--|

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|-------------|--|----------------------|-----|----|-----------|---|
| | | | | | | | IN2 and that the section of paragraph 12.14 which refers to “viability [being] reassessed during the construction phase of the development” are deleted to ensure a fair and reasonable approach, in accordance with the NPPF (para. 35). |
| ST2527 | Story Homes | | 12 Infrastructure | IN3 | 3h | Objection | <p>Although Story Homes supports the provision of social and community infrastructure, such provision needs to be proportionate to the scale of any development. Part 3(h) of Policy IN3 states that the developer will be required to set land aside for the provision of social and community infrastructure, where there is an identified need. Any need for future community infrastructure should be identified within the Plan, with land then allocated accordingly. If there is the potential for the allocated sites to deliver community infrastructure, in addition to the allocated development, there may be a risk that the full allocation cannot be met. The Council need to consider the uptake of land required to deliver social and community infrastructure and whether additional land is required to fulfil their ambitions. In addition to the loss of land to deliver new homes and commercial development it may not be reasonable or proportionate for a development to set aside such land as it could have a negative impact on development viability.</p> <p>The following amendments are therefore being sought to ensure a fair and reasonable approach, in accordance with the NPPF (para. 35):</p> <p>“Require the developer <u>Enter into discussions with the developer to determine whether it would be appropriate</u> to set land aside for the provision of social and community infrastructure, where there is an</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|-------------|--|----------------------|-----|--|-----------|--|
| | | | | | | | identified need, <u>or whether it would be more appropriate to provide a contribution (taking into account development viability)".</u> |
| ST2527 | Story Homes | | 12 Infrastructure | IN5 | | Objection | <p>Story Homes is concerned that draft Policy IN5 requires residential developments to ensure that provision for essential utilities infrastructure and ultrafast broadband will be integrated into the delivery of development. This policy also requires the submission of an ultrafast/gigabit-capable Statement as part of any application with evidence of consultation with a number of broadband providers/networks apart from certain exceptions and then a cascade approach is needed to speeds in excess of 24Mbps.</p> <p>The issue with this approach is that developers will often not be responsible for the delivery of such infrastructure (which is noted and accepted by the Council in para 12.27). However, even securing the Statement pre-application would require third party input much earlier than providers would usually engage with us. This could cause issues for preparing/submitting/validating applications, particularly if there is any reticence from providers/delays etc. In addition, it may not be possible to ultimately deliver a fibre connection with such provisions depending on the wider network provisions in the locality of a site and it would be unreasonable to require a developer to potentially upgrade a wider network for which it has no responsibility for.</p> <p>The policy as currently worded is overly onerous and inflexible. To ensure a sound Plan that accords with the NPPF (paragraphs 35 and 112), it is requested that</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|-------------|--|----------------------|-----|--|-----------|---|
| | | | | | | | this policy is diluted to be more flexible and to recognise that seeking such Statements requires not only the buy in of developers but utility companies as well. |
| ST2527 | Story Homes | | 12 Infrastructure | IN6 | | Objection | <p>Story Homes is concerned about the additional constraint to new schemes presented by a)viii in that they should:</p> <p><i>“Ensure that proposals in terms of their layout do not compromise the potential for the future development of adjoining sites”</i></p> <p>This policy is considered to lack direction and guidance for both the developer and the Council. Where this approach is considered necessary then it should be included in the site specific policy referencing the land the Council wish considered for future development. Our client is concerned about the reference to new developments being no more than 400m from a bus stop in Policy IN6(c)(iii). This is onerous and is not a national requirement. The following change is therefore sought:</p> <p><i>“Where appropriate and necessary, All new homes and commercial development must be no more than 400m from a bus stop should have good access to bus services.”</i></p> |
| ST2527 | Story Homes | | 12 Infrastructure | IN1 | | Objection | <p>To support 2)j) the Council should allocate further land for development to ensure a sufficient future supply. At present there is very little difference between the Standard Methodology requirement and the housing requirement set in the Plan. Should there be any issues with the delivery from the allocated sites this will force the Council into an early review. Identifying land either as Safeguarded or full allocation</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|------------------------|----------|----------------------|------|----|-----------|---|
| | | | | | | | such as our client's land at Lizard Lane, Whitburn will provide a more robust policy position for the Council. |
| ST2529 | Jayne Mackie | | 12 Infrastructure | IN7 | kv | Objection | <p>You speak of idle traffic at the metro crossing causing harm to the environment and the need for a new bridge crossing yet you put forward no consideration for the pollution of the huge weight of traffic generated from such over development. You call climate emergency but yet remove hectares upon hectares of Greenbelt.</p> <p>In line with a transparent approach why haven't the public been made aware of the future plans to build a bridge in a semi-rural location (Tilsheds Boldon)? This proposal would lead to further and additional eradication of greenbelt space</p> |
| ST0003 | Howard Becke | Resident | 12 Infrastructure | IN03 | | Object | <p>6.0 Taking into account the emerging Neighbourhood Plan - Policy IN3, Policy S4</p> <p>Quoting Chapter 4.29, "Securing sustainable development is therefore the central theme which runs through this Local Plan and will also bind with any Neighbourhood Plans that are made. " I would like to express my desire for the East Boldon Neighbourhood Plan to be given the credence that the references to it in this Draft Local Plan would indicate that it will.</p> <p>There is no way that this can be the case if the scale of development proposed goes ahead or if the Green Belt boundary s changed. The Neighbourhood plan will have a design code for housing and green infrastructure, and designated Green Spaces, and we expect these to be considered first and foremost when housing is allocated.</p> |
| ST0004 | Sean and Maria McNally | Resident | 12 Infrastructure | IN03 | | Object | <p>6.0 Taking into account the emerging Neighbourhood Plan - Policy IN3, Policy S4</p> <p>Quoting Chapter 4.29, "Securing sustainable</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|-----------------------|----------|----------------------|------|-----------|---------|---|
| | | | | | | | development is therefore the central theme which runs through this Local Plan and will also bind with any Neighbourhood Plans that are made. " I would like to express my desire for the East Boldon Neighbourhood Plan to be given the credence that the references to it in this Draft Local Plan would indicate that it will. There is no way that this can be the case if the scale of development proposed goes ahead or if the Green Belt boundary s changed. The Neighbourhood plan will have a design code for housing and green infrastructure, and designated Green Spaces, and we expect these to be considered first and foremost when housing is allocated. |
| ST0051 | Craig Jeffrey | Resident | 12 Infrastructure | IN03 | | object | 6.0 Taking into account the emerging Neighbourhood Plan - Policy IN3, Policy S4 Quoting Chapter 4.29, "Securing sustainable development is therefore the central theme which runs through this Local Plan and will also bind with any Neighbourhood Plans that are made. " I would like to express my desire for the East Boldon Neighbourhood Plan to be given the credence that the references to it in this Draft Local Plan would indicate that it will. There is no way that this can be the case if the scale of development proposed goes ahead or if the Green Belt boundary s changed. The Neighbourhood plan will have a design code for housing and green infrastructure, and designated Green Spaces, and we expect these to be considered first and foremost when housing is allocated. |
| ST0121 | Clive Skilbeck | Resident | 12 Infrastructure | IN01 | | Comment | Unsure of resource implications (eg, schools, transport, etc |
| ST0226 | Mrs Christine Ogilvie | Resident | 12 Infrastructure | IN3 | para 12.1 | Support | 5.0 Open Green Spaces and Community Infrastructure - Policy N3 and paragraph 12.1: I would like to state |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|-----------------|------------------------|----------------------|------|-----------|---------|--|
| | | | | | | | my support for Policy N3. In East Boldon we intend to identify some Green spaces within our Neighbourhood Plan. One of the sites which is in question is the area in front of St George's Church. This area is neglected and unsightly and detracts from the Church, making it very difficult to attract congregation. I would like to see it become accessible and landscaped, |
| ST0227 | Mr John Ogilvie | Resident | 12 Infrastructure | IN3 | para 12.1 | Support | 5.0 Open Green Spaces and Community Infrastructure - Policy N3 and paragraph 12.1: I would like to state my support for Policy N3. In East Boldon we intend to identify some Green spaces within our Neighbourhood Plan. One of the sites which is in question is the area in front of St George's Church. This area is neglected and unsightly and detracts from the Church, making it very difficult to attract congregation. I would like to see it become accessible and landscaped, |
| ST0294 | Mark Goodwill | Statutory Consultee | 12 Infrastructure | IN01 | | Comment | In relation to cumulative impacts, as you are aware, we have a long standing relationship of working in partnership with you to ascertain the cumulative impacts of your development aspirations in order to plan for the delivery of any required mitigation measures within the plan period in accordance with Policies IN1, IN2 and IN6. It is noted that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan document was not provided as part of the consultation. We would request that the current version of the document is provided to us at the earliest opportunity, as it is not clear from the Local Plan document how the mitigation schemes for cumulative impacts are to be funded and delivered. We will be testing the cumulative impacts of the plan on the SRN using our A19 model. The model is currently being amended to account for the changes |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|---------------|---------------------|-------------------|------|--|---------|---|
| | | | | | | | <p>to the sites included in the latest iteration of the plan. As a result, this modelling work should be completed by the end of November. This work will then inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and a Joint Position Statement between Highways England and South Tyneside Council on the delivery of required infrastructure on the SRN, in advance of the Examination in Public of the plan.</p> <p>In relation to the sites to be tested, it would appear as though site SBC123: Land between Downhill Lane and Hylton Lane has been removed from the plan. Given its proximity to the Downhill Lane junction, we would request confirmation of whether this site has been removed so that we can update the sites considered as part of the cumulative impact assessment. this site has been removed so that we can update the sites considered as part of the cumulative impact assessment.</p> |
| ST0294 | Mark Goodwill | Statutory Consultee | 12 Infrastructure | IN07 | | Comment | <p>Policy IN7 identifies that the council will work with their key partners to deliver improvements at the following key locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Testo's Grade Separation Scheme (A184 / A19) • Downhill Lane Junction Improvements (A19 / A1290) • A19 Lane Gain / Lane Drop Scheme (A185 to A194) – both northbound and southbound • Whitemare Pool Junction (A194(M) / A194 / A184) <p>Whilst these are the key locations that have been identified as requiring improvement to support the Local Plan as part of ongoing partnership working between us, given the scale and location of development proposed, improvements may be required in other locations such as the Hedworth Lane junction of the A19 and the Follingsby Lane junction of</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|--------------|----------|----------------------|------|--|---------|--|
| | | | | | | | <p>the A194(M). This will be determined by the forthcoming cumulative impact assessment work. In addition, the feasibility of the widening of the northbound approach to the White Mare Pool junction to 3 lanes (which is anticipated to be required in order to mitigate the impact of the Local Plan), a structural assessment will be required in order to confirm whether the existing A194(M) bridge over the Leamside Line could bear this extra load with minimum modifications, or whether bridge strengthening or widening will be required. If a high cost solution is required, this may have implications for the deliverability of the Local Plan. We will continue to work closely with you to agree a way forward for the Local Plan which can deliver the borough's aspirations for growth and which is sound.</p> |
| ST0296 | Kate McKeown | Resident | 12 Infrastructure | IN04 | | Comment | <p>* Whilst I welcome the support for renewable energy, I would like to see the plan offer a concrete pathway towards increased renewable energy generation within our borough. Best practice would be to conduct a survey (determining renewable energy generation capacity and then physical and policy constraints for all sites across the borough), the results of which would be published within the local plan. As a consequence of gathering this data, 'suitable sites for energy generation' would be identified in the plan. This would act to highlight the potential of key sites, thereby inviting energy companies to seriously consider our area for their projects.</p> <p>* As policy IN4 does not identify 'suitable sites for onshore wind energy generation' it , in effect, bans it for the lifetime of the plan. Given that we're in a</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|---------------|----------|----------------------|------|-----------|-----------|--|
| | | | | | | | climate emergency, I'd ask the council to reverse this decision. |
| ST0306 | Sue Balmer | resident | 12 Infrastructure | IN03 | para 12.1 | Support | 5.0 Open Green Spaces and Community Infrastructure - Policy N3 and paragraph 12.1: I would like to state my support for Policy N3. In East Boldon we intend to identify some Green spaces within our Neighbourhood Plan. One of the sites which is in question is the area in front of St George's Church. This area is neglected and unsightly and detracts from the Church, making it very difficult to attract congregation. I would like to see it become accessible and landscaped, |
| ST0312 | Ron Forbister | resident | 12 Infrastructure | IN03 | para 12.1 | Support | 5.0 Open Green Spaces and Community Infrastructure - Policy N3 and paragraph 12.1: I would like to state my support for Policy N3. In East Boldon we intend to identify some Green spaces within our Neighbourhood Plan. One of the sites which is in question is the area in front of St George's Church. This area is neglected and unsightly and detracts from the Church, making it very difficult to attract congregation. I would like to see it become accessible and landscaped, |
| ST0313 | Kay Forbister | resident | 12 Infrastructure | IN03 | para 12.1 | Support | 5.0 Open Green Spaces and Community Infrastructure - Policy N3 and paragraph 12.1: I would like to state my support for Policy N3. In East Boldon we intend to identify some Green spaces within our Neighbourhood Plan. One of the sites which is in question is the area in front of St George's Church. This area is neglected and unsightly and detracts from the Church, making it very difficult to attract congregation. I would like to see it become accessible and landscaped, |
| ST1917 | Ellen Smith | | 12 Infrastructure | IN07 | kv | Objection | I wish to make my objections known about the proposed road bridge for Cleadon. I have already submitted my objections to the proposed development of sites H3.2/BC 48b and H3.3/BC48c |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|--------------|--|-------------------|------|----|-----------|--|
| | | | | | | | <p>Having attended meetings and being made aware of boundary lines which if these proposals went ahead Cleadon would actually merge with South Shields. I find out today that a road bridge is actually proposed which I was totally unaware of. if this goes ahead it will have a detrimental impact on the whole of Cleadon.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The government departments consistently bring up the points about air pollution caused by cars and other vehicles, there is a school on this route from the proposed route. • This would increase the traffic and cause concern for road safety. • Our green spaces should be protected, we are aware of the pressures of modern life and the need to protect our natural environment to help with mental health. • Increased traffic will cause increased congestion in the village, higher air pollution which will impact on childrens and adults health. • There would need to be radical reconstruction of the junction with Sunderland Road and Front Street. • The height of the bridge would have a major visual impact on the area and would endanger high sided vehicles using the bridge in gale force weather conditions. <p>Due to the above points I severely object to the bridge proposal.</p> |
| ST1918 | Robert Smith | | 12 Infrastructure | IN07 | kv | Objection | <p>I wish to make my objections known about the proposed road bridge for Cleadon. I have already submitted my objections to the proposed development of sites H3.2/BC 48b and H3.3/BC48c Having attended meetings and being made aware of boundary lines which if these proposals went ahead</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|--------------|------------------------------|-------------------|-------|--|---------|--|
| | | | | | | | <p>Cleadon would actually merge with South Shields. I find out today that a road bridge is actually proposed which I was totally unaware of. if this goes ahead it will have a detrimental impact on the whole of Cleadon.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The government departments consistently bring up the points about air pollution caused by cars and other vehicles, there is a school on this route from the proposed route. • This would increase the traffic and cause concern for road safety. • Our green spaces should be protected, we are aware of the pressures of modern life and the need to protect our natural environment to help with mental health. • Increased traffic will cause increased congestion in the village, higher air pollution which will impact on childrens and adults health. • There would need to be radical reconstruction of the junction with Sunderland Road and Front Street. • The height of the bridge would have a major visual impact on the area and would endanger high sided vehicles using the bridge in gale force weather conditions. <p>Due to the above points I severely object to the bridge proposal.</p> |
| ST1926 | Nick Horsley | Mineral Products Association | 12 Infrastructure | IN011 | | Comment | <p>THE SOUTH TYNESIDE LOCAL PLAN 2011-2031 PRE-PUBLICATION DRAFT (REGULATION 18) (AUGUST 2019)</p> <p>The Mineral Products Association (MPA) is the trade association for the aggregates, asphalt, cement, concrete, dimension stone, lime, mortar and silica sand industries. With the affiliation of British Precast, the British Association of Reinforcement (BAR),</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|--------------|------------------------------|-------------------|-------|---|-----------|--|
| | | | | | | | <p>Eurobitume, QPA Northern Ireland, MPA Scotland and the British Calcium Carbonate Federation, it has a growing membership of over 530 companies and is the sectoral voice for mineral products. MPA membership is made up of the vast majority of independent SME quarrying companies throughout the UK, as well as the 9 major international and global companies. It covers 100% of UK cement production, 90% of GB aggregates production, 95% of asphalt and over 70% of ready-mixed concrete and precast concrete production. Each year the industry supplies £20 billion worth of materials and services to the Economy and is the largest supplier to the construction industry, which had annual output valued at £151 billion in 2016. Industry production represents the largest materials flow in the UK economy and is also one of the largest manufacturing sectors. For more information visit: www.mineralproducts.org. Thank you for consulting the MPA on the Pre-Publication Draft</p> <p>Whilst we are largely supportive of the plan, we feel there are some areas where the plan would benefit from amendments.</p> <p>Mineral considerations in the plan are addressed in one Policy IN11. This policy is a hybrid of a statement of approach by the Council (point 1.); Minerals and Minerals Infrastructure Safeguarding (Points 2-4) and Development Management considerations (Point 5). We feel it would be beneficial to separate these in to individual policies.</p> |
| ST1926 | Nick Horsley | Mineral Products Association | 12 Infrastructure | IN011 | 1 | Objection | <p>Taking these matters in order:- Policy IN11 (Point 1) Point 1 sets the context within which minerals</p> |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | <p>provision in South Tyneside will be maintained, i.e. by working “with the wider north east authorities to ensure there are appropriate land-banks for the supply of minerals in the region. To achieve this, we have identified Minerals Safeguarding Areas, facilities that need to be safeguarded for the importation of minerals, and set out the criteria by which proposals for minerals extraction will be assessed”.</p> <p>We recognise the good work done through the North East Aggregates Working Party (NEAWP) and the publication of the Joint Local Aggregates Assessment (LAA). The LAA2018 states “Tyne and Wear has sufficient permitted reserves of crushed rock and sand and gravel to meet the calculated demand from quarries in this sub-area. Notwithstanding this it is noted that sand and gravel production is limited to one quarry and crushed rock production is limited to two quarries. The permitted reserves of crushed rock at one of these quarries would be exhausted by the mi-2020s and the remaining quarry would not have sufficient productive capacity to meet the demand forecast. Local Plans and decisions on planning applications should therefore support additional areas for extraction where environmentally acceptable”. Paragraph 207 of the NPPF requires that “Mineral planning authorities should plan for a steady and adequate supply of minerals...”. Para 207 indicates how this should be achieved. Of note, is subsection g) “ensuring that large landbanks bound up in very few sites do not stifle competition...”.</p> <p>We believe Point 1 of Policy IN11 should provide more strategic considerations and a spatial approach to indicate how the Authority will address the steady and</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|--------------|------------------------------|-------------------|-------|---|-----------|--|
| | | | | | | | adequate supply of minerals, a requisite of the NPPF. Whilst we support the MSAs, it is imperative that through working with the wider North East Authorities, the local plan should identify allocations (site specific, preferred areas or areas of search) and not simply safeguard minerals. Further, the joint LAA addresses aggregate minerals and it is understood that Marsden Quarry provides industrial minerals in the form of agricultural lime. It is not clear how continued support for this sector will be delivered. At present, it is not evident how the longer-term provision of minerals will be maintained through the plan period and beyond and we feel the approach outlined in Policy IN11 is UNSOUND. |
| ST1926 | Nick Horsley | Mineral Products Association | 12 Infrastructure | IN011 | 2 | Objection | Policy IN11 (Point 2-4) Minerals Safeguarding Areas and Safeguarding Facilities We support the approach the Council has proposed to MSAs, however, we feel that minerals & minerals infrastructure safeguarding should be addressed in a dedicated Policy. |
| ST1926 | Nick Horsley | Mineral Products Association | 12 Infrastructure | IN011 | 3 | Objection | Policy IN11 (Point 2-4) Minerals Safeguarding Areas and Safeguarding Facilities We support the approach the Council has proposed to MSAs, however, we feel that minerals & minerals infrastructure safeguarding should be addressed in a dedicated Policy. |
| ST1926 | Nick Horsley | Mineral Products Association | 12 Infrastructure | IN011 | 4 | Objection | Policy IN11 (Point 2-4) Minerals Safeguarding Areas and Safeguarding Facilities We support the approach the Council has proposed to MSAs, however, we feel that minerals & minerals infrastructure safeguarding should be addressed in a dedicated Policy. |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|--------------|--|-------------------|-------|-------|---------|---|
| ST1926 | Nick Horsley | Mineral Products Association | 12 Infrastructure | IN011 | 5 | Comment | Policy IN11 (Point 5) Proposal for Minerals Extraction Firstly, we note that the subsections in Point 5 run from 5f) to 5q), rather than starting with 5a). We assume this is a formatting issue linked to subsection 3). Further, it is apparent that many of the matters included in subsections have been addressed in other policies in the plan. For example, issues of air quality, flood risk, biodiversity net gain, etc., are addressed in policies in Chapter 11 of the plan. We therefore question the need for repetition of these development control matters and their application to minerals development, when previous policies of the plan cover all developments. |
| ST1926 | Nick Horsley | Mineral Products Association | 12 Infrastructure | IN011 | 12.61 | Comment | Paragraph 12.61 This paragraph refers to the 2017 Joint LAA. It is not clear why the Council has not used the Joint LAA, published in December 2018. This utilises survey data (sales and permitted reserves) from 2017. It is anticipated a revised LAA covering 2018 sales and permitted reserves data will be published soon and as such this can be used to inform the developing plan. We trust the above comments are helpful and would be happy to discuss any of the points raised with the Council. |
| ST1930 | Gary Baker | Planning Policy Team Leader, Sunderland City Council | 12 Infrastructure | IN07 | | Support | Infrastructure and Transport SCC welcomes support for improvements to transport connectively between South Tyneside and Sunderland, in particular the initiatives which are set out in Policy IN7: Accessible and Sustainable Travel. SCC welcomes the Plan's support for improved rail connectivity between South Tyneside and the IAMP, which is consistent with the IAMP Area Action Plan. In addition, SCC also welcomes support for the re- |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>opening of the Leamside Line, as well as safeguarding a railway alignment between South Shields and Sunderland through enhancements to the Boldon East curve. These will help to create increased connectivity between South Tyneside and Sunderland and SCC look forward to engaging with South Tyneside Council and other stakeholders in the future to help secure these initiatives.</p> <p>With regard to highways improvements, SCC supports the Plan's commitment to improvements to key strategic junctions on the A19 at Testo's roundabout and Downhill Lane, both of which are considered important assets to the functioning of the strategic transport network in Sunderland. The Council would welcome further discussions regarding the Transport Assessment work as part our ongoing duty-to cooperate discussions to understand the potential impacts upon the local road network in Sunderland.</p> <p>2. Objection to Policy IN4 (Renewables and Low Carbon Energy Generation).</p> <p>I welcome the support for renewable energy expressed within this policy, however, I feel that a more detailed plan is necessary. National policy and international commitments state the need for an expansion of renewable energy generation, and yet I question whether Policy IN4 can ensure that South Tyneside contributes to this at the required rate. For instance, within 2018's Clean Growth Strategy, the government describes the centrality of renewables for emissions reductions, and suggests that one pathway to 2032 would be to concentrate upon 'growing low carbon sources such as renewables and nuclear to over 80 percent of electricity generation'; should this</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>be the route, would the provisions set out in the Local Plan enable us to play our part in achieving such an ambition? I suggest not. Regardless of the final pathway settled upon, it's clear that the desired national trajectory is for a significant increase in renewable energy generation capacity, an increase Policy IN4 is ill-equipped to facilitate. I, therefore, respectfully request that the council sets borough-specific renewable energy generation targets over the Plan period, allocate sites which are suitable for renewable energy generation (including onshore wind), and amend paragraph 2 to state: "Community-led initiatives for renewable and low-carbon energy generation will be supported where they are consistent with the other policies in this Local Plan and any neighbourhood plans that are made."</p> <p>2a. The need to identify key sites which are environmentally-suitable for renewable energy generation</p> <p>With the exception of heat mapping, there has been no surveying work done to identify the generation capacity of different renewable technologies across the borough. Without this data, we are left unable to determine both our potential capacity for energy generation and the sites where optimal generation could take place.</p> <p>Support for the such a methodology comes from the Town and Country Planning Association (TCPA) and the Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI), who deem it 'good practice' and 'an essential starting point in considering opportunities to move towards low-carbon communities' (Rising to the Climate Crisis – A Guide for Local Authorities on Planning for Climate</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|---------------|--|----------------------|------|--|-----------|---|
| | | | | | | | Change, 2018). They further state: 'Clearly identifying and mapping an area's sustainable resources helps to ensure that a strategic approach is taken, and enables effective community-led spatial planning.'(pg.26). The NPPF also recommends such an audit (Chapter 14, paragraph 151): 'To help increase the use and supply of renewable and low carbon energy and heat, plans should:[...] consider identifying suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy sources, and supporting infrastructure, where this would help secure their development'. |
| ST1940 | Angela Curtis | | 12 Infrastructure | IN04 | | Objection | A working example of this comes from New Hull's Local Plan, in which the results of a sieve analysis are presented (which entails mapping all the various physical, environmental, technical and policy constraints that would make a site undevelopable), thereby enabling areas which might be most suitable for renewable energy generation to be identified. I would urge the council to adopt this methodology and apply it to all potential sources of renewable energy. Like South Tyneside's heat-mapping efforts, this data needs to result in key sites being explicitly designated as being 'suitable for renewable energy development' within the Local Plan. This, again, is supported by the TCPA and RTPi, who emphasise the need to produce a plan which 'identifies the most, and least, environmentally sensitive areas for deployment of different renewable technologies'. This principle has been embedded in London's Plan, with policy S13, paragraph C1 stating that Development Plans should: 'identify the need for, and suitable sites for, any necessary energy infrastructure requirements including upgrades to existing infrastructure'. I argue |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>that South Tyneside should also mirror this requirement within their own Plan. The need for renewable energy should, I argue, be evaluated within the context of the rapid decarbonisation needed to meet our national and international climate change commitments.</p> <p>Advantageously, via the allocation of sites for energy generation, developers would receive clear signals about the suitability of their proposals, which would act to invite new development into the area, accelerate deployment, and avoid conflict with locals (as public consultations have already been conducted as part of the creation of the Local Plan) (TCPA & RTPi,2018). Additionally, this process would enable us to determine the potential energy generation capability which different configurations of the plan would produce. Thus we could weigh these against the desired outcome of the plan (for example, we want to create 20MW of additional renewable capacity – do we have enough land allotted to achieve this goal?). However, as previously mentioned, this would require concrete goals to be set, as currently there are no SMART carbon reduction goals attached to the Local Plan.</p> <p>2b. Onshore wind</p> <p>The Emerging Local Plan indicates the desirability of ‘commercial-scale renewable and low-carbon energy generation’ (Policy IN4, Chapter 12), and yet, as matters currently stand, would prevent planning permission being granted to new onshore wind developments. This is due to a stipulation (contained within the Written Ministerial Statement HCWS42 (2015)) which determined that planning permission</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|---------------|--|----------------------|------|--|-----------|---|
| | | | | | | | can only be granted for onshore wind in areas which have been identified as 'suitable for wind energy development' within the Local Plan (identification within supporting documents would not meet this criterion and thus wouldn't enable planning permission to be granted). By completing the sieve analysis I describe in the previous paragraph, the council could easily meet this requirement, thereby opening up the possibility of onshore wind in our borough. |
| ST1940 | Angela Curtis | | 12 Infrastructure | IN06 | | Objection | <p>With regards to electric vehicles the Emerging Local Plan states the following:</p> <p>b) Development proposals must be designed to meet the needs of ultra-low emission vehicle users. In particular:</p> <p>i. All major development will incorporate charging infrastructure for ultra-low emission vehicles; and</p> <p>ii. Minor development should incorporate charging infrastructure for ultra-low emission vehicles where it is practicable to do so</p> <p>While I welcome the sentiment behind these policies, I question whether they are sufficient to meet the ambition, set out within The Road to Zero Strategy (2018), that 'at least half of all new cars will be ultra-low emission by 2030'. In order to accomplish this, the Strategy calls for all new homes to have a charging point available, and that, in residential areas without off-street parking provision, new street lighting columns will include charging points. I suggest that by not quantifying requirements for the installation of charging infrastructure, within the Emerging Local Plan, the policy can be adhered to by installing the minimal amount of charging points that developers</p> |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>can get away with. Policy IN6 can therefore not guarantee that it meets national objectives and should, consequently, be considered unsound. Instead, I would propose adopting a similar policy to policy DM16 of Bath's and North East Somerset's Local Plan, which is:</p> <p>DM16 Emerging policy approach for electric vehicles infrastructure</p> <p>Overarching principle</p> <p>Require all development proposals to integrate the provision of infrastructure into the design and layout of the development to enable the charging of electric or other Ultra-Low Emission vehicles</p> <p>Residential Development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• All individual dwellings with one or more dedicated parking spaces or garage to include infrastructure for charging electric vehicles.• Where off street parking is not provided within a development proposal, the design and layout of the development should be incorporate infrastructure to enable the on street charging of electric or other vehicles.• For residential development with communal off street parking provision for all remaining parking spaces with the layout of the car park ensuring that all spaces can be easily activated with minimal disruption as demand increases. <p>Active/passive charging</p> <p>Preferred approach: Require 100% active charging facilities for all residential development (subject to further work). Alternative approach: At least 20% of dwellings to have active charge facilities, and the remaining 80% of dwellings to have passive provision.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|---------------|--|----------------------|------|--|-----------|--|
| | | | | | | | <p>Rapid/fast charging points</p> <p>High density and /or large scale residential/mixed use developments to provide at least one rapid charging point clustered with a fast charging point (number per car to be determined) and the provision of an electric vehicle car club, and provide dedicated spaces for the car club with active charging facilities.</p> <p>Non-residential development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In all non-residential developments providing 1 or more car parking bays, ducting to be installed to enable provision of charging facilities for electric vehicles. • Where 10 or more car parking bays are provided, at least 20% of those bays to provide active charging facilities for electric vehicles, and passive provision for all remaining bays. • In non-residential development where provision is made for taxis stopping , the taxi spaces are required to include active charging facilities. |
| ST1940 | Angela Curtis | | 12 Infrastructure | IN07 | | Objection | <p>The proposed policies in the ‘Pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders’ section should also be regarded as unsound on the basis that they would not deliver national walking and cycling objectives. The Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy (CWIS) contains the following targets:</p> <p>1.14 Our objectives are that by 2020, we will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increase cycling activity, where cycling activity is measured as the estimated total number of cycle stages made • increase walking activity, where walking activity is measured as the total number of walking stages per person • reduce the rate of cyclists killed or seriously injured |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | <p>on England's roads, measured as the number of fatalities and serious injuries per billion miles cycled</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• increase the percentage of children aged 5 to 10 that usually walk to school <p>1.15 Further to this, we have set the following aims and target, respectively, to 2025:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• We aim to double cycling, where cycling activity is measured as the estimated total number of cycle stages made each year, from 0.8 billion stages in 2013 to 1.6 billion stages in 2025, and will work towards developing the evidence base over the next year.• We aim to increase walking activity, where walking activity is measured as the total number of walking stages per person per year, to 300 stages per person per year in 2025, and will work towards developing the evidence base over the next year.• We will increase the percentage of children aged 5 to 10 that usually walk to school from 49% in 2014 to 55% in 2025. <p>The policies contained in the Emerging Local Plan are not detailed enough nor large enough in scope to trigger and support a modal shift on the scale National Policy requires. Borough-specific cycling and walking targets should be set, barriers to uptake identified and removed (such as disjointed cycle networks and pothole-ridden cycle lanes), and policies aimed at getting schoolchildren walking should be implemented. Pedestrian charity Living Streets' has called, in response to the consultation on Leicester's Local Plan, for a walkability assessment on the whole Local Plan to be conducted – and I would request this approach be adopted in South Tyneside too.</p> <p>I, further, advocate for the following Walking and</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | <p>Cycling Policies (Policies 6.10 and 6.9 from the London Plan) to be applied to South Tyneside and included in our Local Plan, as a supplement to the 'Pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders' section.</p> <p>Policy 6.10 Walking: Strategic Policy: 'The Mayor will work with all relevant partners to bring about a significant increase in walking in London, by emphasizing the quality of the pedestrian and street environment, including the use of shared space principles, – promoting simplified streetscape, decluttering and access for all.'</p> <p>C.d. provide for the undertaking of audits to ensure that the existing pedestrian infrastructure is suitable for its proposed use and that new development improves pedestrian amenity</p> <p>6.37 : 'The Mayor is also committed to a substantial increase in walking in London. To this end, the quality and safety of London's pedestrian environment should be improved to make the experience of walking more pleasant and an increasingly viable alternative to the private car (see also policies on inclusive environments (7.2) and the public realm (7.5). By providing safe and attractive routes that are easy to navigate, people will be encouraged to walk more, which will have safety, economic and health benefits for them and also help tackle climate change and support the viability of town centres. [...] To support pleasant and enjoyable walking conditions, the Mayor is keen to promote street trees, and proposals for public realm improvements should include additional planting, while avoiding removing trees to further decluttering.'</p> <p>6.38 Planning briefs and masterplans should include</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | <p>principles to encourage a high quality, connected pedestrian environment. Walking issues should be addressed in development proposals, to ensure that walking is promoted and that street conditions, especially safety/security and accessibility for disabled people, are enhanced. Walking networks and facilities in and around all new developments should be direct, safe, attractive, accessible and enjoyable.</p> <p>Policy 6.9 Cycling:</p> <p>6.33 The Mayor is committed to delivering a step-change in cycling provision that will support the growing numbers of cyclists in central London as well as encourage growth in cycling across all of London. The Mayor's aim to increase the mode share for cycling to 5% across Greater London will require significant increases in particular areas and for particular trip purposes.</p> <p>6.35 New developments should provide cycling parking and cycle changing facilities to encourage more cycling. Planning briefs and masterplans should clearly demonstrate how new developments will contribute to creating a high quality, connected environment for cyclists. They should highlight where highways are likely to require dedicated cycling infrastructure, where street environments will be safe for cyclists to share with other modes and where off-highway routes and green spaces will form part of the cycling network. Cycling issues should be addressed in detail in development proposals as part of an integrated approach to sustainable transport, health and local economy. Proposals should ensure that cycling is promoted and that the conditions for cycling are enhanced. They should also seek to take all</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | <p>opportunities to improve the accessibility of town centres, places of work, places of education, leisure facilities and transport nodes to residential areas.</p> <p>6.35a Developments will need to address the needs of both long stay (staff, residents) and short stay (visitor) cyclists. Where it has been demonstrated that it is not practicable to locate all cycle parking within the development site, developers should liaise with neighbouring premises and the local planning authority to identify potential for, and fund appropriate off-site visitor cycle parking. In all circumstances, long stay cycle parking should normally be provided on site. Cycle parking should be designed and located in accordance with best practice set out in London Cycling Design Standards (or subsequent revisions).</p> <p>6.6. Road Bridge & Tiledshed Metro Station I object to further Road Bridge (policy IN7) and proposed Metro Station at Tiledsheds. Firstly Tiledsheds is within walking distance of East Boldon and therefore it is a further unnecessary development which would attract further traffic as there a very few houses situated at Tiledsheds. A carpark would be required, therefore further loss of fields, fauna, wildlife to increase residents waiting times at the metro barriers. Please can you share your footfall, demand and capacity analysis which identifies the need of a further station in that location? The road bridge would create further traffic rather than appease any congestion, bringing additional emphasis to points 6.2, 6.3 and 6.4. This could allow a further 2,000 cars which in addition to the proposed</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|----------------|--|----------------------|------|--|-----------|--|
| | | | | | | | local housing plans is absolutely disproportionate to the size of the village. |
| ST1942 | Alan Hedley | | 12 Infrastructure | IN04 | | Objection | <p>Whilst I welcome the support for renewable energy, I would like to see the plan offer a concrete pathway towards increased renewable energy generation within our borough. Best practice would be to conduct a survey (determining renewable energy generation capacity and then physical and policy constraints for all sites across the borough), the results of which would be published within the local plan. As a consequence of gathering this data, “suitable sites for energy generation” would be identified in the plan. This would act to highlight the potential of key sites, thereby inviting energy companies to seriously consider South Tyneside for their projects. As policy IN4 does not identify “suitable sites for onshore wind energy generation” the policy in effect bans it for the lifetime of the plan. Given that we’re in a climate emergency, I’d ask South Tyneside council to reverse this decision.</p> |
| ST1986 | Alison Cornell | | 12 Infrastructure | IN01 | | Objection | <p>Traffic congestion and the associated pollution are already a problem throughout the area. By increasing the number of residential properties this would exacerbate these problems. Accessibility to key local services would be adversely affected due to additional traffic and levels of air pollution would rise. This would have a direct impact on both the environment and the health of the community, and place an additional strain on health services. The loss of green spaces will result in lower biodiversity for the area and the loss of wildlife. Greenbelt cannot be replaced once lost.</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|-----------------|--|----------------------|------|------|-----------|---|
| ST1994 | Jane Drummond | | 12 Infrastructure | IN03 | | Comment | 6.0 Taking into account the emerging Neighbourhood Plan – policy IN3, policy S4 Quoting Chapter 4.29, “Securing sustainable development is therefore the central theme which runs through this Local Plan and will also bind with any Neighbourhood Plans that are made.” I would like to express my desire for the East Boldon Neighbourhood Plan to be given the credence that the references to it in this Draft Local Plan would indicate that it will. There is no way that this can be the case if the scale of development proposed goes ahead or if the Green Belt boundary is changed. The Neighbourhood plan will have a design code for housing and green infrastructure, and designated Green Spaces, and we expect these to be considered first and foremost when housing is allocated. |
| ST2001 | Lynn Hughes | | 12 Infrastructure | IN07 | k) v | objection | Also the removal of both Tile Shed and Benton Road crossings referred to as H3.1 with a 30ft high bridge construction is totally unnecessary. There are level crossings all over the country without any public safety issues and feel this is just a way of upgrading the road infrastructure whilst making it sound like you have our interests at the forefront of your reasoning. Again this will have a detrimental effect on the Boldon area and the wildlife of the area and will also look horrendous and again remove the village status as we will be merged into South Shields. I hope you take my points into consideration before this plan is authorised. |
| ST2003 | Claire Ludbrook | | 12 Infrastructure | IN03 | | Comment | 6.0 Taking into account the emerging Neighbourhood Plan – policy IN3, policy S4 Quoting Chapter 4.29, “Securing sustainable development is therefore the central theme which |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|---------------|--|----------------------|------|--|---------|---|
| | | | | | | | runs through this Local Plan and will also bind with any Neighbourhood Plans that are made.” I would like to express my desire for the East Boldon Neighbourhood Plan to be given the credence that the references to it in this Draft Local Plan would indicate that it will. There is no way that this can be the case if the scale of development proposed goes ahead or if the Green Belt boundary is changed. The Neighbourhood plan will have a design code for housing and green infrastructure, and designated Green Spaces, and we expect these to be considered first and foremost when housing is allocated. |
| ST2005 | Grahame Tobin | | 12 Infrastructure | IN03 | | Comment | 5.0 Taking into account the emerging Neighbourhood Plan – policy IN3, policy S4 Quoting Chapter 4.29, “Securing sustainable development is therefore the central theme which runs through this Local Plan and will also bind with any Neighbourhood Plans that are made.” I would like to express my desire for the East Boldon Neighbourhood Plan to be given the credence that the references to it in this Draft Local Plan would indicate that it will. There is no way that this can be the case if the scale of development proposed goes ahead or if the Green Belt boundary is changed. The Neighbourhood plan will have a design code for housing and green infrastructure, and designated Green Spaces, and we expect these to be considered first and foremost when housing is allocated. |
| ST2006 | Andrea Tobin | | 12 Infrastructure | IN03 | | Comment | 5.0 Taking into account the emerging Neighbourhood Plan – policy IN3, policy S4 Quoting Chapter 4.29, “Securing sustainable development is therefore the central theme which runs through this Local Plan and will also bind with any |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|-----------------|--|-------------------|------|--|-----------|---|
| | | | | | | | Neighbourhood Plans that are made.” I would like to express my desire for the East Boldon Neighbourhood Plan to be given the credence that the references to it in this Draft Local Plan would indicate that it will. There is no way that this can be the case if the scale of development proposed goes ahead or if the Green Belt boundary is changed. The Neighbourhood plan will have a design code for housing and green infrastructure, and designated Green Spaces, and we expect these to be considered first and foremost when housing is allocated. |
| ST2009 | Eileen Thompson | | 12 Infrastructure | IN07 | | Objection | <p>Policy IN7 Accessible and Sustainable Travel –Object The Park and Ride facilities at East Boldon station are inadequate.</p> <p>The current car park is constantly at capacity and demand leads to parking problems in surrounding roads and streets. The statement in this policy must be, more specific with regard to additional parking. The policy proposes to safeguard land to enable additional park and ride facilities at existing metro stations but is not specific about East Boldon.</p> <p>The proposed improvement of the local highway network at Boldon and Tiledshed Level Crossing Scheme with new bridge and carriageways is causing concern to many residents.</p> <p>It is at the very early stages of design and full public consultation on its design is required as a matter of urgency. The Council has made a bid to the Department of Transport for funding and if this is not successful then there are also concerns. The Council have stated that full barriers as proposed by Network Rail "will significantly increase the time in which the level crossings are in operation and will increase</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|-------------------|--|----------------------|------|------|---------|---|
| | | | | | | | delays and congestion." The addition of new housing in this area will only make this worse. |
| ST2013 | Gary Attewell | | 12 Infrastructure | | 12.1 | Support | 5.0 Open Green Spaces and community infrastructure – Policy N3 and paragraph 12.1 I would like to state my support for Policy N3. In East Boldon we intend to identify some Green spaces within our Neighbourhood Plan. One of the sites which is in question is the area in front of St George’s Church. This area is neglected and unsightly and detracts from the Church, making it very difficult to attract congregation. I would like to see it become accessible and landscaped, while respecting the wildlife which habits it. |
| ST2013 | Gary Attewell | | 12 Infrastructure | IN03 | | Comment | 6.0 Taking into account the emerging Neighbourhood Plan – policy IN3, policy S4 Quoting Chapter 4.29, “Securing sustainable development is therefore the central theme which runs through this Local Plan and will also bind with any Neighbourhood Plans that are made.” I would like to express my desire for the East Boldon Neighbourhood Plan to be given the credence that the references to it in this Draft Local Plan would indicate that it will. There is no way that this can be the case if the scale of development proposed goes ahead or if the Green Belt boundary is changed. The Neighbourhood plan will have a design code for housing and green infrastructure, and designated Green Spaces, and we expect these to be considered first and foremost when housing is allocated. |
| ST2099 | Mrs L Grimwood | | 12 Infrastructure | IN03 | | Object | 6.0 Taking into account the emerging Neighbourhood Plan - Policy IN3, Policy S4 Quoting Chapter 4.29, "Securing sustainable development is therefore the central theme which |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|--------------------|--|-------------------|------|--|--------|---|
| | | | | | | | runs through this Local Plan and will also bind with any Neighbourhood Plans that are made. " I would like to express my desire for the East Boldon Neighbourhood Plan to be given the credence that the references to it in this Draft Local Plan would indicate that it will. There is no way that this can be the case if the scale of development proposed goes ahead or if the Green Belt boundary s changed. The Neighbourhood plan will have a design code for housing and green infrastructure, and designated Green SPaces, and we expect these to be considered first and foremost when housing is allocated. |
| ST2100 | Miss Amy Forbister | | 12 Infrastructure | IN03 | | Object | 5.0 Taking into account the emerging Neighbourhood Plan – policy IN3, policy S4 Quoting Chapter 4.29, “Securing sustainable development is therefore the central theme which runs through this Local Plan and will also bind with any Neighbourhood Plans that are made.” I would like to express my desire for the East Boldon Neighbourhood Plan to be given the credence that the references to it in this Draft Local Plan would indicate that it will. There is no way that this can be the case if the scale of development proposed goes ahead or if the Green Belt boundary is changed. The Neighbourhood plan will have a design code for housing and green infrastructure, and designated Green Spaces, and we expect these to be considered first and foremost when housing is allocated. |
| ST2101 | Mr Eoghan Johnston | | 12 Infrastructure | IN03 | | Object | 6.0 Taking into account the emerging Neighbourhood Plan – policy IN3, policy S4 Quoting Chapter 4.29, “Securing sustainable development is therefore the central theme which runs through this Local Plan and will also bind with any |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------|------|--|-----------|---|
| | | | | | | | Neighbourhood Plans that are made.” I would like to express my desire for the East Boldon Neighbourhood Plan to be given the credence that the references to it in this Draft Local Plan would indicate that it will. There is no way that this can be the case if the scale of development proposed goes ahead or if the Green Belt boundary is changed. The Neighbourhood plan will have a design code for housing and green infrastructure, and designated Green Spaces, and we expect these to be considered first and foremost when housing is allocated. |
| ST2102 | Mrs Kathryn Tutill | | 12 Infrastructure | IN03 | | Object | 6.0 Taking into account the emerging Neighbourhood Plan – policy IN3, policy S4 Quoting Chapter 4.29, “Securing sustainable development is therefore the central theme which runs through this Local Plan and will also bind with any Neighbourhood Plans that are made.” I would like to express my desire for the East Boldon Neighbourhood Plan to be given the credence that the references to it in this Draft Local Plan would indicate that it will. There is no way that this can be the case if the scale of development proposed goes ahead or if the Green Belt boundary is changed. The Neighbourhood plan will have a design code for housing and green infrastructure, and designated Green Spaces, and we expect these to be considered first and foremost when housing is allocated. |
| ST2111 | Nicola Reed | Persimmon Homes | 12 Infrastructure | IN03 | | objection | Part 3h of this policy requires a developer to set land aside for the provision of social and community infrastructure, where there is an identified need. The wording of this policy should be more flexible to ensure that this policy is applied on a case by case basis. This will ensure any infrastructure provision in |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|-------------|-----------------|-------------------|------|-------|-------------|--|
| | | | | | | | <p>on the right sites and in the right location. This policy requirement must also consider the viability implications of this policy requirement which is extremely important in delivering development across the Borough.</p> <p>Should this policy be retained in its current form, it should be underpinned by an appropriate evidence base to support the need for infrastructure facilities to be provided on new developments.</p> |
| ST2111 | Nicola Reed | Persimmon Homes | 12 Infrastructure | IN02 | 12.14 | Observation | <p>It is noted within paragraph 12.14 that proposals within this Local Plan have been subject to a Whole Plan Viability Assessment. This should have been included as part of the evidence base for the Plan and made available for public consultation. Consultation with interested parties is important at the early stages of the plan to ensure that it is informed by appropriate and up to date evidence.</p> |
| ST2111 | Nicola Reed | Persimmon Homes | 12 Infrastructure | IN06 | | Observation | <p>Part B i) of this policy requires all major developments to incorporate charging infrastructure for ultra-low emission vehicles. It is not wholly clear from the policy whether this applies to all dwellings forming part of a major development. It is assumed that this will be included for within the Parking Standards SPD which is being developed.</p> <p>Persimmon Homes trust that the Council have been in discussion with the National Grid to determine if this policy requirement is achievable and can be supported.</p> <p>Persimmon Homes also trust that viability testing has been carried out to ensure that the implementation of this policy would not overly burden developments and potentially render them unviable.</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|--|---------------------------|-------------------|------|---|-----------|---|
| ST2112 | | Shlomo Memorial Trust Ltd | 12 Infrastructure | IN01 | b | objection | Policy IN(b) refers to “where appropriate, [seeking] to improve any deficiencies in existing provision”. However, it would be unreasonable for a development to have to rectify / improve existing deficiencies in provision in an area. Such an approach would conflict with the tests for planning obligations as set out in the Community Infrastructure Regulations (Regulation 122(2)) and the NPPF (para. 56). To ensure a sound Plan that is consistent with national legislation and policy, it is requested that this text is deleted from the policy. |
| ST2112 | | Shlomo Memorial Trust Ltd | 12 Infrastructure | IN01 | d | objection | Policy IN1(d) refers to ‘world class’ digital infrastructure; however, its exact definition and the cost implications of providing such infrastructure is unclear. It is therefore suggested that this word is deleted from the policy. |
| ST2112 | | Shlomo Memorial Trust Ltd | 12 Infrastructure | IN02 | 1 | support | Our client supports draft Policy IN2 (1) which states that regard will be given to the impact of contributions on the economic viability of the scheme. |
| ST2112 | | Shlomo Memorial Trust Ltd | 12 Infrastructure | IN02 | b | objection | However, our client is concerned about part 2(b) of this policy which advises that the council may “consider alternative phasing, through the development period, of any contributions where to do so would sufficiently improve the viability of the scheme to enable payment.” The development industry requires certainty and including a review mechanism in any Section 106 Agreement which could potentially trigger an unforeseen payment at a later date would create an uncertain approach. Indeed, the council has not suggested including a review mechanism that would enable a lower contribution to be paid in the future there be an economic downturn. Once the level of |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|--|---------------------------|-------------------|------|-------|-----------|--|
| | | | | | | | <p>contributions are agreed and a Section 106 Agreement is signed, the development industry then has to accept any up or down turns in the market. It would not be fair and reasonable if they have to accept the risk of downturns but are not in turn rewarded should there be an economic upturn.</p> <p>Our client therefore requests that part 2(b) of Policy IN2 and that the section of paragraph 12.14 which refers to “viability [being] reassessed during the construction phase of the development” are deleted to ensure a fair and reasonable approach, in accordance with the NPPF (para. 35). They would also recommend any S106 incorporates a 10 year time limit on the expenditure of contribution to demonstrate the monies are being properly allocated to local ‘needs’.</p> |
| ST2112 | | Shlomo Memorial Trust Ltd | 12 Infrastructure | IN02 | 12.14 | objection | <p>However, our client is concerned about part 2(b) of this policy which advises that the council may “consider alternative phasing, through the development period, of any contributions where to do so would sufficiently improve the viability of the scheme to enable payment.”</p> <p>The development industry requires certainty and including a review mechanism in any Section 106 Agreement which could potentially trigger an unforeseen payment at a later date would create an uncertain approach. Indeed, the council has not suggested including a review mechanism that would enable a lower contribution to be paid in the future there be an economic downturn. Once the level of contributions are agreed and a Section 106 Agreement is signed, the development industry then has to accept any up or down turns in the market. It would not be</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|--|---------------------------|-------------------|------|-----|-----------|--|
| | | | | | | | <p>fair and reasonable if they have to accept the risk of downturns but are not in turn rewarded should there be an economic upturn.</p> <p>Our client therefore requests that part 2(b) of Policy IN2 and that the section of paragraph 12.14 which refers to “viability [being] reassessed during the construction phase of the development” are deleted to ensure a fair and reasonable approach, in accordance with the NPPF (para. 35). They would also recommend any S106 incorporates a 10 year time limit on the expenditure of contribution to demonstrate the monies are being properly allocated to local ‘needs’.</p> |
| ST2112 | | Shlomo Memorial Trust Ltd | 12 Infrastructure | IN03 | 3 h | objection | <p>Although our client supports the provision of social and community infrastructure, such provision needs to be proportionate to the scale of any development. Part 3(h) of Policy IN3 states that the developer will be required to set land aside for the provision of social and community infrastructure, where there is an identified need. However, it may not be reasonable or proportionate for a development to set aside such land and it could also have a negative impact on development viability.</p> <p>The following amendments are therefore being sought to ensure a fair and reasonable approach, in accordance with the NPPF (para. 35):</p> <p>“Require the developer Enter into discussions with the developer to determine whether it would be appropriate to set land aside for the provision of social and community infrastructure, where there is an identified need, or whether it would be more appropriate to provide a contribution (taking into account development viability”.</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|---------------|---------------------------|-------------------|------|-------|---------|---|
| ST2112 | | Shlomo Memorial Trust Ltd | 12 Infrastructure | IN06 | c iii | | Our client is concerned about the reference to new developments being no more than 400m from a bus stop in Policy IN6(c)(iii). This is onerous and is not a national requirement. The following change is therefore sought: "Where appropriate and necessary, All new homes and commercial development must be no more than 400m from a bus stop should have good access to available bus services." |
| ST2114 | Andrew Walker | Nexus | 12 Infrastructure | IN06 | | comment | Thank you for consulting Nexus on the pre-publication draft Local Plan. Nexus would like to recognise the hard work undertaken so far by the council to bring the development of the Local Plan to this stage. Nexus submits this response without prejudice and reserves the right to amend its position if further developments are made to the plan. Following a review of the plan, Nexus wishes to comment on two specific policies within the plan. These are Policies IN6 and IN7. Policy IN6 addresses many of the key criteria of the Nexus Planning Liaison Policy which aims to provide guidance to developers on what is required therefore Nexus supports the policy but asks that the council considers including reference to the Nexus Planning Liaison Policy to signpost potential developers to it when planning new developments. |
| ST2114 | Andrew Walker | Nexus | 12 Infrastructure | IN07 | | comment | Thank you for consulting Nexus on the pre-publication draft Local Plan. Nexus would like to recognise the hard work undertaken so far by the council to bring the development of the Local Plan to this stage. Nexus submits this response without prejudice and reserves the right to amend its position if further developments are made to the plan. |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | <p>Following a review of the plan, Nexus wishes to comment on two specific policies within the plan. These are Policies IN6 and IN7.</p> <p>Nexus supports in principle Policy IN7 however requires the council take additional steps to protect assets that are strategically significant to the delivery of network extensions detailed in the 2016 Metro and Local Rail Strategy, which may be negatively impacted by future developments.</p> <p>Specifically, Policy IN7 states that the Council will safeguard land to enable additional park-and-ride facilities at existing metro stations. Nexus' own research suggests that existing park-and-ride provision within South Tyneside is predominantly used by local residents rather than people travelling from further away.</p> <p>As well as enabling new park-and-ride sites, South Tyneside Council should work to promote active travel to Metro stations including improving walking and cycling links to reduce the number of short distance car trips and to promote park-and-ride opportunities to the wider region to reduce congestion on the area's road network.</p> <p>Nexus would like to see the policy also commit to protecting strategically significant land at sites where new Metro stations may be developed on alignments identified as potential network extensions.</p> <p>It is Nexus' view that a 5m buffer be applied to each side of the alignments proposed in point "a" of Policy IN7 to restrict any development that may inhibit the future expansion of the Metro network including the construction of the line and any new stations.</p> <p>Policy IN7 also refers to a new river crossing. At the</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|----------------------|--|-------------------|------|--|-----------|---|
| | | | | | | | next stage of the development process of the Plan, Nexus would like to see further clarification on this crossing including mention of what method of crossing this will be, whether a new bridge, tunnel or if this will be a new ferry crossing. |
| ST2117 | Church Commissioners | | 12 Infrastructure | IN02 | | comment | <p>3.78 Our Client broadly supports the intentions of the policy however we consider that the policy should open with the following change: “Where appropriate, new development will be required...”. This is in accordance with paragraph 16 of the Framework which sets out that plans should contain policies that are “clearly written”.</p> <p>3.79 We also note paragraph 34 of the Framework which states that policies setting out contributions expected from development must not undermine the delivery of the plan. We wish to restate that, until we are able to view the Viability Report supporting the Local Plan, we are not able to comment on how the contributions would affect the delivery of the plan. Therefore, we reserve the right to comment further, until we have seen and reviewed the viability testing and the report.</p> |
| ST2117 | Church Commissioners | | 12 Infrastructure | IN06 | | Objection | <p>3.80 We support the intentions of the policy and agree that an important consideration of promoting sustainable development is wherever possible, ensuring sustainable transport methods are accessible, or can be supported by new development.</p> <p>3.81 However, we are concerned by the inclusion in part c) v. of the policy which states that proposals must demonstrate how they sought to maximise opportunities to improve accessibility to metro stations.</p> <p>3.82 The way the policy is currently worded would</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|--------------|------------------------|-------------------|------|--|---------|---|
| | | | | | | | <p>suggest that the criteria specified in part c) is a starting point for assessing development proposals. Given the variance throughout South Tyneside, not all areas of the authority are in close proximity to the metro network. For example, the village of Whitburn is approximately 2.68 kilometres from the nearest metro station (Seaburn). We do not consider it appropriate to impose this requirement throughout the Authority boundary, nor do we consider it justified and therefore object to Policy IN6 on this point and propose its removal from the policy.</p> |
| ST2119 | Kath Lawless | Newcastle City Council | 12 Infrastructure | IN07 | | Support | <p>Thank you for providing Newcastle City Council the opportunity to submit representations on the South Tyneside Local Plan. As we continue to implement the Gateshead and Newcastle Core Strategy and Urban Core Plan, and await the Inspector's Report on the Newcastle Development Allocations Plan, the South Tyneside Local Plan (STLP) Pre-Publication Draft will be of strategic relevance to us as a neighbouring authority.</p> <p>The STLP Duty to Cooperate Position Statement acknowledges the flow of South Tyneside residents who travel to work in Newcastle, creating an important functional relationship between the two councils. Opportunities for strategic infrastructure improvements are key to this relationship and can help to improve the vibrancy of our Urban Core. We therefore welcome proposals in Policy IN7 for sustainable public transport improvements, including the safeguarding of land for potential Metro and rail line extensions, and collaborative working with regional partners to improve bus services.</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|-----------------|------------------------|-------------------|------|----|-----------|--|
| ST2119 | Kath Lawless | Newcastle City Council | 12 Infrastructure | IN11 | | Support | Throckley Brickworks, to the west of Newcastle, is a crucial facility for brickmaking and is reliant on raw material extracted at Red Barns Quarry in West Boldon. We support the restoration of Red Barns Quarry to underpin investment at Throckley Brickworks, and highlight the importance of ensuring appropriate land-banks for the supply of minerals in the Tyne and Wear region, as set out in Policy IN11. |
| ST2121 | Sheila Graber | | 12 Infrastructure | IN04 | | objection | As policy IN4 does not identify 'suitable sites for onshore wind energy generation' it , in effect, bans it for the lifetime of the plan. Given that we're in a climate emergency, I'd ask the council to reverse this decision. |
| ST2122 | Brittany Hansen | | 12 Infrastructure | IN04 | | objection | * As policy IN4 does not identify 'suitable sites for onshore wind energy generation' it , in effect, bans it for the lifetime of the plan. Given that we're in a climate emergency, I'd ask the council to reverse this decision. |
| ST2124 | P W Taylor | | 12 Infrastructure | IN07 | kv | objection | 5. Roads, traffic and Road Bridge I have a major concern about the effect of the proposed developments in Cleadon on the already busy roads in the area, particularly those linking the village to the west through Boldon to the A19 and Newcastle. I understand that a road bridge is proposed to replace the level crossings at Tiledshed and Boldon Lane partly to develop sites outside Cleadon, but the effect will inevitably be to increase traffic through Cleadon on either Moor Lane or Boldon Lane. I also understand that a new Metro station (and car park?) is proposed, the details of which (like the road bridge) are not available. Both however will increase rather than alleviate the traffic problems in Cleadon itself. Major changes to the Sunderland Road/Moor |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|-------------|--|----------------------|------|--|-----------|---|
| | | | | | | | Lane junction which would be necessary of the H3.70 were developed would further destroy the openness of the Green Belt. I think it is likely that a high proportion of occupants of houses in the proposed developments would not be people working in South Tyneside, significantly increasing commuter traffic. |
| ST2167 | Jean Eckert | | 12 Infrastructure | IN07 | | Objection | <p>This is also demonstrated in Policy IN7 where the building of a road bridge to replace two level crossings is referred to (but not actually stated) in many of the site allocations key considerations (at least 4 depend on this infrastructure before they are deliverable) For example: H3.1 Land at Benton Road refers to “Trees likely to be removed due to level crossing closure, so noise implications would have to quantify”.</p> <p>This closure scheme is part of a regional transport proposal. This infrastructure will also require Green Belt deletion, but is not included in the total loss of Green Belt calculations. (Its construction is also not mentioned or referenced anywhere in the Plan other than a single sentence in Policy IN7.)</p> <p>The ‘noise’ referred to will be the significant rise in traffic noise which is amplified above road noise levels on such road bridges.</p> <p>Removal of trees will also contribute to, and lose the protection against, the increased pollution which will be caused by this addition to the regional strategic road network.</p> <p>Construction of this road bridge and the subsequent increase of traffic from development using this route, will pose a significant threat to the distinct character of the villages of Cleadon and East Boldon which this Plan seeks to protect, and will have a major impact on the health and wellbeing of all residents (current and</p> |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | <p>future) along the routes that feed in to the bridge and even more so for those residents along New Road and Boldon Colliery.</p> <p>How can infrastructure to support a 'green' bus route be a sustainable solution when the 'presumption of sustainability' is so strongly against the social and environmental objectives it is based on?</p> <p>Should co-operation with other regional transport policy makers not allow South Tyneside Council to make decisions on road infrastructure requirements (supporting the IAMP development), to be made in the best interests of the residents in South Tyneside?</p> <p>Other road schemes in South Tyneside, such as Lindisfarne and Testos roundabout, have been hailed as 'green successes' because these will lower carbon emissions by keeping a free flow of traffic: the road bridge will actually increase carbon emissions by allowing development to increase more traffic and then causing congestion in, particularly Cleadon and Boldon Colliery as traffic from the west of the bridge accumulates at the many junctions this route will have. An assumption of sustainability will allow this to happen. This must be challenged.</p> <p>Policy IN7 Accessible and Sustainable Travel (Strategic Policy)</p> <p>OBJECT</p> <p>The main reason I am objecting to this policy is because of the inclusion at:</p> <p>IMPROVING CAPACITY ON THE NETWORK, item, k) v. Boldon and Tiledshed Level Crossing Closure Scheme with new bridge and carriageways.</p> <p>There is no other information given about the bridge in the Plan, although it is intimated that some sort of</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>the 'improvements' to the road system are required before development of sites H3.1, H3.12, H3.59 and RG5 can go ahead.</p> <p>More information was found in an Infrastructure Delivery Plan schedule (when searching for information about flood alleviation schemes, contained in the same document). Why is this information not given in the Policy IN7? Should there not be a transport policy document which discusses this?</p> <p>This schedule informs that the road bridge will require funding which includes contributions from developers through "CIL" (which I think is the Community Infrastructure Levy); from Nexus and also funding from a regional transport fund, which, I have found, involves a bidding process.</p> <p>The conclusion that is reached from this is that, unless development of the 4 sites (above) goes ahead then the bridge will not be funded and cannot be built. Yet it is in the Plan as part of improving capacity on the network and funding is being sought as being part of a scheme to improve bus routes? There is only one bus that goes along this route which goes to Newcastle. It runs twice an hour. Is it really worth in excess of £20 million to 'improve' this route? If that is the case, then hiding this information shows that this policy cannot be justified.</p> <p>However, after further conjecture, from reading the key considerations of the site allocations in policy H3, then this would suggest it is more important to the main objective of the Local Plan to have this road bridge to 'open up development'.</p> <p>This suggests that the sustainability assessments of</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | <p>the sites, above, have not been assessed on current road provision but on a predicted improvement in this being made by the road bridge? This puts the validity of these assessments into question and suggests that these developments cannot be sustainable.</p> <p>The impact of all of these sites being developed is obvious. A total of 1121 houses will be built. That is a minimum of 1121 cars more than those currently using this route. Realistically this number could almost double. Although two of these sites are close to East Boldon Metro station, at peak times this runs with a full capacity of passengers. The Metro cannot take another potential minimum of 1121 passengers or another minimum of 477 from development proposed in Cleadon or hundreds more from sites in East Boldon and Whitburn. A conservative estimate would be about 3,000 more cars per day using Benton Road/Boldon Lane, Tiled Lane and then New Road to Boldon Colliery, which is already a very congested route, due to its links to Testo's and the A19 and A184 AND the main road to the Asda hypermarket.</p> <p>Additional traffic from proposed development in Whitburn would also add to this and create more congestion both in the centre of Cleadon and the roads running through the village.</p> <p>Closing the level crossing and building the road bridge would ruin the rural aspect of the approach to the village which Cleadon enjoys now and will have a critical impact on the special character of the village. Congestion caused by permanent heavy traffic through the village will also be a dangerous cause of pollution and air quality would suffer as a result. This would be replicated in Boldon Colliery.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>Should the health of residents be sacrificed so that regional transport policies* can be applied and so meet targets outside of this Plan? The answer must be 'No'. A policy which allows that cannot be justified. (*If they exist. They are not included with the Plan.)</p> <p>The road bridge will be a major source of noise pollution. Such constructions in other parts of the country are known to amplify the noise of traffic. This will be in addition to the noise from the Metro and any additional freight trains which will be running along this stretch of track.</p> <p>The position of the road bridge to take traffic across the Metro line at Benton Road and Tiledshed Lane, means that this will have to be constructed on Green Belt land in an area that is at risk from flooding. Where the bridge will join New Road will also be close to the flood plain of the River Don This river and its tributaries will be at risk of more flooding if development goes ahead as this river and its tributary, Tiledshed Burn, will be the receptors of all SuDs systems for development at IAMP and all proposed development to the east of Boldon - in addition to their present catchments, which include the present flood alleviation schemes in Cleadon. We do not know if any assessment has been made of these issues pertaining to the road bridge. It is irresponsible that this has been included in the Local Plan. The road bridge is not sustainable.</p> <p>Another entry in the Infastructure Delivery Plan schedule, revealed that there is also a new Metro station proposed to be built at Tiledshed Lane/Boldon Lane. The capacity of the Metro system has already</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | <p>been mentioned as a negative to any development in the area being sustainable. The detrimental environmental impact from an additional increase in traffic caused by another Metro station, will just compound this. South Tyneside Council has recently announced a Climate Emergency to prevent an environmental crisis in the Borough. This will include the Council promoting carbon reduction throughout the Borough and also producing a Climate Change Strategy which will set clear targets for carbon reduction. This strategy will be considered in March 2020 and will set an action plan for the following 5 years. This coincides with the expected delivery of many of the proposed development sites in the areas surrounding the road bridge. The timescale for the road bridge is 2024. If action against climate change is being taken seriously the Local Plan cannot deliver the proposals in this policy.</p> <p>This policy must be withdrawn. It is not sound.</p> |
| ST2171 | Anneliese Hutchinson | Gateshead Council | 12 Infrastructure | IN07 | | | <p>With regard to the Plan's approach to transport, we welcome South Tyneside's support for the development of the Metro and Rail networks in the North East (Policy IN7). We would also welcome continued engagement on the location and access arrangements for any new Metro station proposal at Mill Lane. Similarly, Gateshead Council is happy to work with South Tyneside Council where any cross-border improvements for bus services can be identified, particularly in the delivery of the commitments made in the IAMP Area Action Plan. Given the potential nature of trip patterns, the levels of traffic already seen on the local road network in</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|---------------|------------|-------------------|------|----|-----------|---|
| | | | | | | | East Gateshead through to the Tyne Bridge, and the issues this presents in terms of air quality, we will be keen to see the outcomes of the Plan's traffic modelling exercises at the earliest opportunity. |
| ST2176 | Neil Westwick | Lichfields | 12 Infrastructure | IN01 | b | objection | Policy IN(b) refers to "where appropriate, [seeking] to improve any deficiencies in existing provision". However, it would be unreasonable for a development to have to rectify / improve existing deficiencies in provision in an area. Such an approach would conflict with the tests for planning obligations as set out in the Community Infrastructure Regulations (Regulation 122(2)) and the NPPF (para. 56). To ensure a sound Plan that is consistent with national legislation and policy, it is requested that this text is deleted from the policy. |
| ST2176 | Neil Westwick | Lichfields | 12 Infrastructure | IN01 | d | objection | Policy IN1(d) refers to 'world class' digital infrastructure; however, its exact definition and the cost implications of providing such infrastructure is unclear. It is therefore suggested that this word is deleted from the policy. |
| ST2176 | Neil Westwick | Lichfields | 12 Infrastructure | IN02 | 1 | support | Our client supports draft Policy IN2 (1) which states that regard will be given to the impact of contributions on the economic viability of the scheme. |
| ST2176 | Neil Westwick | Lichfields | 12 Infrastructure | IN02 | 2b | objection | However, our client is concerned about part 2(b) of this policy which advises that the council may "consider alternative phasing, through the development period, of any contributions where to do so would sufficiently improve the viability of the scheme to enable payment." The development industry requires certainty and including a review mechanism in any Section 106 Agreement which could potentially trigger an unforeseen payment at a later date would create an |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|---------------|------------|-------------------|------|-------|-----------|---|
| | | | | | | | <p>uncertain approach. Indeed, the council has not suggested including a review mechanism that would enable a lower contribution to be paid in the future there be an economic downturn. Once the level of contributions are agreed and a Section 106 Agreement is signed, the development industry then has to accept any up or down turns in the market. It would not be fair and reasonable if they have to accept the risk of downturns but are not in turn rewarded should there be an economic upturn.</p> <p>Our client therefore requests that part 2(b) of Policy IN2 and that the section of paragraph 12.14 which refers to “viability [being] reassessed during the construction phase of the development” are deleted to ensure a fair and reasonable approach, in accordance with the NPPF (para. 35). They would also recommend any S106 incorporates a 10 year time limit on the expenditure of contribution to demonstrate the monies are being properly allocated to local ‘needs’.</p> |
| ST2176 | Neil Westwick | Lichfields | 12 Infrastructure | IN02 | 12.14 | objection | <p>However, our client is concerned about part 2(b) of this policy which advises that the council may “consider alternative phasing, through the development period, of any contributions where to do so would sufficiently improve the viability of the scheme to enable payment.”</p> <p>The development industry requires certainty and including a review mechanism in any Section 106 Agreement which could potentially trigger an unforeseen payment at a later date would create an uncertain approach. Indeed, the council has not suggested including a review mechanism that would enable a lower contribution to be paid in the future</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|---------------|------------|----------------------|------|----|--|--|
| | | | | | | | <p>there be an economic downturn. Once the level of contributions are agreed and a Section 106 Agreement is signed, the development industry then has to accept any up or down turns in the market. It would not be fair and reasonable if they have to accept the risk of downturns but are not in turn rewarded should there be an economic upturn.</p> <p>Our client therefore requests that part 2(b) of Policy IN2 and that the section of paragraph 12.14 which refers to “viability [being] reassessed during the construction phase of the development” are deleted to ensure a fair and reasonable approach, in accordance with the NPPF (para. 35). They would also recommend any S106 incorporates a 10 year time limit on the expenditure of contribution to demonstrate the monies are being properly allocated to local ‘needs’.</p> |
| ST2176 | Neil Westwick | Lichfields | 12 Infrastructure | IN03 | 3h | | <p>Although our client supports the provision of social and community infrastructure, such provision needs to be proportionate to the scale of any development. Part 3(h) of Policy IN3 states that the developer will be required to set land aside for the provision of social and community infrastructure, where there is an identified need. However, it may not be reasonable or proportionate for a development to set aside such land and it could also have a negative impact on development viability.</p> <p>The following amendments are therefore being sought to ensure a fair and reasonable approach, in accordance with the NPPF (para. 35):</p> <p>“Require the developer Enter into discussions with the developer to determine whether it would be appropriate to set land aside for the provision of social</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|---|------------|-------------------|------|-------|-----------|---|
| | | | | | | | and community infrastructure, where there is an identified need, or whether it would be more appropriate to provide a contribution (taking into account development viability”. |
| ST2176 | Neil Westwick | Lichfields | 12 Infrastructure | IN06 | c iii | | Our client is concerned about the reference to new developments being no more than 400m from a bus stop in Policy IN6(c)(iii). This is onerous and is not a national requirement. The following change is therefore sought: “Where appropriate and necessary, All new homes and commercial development must be no more than 400m from a bus stop should have good access to available bus services.” |
| ST2181 | Cleadon and East Boldon Branch Labour Party | | 12 Infrastructure | IN07 | | objection | We have long campaigned for the expansion of the Park and Ride facilities at East Boldon station. The current car park is constantly at capacity and demand leads to parking problems in surrounding roads and streets. The statement in this policy must be, more specific with regard to additional parking. The policy proposes to safeguard land to enable additional park and ride facilities at existing metro stations but is not specific about East Boldon. The proposed improvement of the local highway network at Boldon and Tiledshed Level Crossing Scheme with new bridge and carriageways is causing concerns to local residents. It is at the very early stages of design and full public consultation on its design is required as a matter of urgency. The Council has made a bid to the Department of Transport for funding and if this is not successful then there are also concerns. The Council have stated that full barriers as proposed by Network Rail "will significantly increase the time in which the |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|---------------|----------------|-------------------|------|--|---------|--|
| | | | | | | | level crossings are in operation and will increase delays and congestion." The addition of new housing in this area will only make this worse. We are also concerned about its impact on existing properties and on Tiled Nature Reserve. |
| ST2185 | James Seabury | Banks Property | 12 Infrastructure | IN01 | | comment | 5. CHAPTER 12: INFRASTRUCTURE Policy IN1: Our Strategic Approach to Infrastructure 5.1 Banks Property support policy IN1 particularly to ensure that infrastructure required to support new development is delivered as an integral part of the development and at the appropriate stage. 5.2 We have reviewed the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which identifies the infrastructure required to deliver the site allocations and policies in the local plan as well as providing a guiding framework as to the timing of the delivery of infrastructure required. It is important that the IDP and background assessments that have informed its content are discussed with site promoters to allow all parties to understand the provision of new infrastructure required. It is also important to distinguish between existing infrastructure problems that are required to be addressed regardless of new development and those directly attributable to new development e.g. the A183 Coast Road realignment which is necessitated by coastal erosion and not highways capacity. |
| ST2185 | James Seabury | Banks Property | 12 Infrastructure | IN06 | | support | Policy IN6: Travel - New Development 5.3 Banks Property support policy IN6 and the need to prepare Transport Statements or Transport Assessments to assist the consideration of transport impacts of new developments. This will ensure that |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|------|-----|-----------|--|
| | | | | | | | impacts attributed to specific developments will be identified and can be mitigated appropriately. |
| ST2185 | James Seabury | Banks Property | 12 Infrastructure | IN06 | b | support | 5.4 Section b) refers to development proposals being designed to meet the needs of ultra-low emission vehicle users. Banks Property support this approach and would ensure that overnight charging points are provided as an integral part of each residential unit. |
| ST2186 | Alastair Willis | Lichfields | 12 Infrastructure | IN01 | b | objection | Policy IN1(b) refers to “where appropriate, [seeking] to improve any deficiencies in existing provision”. However, it would be unreasonable for a development to have to rectify / improve existing deficiencies in provision in an area. Such an approach would conflict with the tests for planning obligations as set out in the Community Infrastructure Regulations (Regulation 122(2)) and the NPPF (para. 56). To ensure a sound Plan that is consistent with national legislation and policy, it is requested that this text is deleted from the policy. |
| ST2186 | Alastair Willis | Lichfields | 12 Infrastructure | IN01 | d | objection | Policy IN1(d) refers to ‘world class’ digital infrastructure; however, its exact definition and the cost implications of providing such infrastructure is unclear. It is therefore suggested that this word is deleted from the policy. |
| ST2186 | Alastair Willis | Lichfields | 12 Infrastructure | IN02 | 1 | support | Our client supports draft Policy IN2 (1) which states that regard will be given to the impact of contributions on the economic viability of the scheme. |
| ST2186 | Alastair Willis | Lichfields | 12 Infrastructure | IN02 | 2 b | objection | However, our client is concerned about part 2(b) of this policy which advises that the council may “consider alternative phasing, through the development period, of any contributions where to do so would sufficiently improve the viability of the scheme to enable payment.” The development industry requires certainty and |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|------------------------------|--|-------------------|------|--|-----------|---|
| | | | | | | | including a review mechanism in any Section 106 Agreement which could potentially trigger an unforeseen payment at a later date would create an uncertain approach. Indeed, the council has not suggested including a review mechanism that would enable a lower contribution to be paid in the future should there be an economic downturn. Once the level of contributions are agreed and a Section 106 Agreement is signed, the development industry then has to accept any up or down turns in the market. It would not be fair and reasonable if they have to accept the risk of downturns but are not in turn rewarded should there be an economic upturn. Our client therefore requests that part 2(b) of Policy IN2 and that the section of paragraph 12.14 which refers to “viability [being] reassessed during the construction phase of the development” are deleted to ensure a fair and reasonable approach, in accordance with the NPPF (para. 35). |
| ST2187 | Whitburn Neighbourhood Forum | | 12 Infrastructure | IN02 | | Objection | <p>Transport Assessments / Statements, and Travel Plans For new development, changes of use and alterations to existing buildings, the transportation and accessibility outcomes of development needs to be set out as part of a planning application. This information is used to assess the suitability of the development and to ensure it is in accordance with policy and other related guidance.</p> <p>Where a development is likely to have significant transportation implications, a Transport Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan (TP) should be prepared. In some instances, The TA may be downgraded to a Transport Statement (TS). These documents are used to determine whether the impact of the development is</p> |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | <p>acceptable, in highways and transportation terms. For a development of dwelling houses above 80 units a TA and a TP are required. For between 50 and 80 units a TS and TP are required.</p> <p>These requirements will apply for the sites identified in Whitburn as follows:</p> <p>WH8 Whitburn Lodge – 25 units. (This site is contiguous with WH9 and WH9a which will produce a total development of 122 units)</p> <p>WH9a Land to North of Shearwater - 57 units</p> <p>WH9b Land to the East of Mill Lane, Whitburn - 40 units</p> <p>WH17 Land at Wellands Farm, Whitburn – 200 units</p> <p>WH19 Former Charlie Hurley Centre, Cleadon Lane, Whitburn- 75 units</p> <p>STC have graded all these Whitburn sites as Amber – Site is likely to cause congestion, with specific junction improvements required.</p> <p>There are no further details available in the draft local plan, however the following junctions /roads in Whitburn are all currently facing high levels of congestion without the added stresses that more development in Whitburn will provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The junction at Moor Lane with Sunderland Road (A1018) is currently congested at peak times. • The junction at Cleadon Lane with Sunderland Road (A1018) is currently congested at peak times. • The traffic lights junction at A183 (Coast Road) with Moor Lane (At the Jolly Sailor PH) is currently regularly congested throughout the day. (See photo above of traffic entering Whitburn on a fine day in 2019) • Lizard Lane has congestion problems to the North where chicanes and a 20 mph restriction has been |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>created. To the South of Lizard Lane the road effectively becomes a single lane road due to cars parked on the Western side of the road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Cleadon Lane also currently has chicanes and a 20 mph restriction to regulate the speed and flow of traffic.• Sandy Chare presents motorists with a single lane road with only one pavement for pedestrians.• Traffic, including HGVs regularly avoid using Sandy Chare and the traffic lights at the Jolly Sailor by using a 'rat run' through the 20 mph residential streets of Central Avenue, Field side, Wellands Lane and Parry Drive in order to reach Lizard Lane. <p>Any plans to help traffic flow by widening the roads within the highly built up areas of Whitburn would entail demolition of buildings and road-side features that give Whitburn its unique character as a coastal village. The latest Coastal Management Plan suggests re-routing the Coast Road (A183) near the Lime Kilns due to the possibility of the loss of parts of this route due to the risk of coastal erosion in that area. There is a suggestion that traffic would be diverted from the Coast Road along Lizard Lane but this does not appear to have been taken into account in the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>According to the draft Local Plan solutions are predicated on external investment using Sec 106 and CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy), all costs to be borne by developers. South Tyneside Council do not presently have a CIL policy in place. The concern is that all of the junction and road improvements required to alleviate the pressure that currently exists on the traffic system in Whitburn will be prohibitively</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|------------------------------|--|-------------------|------|--|-----------|--|
| | | | | | | | expensive. To rely on the costs of these required improvements to be borne by developers would make the developments no longer viable. No other solutions have been provided in the draft Local Plan. |
| ST2187 | Whitburn Neighbourhood Forum | | 12 Infrastructure | IN01 | | objection | <p>3.5 Sewerage and Water Quality</p> <p>A member of the Whitburn Neighbourhood Forum complained to the European Commission in 2000 about the level of sewage found in the sea and on the beach at Whitburn. The Commission brought the case to the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) which determined in 2012 that the UK was in breach of Council Directive 91/271/EEC concerning urban waste water treatment. This was due to the failure of Northumbrian Water ensuring that appropriate collecting systems were in place leading to the contamination of Whitburn beach. The UK government was given 5 years until December 2017 to rectify the problem. Our member contacted the Commission in 2018 complaining that pollution of the beach has continued despite the completion of remedial work. He believes that the collection system is flawed and has never met the requirement of the initial licence and that the UK is still in breach of Directive 91/271/EEC. The Commissioner on the 31st October 2018 noted that up to the end of August 2018 there were still quite high number of spills with quite high spill volumes from the Whitburn Long Sea Outfall. The Commission are continuing to pursue the UK government on this matter since collecting systems spilling untreated wastewater into the environment is covered by EU law as confirmed by the CJEU in its judgement in case C-301/10.</p> <p>The Combined Sewer Overflow pipe (CSO) at</p> |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | <p>Whitburn is supposed to be used in emergencies only, when the treatment plant at Sunderland is overwhelmed with storm water. The idea is that - as a last resort - it is better to allow the sewage to flow into the sea, rather than have it backing up in our communities, even in our homes.</p> <p>We, the Forum have evidence that there has been in the first 10 months of 2018 43 spills with a total of 376593 cubic metres of raw sewage discharged into the sea off the coast of Whitburn despite there being only 60% average rainfall during this period. This is NOT a last resort but due to inadequate collecting systems.</p> <p>The levels of bacteria found in Marsden bathing waters on 20th August 2018 showed 973 Intestinal Enterococci colonies per 100ml; and 3000 E. coli colonies per 100ml . Such levels of bacteria have a deleterious effect on the coastline of South Tyneside and on the health and welfare of residents of Whitburn</p> <p>The foul pumping station at Whitburn serves 4 communities, South Bents, Whitburn, Cleadon and Boldon. The current total population of these communities is approximately 15,000. Sunderland council have just approved the building of 64 dwellings on greenbelt in South Bents. If the proposed release of a further 1,871 houses in the STC draft local plan for Whitburn, Cleadon and Boldon is approved it will increase the serving population by a further 4,000 (27%) adding an intolerable strain to an already overworked collecting system at Whitburn.</p> <p>The building of 64 dwellings on greenbelt in South Bents was approved by Sunderland Council on the</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | | <p>assurance from NWA that the sewers could cope with the increased sewerage. Here are some examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Email from NWL to the Sunderland Planning Department dated 14 September 2018 “Foul water will discharge to the combined sewer via connection at existing manhole 5610 and surface water will discharge to the local watercourse” – “Conditions... The drainage scheme shall ensure that foul flows discharge to the combined sewer at manhole 5610 and ensure that surface water discharges to the existing watercourse”• NWL email dated 25 September 2018 to the Planning Department “Following a number of emails which were received from Mr Latimer regarding our planning consultation response for the above. I would like to take the opportunity to confirm that we will not be seeking any amendments to our consultation response dated 14 September (as attached). We are satisfied with the detail contained within the applicant’s Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy regarding the disposal of the domestic (foul) sewage generated by their proposals, if the development is approved. The foul flow can discharge into the combined sewer via connection at the existing manhole 5610, as there is capacity within the existing public sewerage network to accommodate this”• Planning Committee Report “Northumbrian Water is the sewerage undertaker for Sunderland and as such is consulted regarding planning proposals for developments that will connect to the sewerage network. In response to consultation regarding this planning application, Northumbrian |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>Water has confirmed that it has assessed the impact of the proposed development upon its assets, and assessed the capacity within its network to accommodate and treat anticipated flows arising from the proposed development. Having done assessments, Northumbrian Water has no objection to the proposed development and advised that foul water will discharge in to a combined sewer via connection at existing manhole 5610 and surface water will discharge to the local watercourse. On this basis, the proposed development is considered to be acceptable in terms of its impact upon the local sewerage network”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Planning Decision 29 April 2019 – Planning Condition number 14 <p>“Development shall be implemented in line with the drainage scheme contained within the submitted entitled ‘Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy Rev C’ dated ‘2010’. The drainage scheme shall ensure that foul flows discharge to the combined sewer at manhole 5610 and ensure that surface water discharges to the existing watercourse. In the interest of water management and to comply with the requirements of policy EN12 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan”</p> <p>However, NWL (after the planning application has been approved) now say:</p> <p>When the Forum requested information from the council regarding sewerage issues we were directed to the stakeholder NWL. We, the forum wrote to the company with certain questions. They treated our questions as an EIR request and have refused to answer them on the grounds of manifest</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|----------|--|----------------------|------|-----|-----------|---|
| | | | | | | | <p>unreasonableness. They are using the EIR regulations as a legal framework to evade questions that they do not want to answer, namely the ongoing issues with the collecting systems spilling untreated wastewater into the environment.</p> <p>Recent case law demonstrating the duty of planning authorities is outlined in Barratt Homes Limited v Dwr Cymru Cyfyngedig (Welsh Water) [2009] UKSC13</p> <p>The Supreme Court noted that, since the building of a development requires planning permission under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, planning authorities are able to make planning permission conditional upon the public water authority first taking steps to ensure that the public sewer can accommodate any increased flow.</p> <p>We, the forum believe that leaving decisions to NWL on the viability of the sewerage system is wrong. It is like asking the pupil to mark his own homework. We believe that the council should go further than the Supreme Court Ruling and that any new developments in South Tyneside should be subject to independent scrutiny regarding sewerage and drainage systems.</p> <p>NWL have proved that they are not to be trusted hiding behind the EIR regulations and refusing to answer any questions relating to their collection systems.</p> |
| ST2196 | P Murray | | 12 Infrastructure | IN07 | k)v | Objection | <p>Interestingly enough, all the planned improvements to rail and road at Tylesheds and Benton Road are not part of the Local Plan, and therefore not open to public discussion or objection. The question is why is this not in the Local Plan as without these improvements the development cannot go ahead? This is clearly in anticipation of the extra</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|--------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|------|-----|-----------|---|
| | | | | | | | traffic from the proposed new housing on the Green Belt and to prevent the current waiting time at each of the crossings. By seeking to improve these areas, developers are already expecting to be successful in obtaining the land. From an observer's point of view, it appears that South Tyneside Council hoped they could quietly get on with this while the people were distracted by the published Local Plan. |
| ST2219 | James Ritson Daley | Cleadon Residents | 12 Infrastructure | IN07 | k)v | Objection | 3. I understand that the proposed bridge at Tiledshed Crossing is to take care of the anticipated extra traffic created by the proposed addition houses in the Cleadon and East Boldon area find brown field sites and the bridge won't be needed saving the £15million estimated cost. |
| ST2224 | Rebecca Bailey | | 12 Infrastructure | IN03 | | Comment | I'm all for demographic growth where infrastructure grows alongside that growth. We have just closed a school down claiming demographic effected its ability to be viable with such a high PFI on the building. I can't help but ask the question of if we consistently see growth within the next 20yr infrastructure must change more gp surgery more schools will be needed to accommodate such growth. I would be interested in any future plans regarding this is areas the council are planning to build. |
| ST2278 | Daniel Stone | Centre for Sustainable Energy | 12 Infrastructure | IN04 | | Objection | Objection to Policy IN4 - Renewables and Low Carbon Energy Generation (Strategic Policy) We object to paragraphs 1 to 4 of this policy for the reasons set out below. 1. We are committed to encouraging and supporting the local production of energy from renewable and low carbon sources in order to reduce carbon emissions. Proposals for commercial-scale renewable and low-carbon energy generation, including district |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>heating schemes, will be supported where;</p> <p>a) The applicant demonstrates that there would be no unacceptable adverse impacts which cannot be satisfactorily addressed including: i. Impacts on the built environment including heritage assets; and ii. Impacts on the natural environment including green infrastructure and biodiversity assets, such as designated sites, protected species and priority habitats and species; and iii. Cumulative, indirect and direct, temporary and permanent impacts on the landscape; and iv. Neighbouring land uses and developments including adverse impacts on amenity by virtue of noise, visual intrusion and, specifically for wind turbines, shadow flicker.</p> <p>b) With specific reference to wind energy development, proposals to repower existing turbines will be supported.</p> <p>2. Small-scale c Community-led initiatives for renewable and low-carbon energy generation will be supported where they are consistent with the other policies in this Local Plan and any neighbourhood plans that are made.</p> <p>3. We will support and encourage the incorporation of renewable energy into developments, particularly as part of major schemes. The retrofit of renewable energy and use of micro- generation will also be supported in appropriate buildings and locations.</p> <p>4. Taking viability into account, proposals for major residential and commercial development within 100m of a local district heating network, will be encouraged to link to that network, if one is available and there is sufficient capacity.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|--------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|------|----|-----------|---|
| ST2278 | Daniel Stone | Centre for Sustainable Energy | 12 Infrastructure | IN04 | 1 | Objection | <p>Objection to Paragraph 1</p> <p>As raised by others, with the exception of heat mapping, there has been no surveying work done to identify the generation capacity of different renewable technologies across the borough. The NPPF states (para 151) that “to help increase the use and supply of renewable and low carbon energy and heat, plans should: a) provide a positive strategy for energy from these sources, that maximises the potential for suitable development, and b) consider identifying suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy sources...”</p> <p>We would question whether policy IN4 could be extended in ambition to identify suitable areas for new onshore wind development.</p> |
| ST2278 | Daniel Stone | Centre for Sustainable Energy | 12 Infrastructure | IN04 | 1b | Objection | <p>Clause 1 (b) is unnecessary in that in 2019 the NPPF (footnote 49) was amended to remove the requirement to forward plan the re-powering of existing wind turbines. The Rensmart website suggests that the South Tyneside coast has a viable wind resource which could potentially be exploited and should be explored¹².</p> |
| ST2278 | Daniel Stone | Centre for Sustainable Energy | 12 Infrastructure | IN04 | 2 | Objection | <p>Objection Paragraph 2</p> <p>We welcome the support given to community led initiatives for renewable energy, but object to the limitation of this support to ‘small scale’ schemes. Limiting support to small scale schemes is unjustified, and is contrary to the guidance in the NPPF (paragraph 151 & 152) which advises that renewable energy should be maximised and places no size limit on community-led energy projects. The criteria set out in paragraph 1 (a) of the policy should ensure community energy projects with unacceptable</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|--------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|------|---|-----------|---|
| | | | | | | | impacts can be resisted. As shown above, the words “small scale” should be crossed out. |
| ST2278 | Daniel Stone | Centre for Sustainable Energy | 12 Infrastructure | IN04 | 3 | Objection | <p>Objection Paragraph 3</p> <p>We welcome paragraph 3. supporting the inclusion of renewable energy into developments, but the text is not strong enough, and once again, will not change business as usual development approaches. We recommend that a requirement to include and maximise on-site renewable energy generation is folded into an overall green house gas emissions policy, as seen in the London Plan, policy S1213. Please see our earlier comments in respect of policy D2.</p> |
| ST2278 | Daniel Stone | Centre for Sustainable Energy | 12 Infrastructure | IN04 | 4 | Objection | <p>Objection to Paragraph 4</p> <p>We welcome the inclusion of policies requiring development to connect to district heating networks, however this policy could be made significantly stronger. The best example of which we are aware is draft policy SI13 of the draft London Plan: Example policy - London Plan Policy SI3 – Energy Infrastructure ...D Major development proposals within Heat Network Priority Areas should have a communal low-temperature heating system 1) the heat source for the communal heating system should be selected in accordance with the following heating hierarchy: a) connect to local existing or planned heat networks b) use zero-emission or local secondary heat sources (in conjunction with heat pump, if required) e) use low-emission combined heat and power (CHP) (only where there is a case for CHP to enable the delivery of an area-wide heat network) f) use ultra-low NOx gas boilers. 2) CHP and ultra-low NOx gas boiler communal or district heating systems should be</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|--------------|--|----------------------|------|--|--------|---|
| | | | | | | | designed to ensure that they meet the requirements of policy SI1 (A) 3) Where a heat network is planned but not yet in existence the development should be designed for connection at a later date. To support this policy the London Mayor has identified Heat Network Priority Areas ¹⁴ , where heat networks exist, are being developed or the heat demand is sufficient to make the inclusion of district heating infrastructure within new development viable. We would suggest that a similar approach is adopted in South Tyneside, putting you in a better position to demand that new major development connects to or develops district heating infrastructure, or in its absence utilises zero or low emission heating systems. The policy goes on to require the submission of energy masterplans for large-scale development locations to establish the most effective energy supply options available. |
| ST2281 | Simon Hedley | | 12 Infrastructure | IN04 | | Object | As policy IN4 does not identify “suitable sites for onshore wind energy generation” the policy in effect bans it for the lifetime of the plan. Given that we’re in a climate emergency, I’d ask South Tyneside council to reverse this decision. |
| ST2283 | Nicola Usher | | 12 Infrastructure | IN04 | | Object | * Whilst I welcome the support for renewable energy, I would like to see the plan offer a concrete pathway towards increased renewable energy generation within our borough. Best practice would be to conduct a survey (determining renewable energy generation capacity and then physical and policy constraints for all sites across the borough), the results of which would be published within the local plan. As a consequence of gathering this data, ‘suitable sites for energy generation’ would be identified in the plan. This would act to highlight the potential of key sites, |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|---------------|------|----------------------|------|---|---------|--|
| | | | | | | | thereby inviting energy companies to seriously consider our area for their projects. * As policy IN4 does not identify 'suitable sites for onshore wind energy generation' it , in effect, bans it for the lifetime of the plan. Given that we're in a climate emergency, I'd ask the council to reverse this decision. |
| ST2285 | Gillan Gibson | CPRE | 12 Infrastructure | IN01 | | Support | Our Strategic Approach to Infrastructure (Strategic Policy) - CPRE supports Policy IN1 |
| ST2285 | Gillan Gibson | CPRE | 12 Infrastructure | IN02 | | Support | Developer Contributions, Infrastructure Funding and Viability - CPRE supports Policy IN2 |
| ST2285 | Gillan Gibson | CPRE | 12 Infrastructure | IN03 | | Support | Social and Community Infrastructure - CPRE supports Policy IN3 |
| ST2285 | Gillan Gibson | CPRE | 12 Infrastructure | IN04 | | Support | Renewables and Low Carbon Energy Generation (Strategic Policy) - CPRE supports Policy IN4 |
| ST2285 | Gillan Gibson | CPRE | 12 Infrastructure | IN05 | | Support | Telecommunications and Utilities - CPRE supports Policy IN5 |
| ST2285 | Gillan Gibson | CPRE | 12 Infrastructure | IN06 | | Support | Travel – New Development (Strategic Policy) - CPRE supports Policy IN6 which it considers is positive and pro-active |
| ST2285 | Gillan Gibson | CPRE | 12 Infrastructure | IN07 | | Support | Accessible and Sustainable Travel (Strategic Policy) - CPRE supports Policy IN7 generally, which it considers is positive and pro-active |
| ST2285 | Gillan Gibson | CPRE | 12 Infrastructure | IN07 | f | comment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy IN7f and IN7g: Care will be needed in order to minimise potential conflict between equestrian and cycle use. Appropriate surfaces must be approved and maintained and be of sufficient width to minimise physical conflict. |
| ST2285 | Gillan Gibson | CPRE | 12 Infrastructure | IN07 | g | comment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy IN7f and IN7g: Care will be needed in order to minimise potential conflict between equestrian and cycle use. Appropriate surfaces must be approved and maintained and be of sufficient width to minimise physical conflict. |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|-------------------|------|----------------------|------|----|---------|--|
| ST2285 | Gillan Gibson | CPRE | 12 Infrastructure | IN07 | K | comment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IN7 k must be designed to include improved, safe and convenient provision for pedestrians and cyclists. Where these works do not require planning permission, there should be adequate consultation with user groups during the design stage. |
| ST2285 | Gillan Gibson | CPRE | 12 Infrastructure | IN07 | | comment | However, the concern of residents regarding the proposals for Tiledsheds is noted and are important |
| ST2285 | Gillan Gibson | CPRE | 12 Infrastructure | IN08 | | Support | Airport and Aircraft Safety - CPRE supports Policy IN8 |
| ST2285 | Gillan Gibson | CPRE | 12 Infrastructure | IN09 | | Support | Waste Facilities (Strategic Policy) - CPRE supports Policy IN9 |
| ST2285 | Gillan Gibson | CPRE | 12 Infrastructure | IN10 | | Support | Protection of Existing Waste Facilities (Strategic Policy) - CPRE supports Policy IN10 |
| ST2285 | Gillan Gibson | CPRE | 12 Infrastructure | IN11 | | Support | Minerals Safeguarding Extraction (Strategic Policy) - CPRE supports Policy IN11 |
| ST2290 | Sue Stonehouse | | 12 Infrastructure | IN04 | | Object | As policy IN4 does not identify 'suitable sites for onshore wind energy generation' it , in effect, bans it for the lifetime of the plan. Given that we're in a climate emergency, I'd ask the council to reverse this decision. |
| ST2296 | William Fleetwood | | 12 Infrastructure | IN7 | kv | Object | <p>4.4 Proposed Road Bridge</p> <p>There is reference within the proposals to a possible new road bridge to replace Benton Road/Boldon Lane and Tiledshed Crossings which will, if it goes ahead, relieve congestion generated at these crossings. However this new bridge, the funding for which has not been identified, will probably have to be built on Green Belt land with a detrimental effect on the green infrastructure and biodiversity.</p> <p>A further effect of this will potentially be that traffic flow through Cleadon Village will increase even more than through the housing development as drivers coming from the main road network use the bridge to</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|-----------------------|--|-------------------|------|-----------|---------|--|
| | | | | | | | <p>get to Whitburn, Marsden and the southern part of South Shields</p> <p>It is unfortunate that full details of this proposal are not included within the draft plan as this prevents public scrutiny and a realistic assessment of the likely impact of the bridge.</p> |
| ST2320 | Dr Kirstin Richardson | | 12 Infrastructure | IN01 | Para 12.1 | support | <p>5.0 Open Green Spaces and community infrastructure – Policy N3 and paragraph 12.1</p> <p>I would like to state my support for Policy N3. In East Boldon we intend to identify some Green spaces within our Neighbourhood Plan. One of the sites which is in question is the area in front of St George’s Church. This area is neglected and unsightly and detracts from the Church, making it very difficult to attract congregation. I would like to see it become accessible and landscaped, while respecting the wildlife which habits it.</p> |
| ST2320 | Dr Kirstin Richardson | | 12 Infrastructure | IN03 | | Comment | <p>6.0 Taking into account the emerging Neighbourhood Plan – policy IN3, policy S4</p> <p>Quoting Chapter 4.29, “Securing sustainable development is therefore the central theme which runs through this Local Plan and will also bind with any Neighbourhood Plans that are made.” I would like to express my desire for the East Boldon Neighbourhood Plan to be given the credence that the references to it in this Draft Local Plan would indicate that it will. There is no way that this can be the case if the scale of development proposed goes ahead or if the Green Belt boundary is changed. The Neighbourhood plan will have a design code for housing and green infrastructure, and designated Green Spaces, and we expect these to be considered first and foremost when housing is allocated.</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|----------------|--|----------------------|------|--|-----------|--|
| ST2337 | Peter Arthurs | | 12 Infrastructure | IN07 | | Objection | <p>Policy IN7 Accessible and Sustainable Travel –Object</p> <p>We have long campaigned for the expansion of the Park and Ride facilities at East Boldon station. The current car park is constantly at capacity and demand leads to parking problems in surrounding roads and streets. The statement in this policy must be, more specific with regard to additional parking. The policy proposes to safeguard land to enable additional park and ride facilities at existing metro stations but is not specific about East Boldon. The proposed improvement of the local highway network at Boldon and Tiledshed Level Crossing Scheme with new bridge and carriageways is causing concerns to local residents.</p> <p>It is at the very early stages of design and full public consultation on its design is required as a matter of urgency. The Council has made a bid to the Department of Transport for funding and if this is not successful then there are also concerns. The Council have stated that full barriers as proposed by Network Rail "will significantly increase the time in which the level crossings are in operation and will increase delays and congestion." The addition of new housing in this area will only make this worse.</p> |
| ST2350 | Carly Carrahar | | 12 Infrastructure | IN03 | | Object | <p>6.0 Taking into account the emerging Neighbourhood Plan - Policy IN3, Policy S4</p> <p>Quoting Chapter 4.29, "Securing sustainable development is therefore the central theme which runs through this Local Plan and will also bind with any Neighbourhood Plans that are made. " I would like to express my desire for the East Boldon Neighbourhood Plan to be given the credence that the references to it in this Draft Local Plan would indicate that it will.</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|-----------------|--|----------------------|------|--|--------|--|
| | | | | | | | There is no way that this can be the case if the scale of development proposed goes ahead or if the Green Belt boundary s changed. The Neighbourhood plan will have a design code for housing and green infrastructure, and designated Green SPaces, and we expect these to be considered first and foremost when housing is allocated. |
| ST2354 | Rebecca Higgins | | 12 Infrastructure | IN03 | | Object | 6.0 Taking into account the emerging Neighbourhood Plan - Policy IN3, Policy S4 Quoting Chapter 4.29, "Securing sustainable development is therefore the central theme which runs through this Local Plan and will also bind with any Neighbourhood Plans that are made. " I would like to express my desire for the East Boldon Neighbourhood Plan to be given the credence that the references to it in this Draft Local Plan would indicate that it will. There is no way that this can be the case if the scale of development proposed goes ahead or if the Green Belt boundary s changed. The Neighbourhood plan will have a design code for housing and green infrastructure, and designated Green SPaces, and we expect these to be considered first and foremost when housing is allocated. |
| ST2356 | Sam Attewell | | 12 Infrastructure | IN03 | | Object | 6.0 Taking into account the emerging Neighbourhood Plan – policy IN3, policy S4 Quoting Chapter 4.29, “Securing sustainable development is therefore the central theme which runs through this Local Plan and will also bind with any Neighbourhood Plans that are made.” I would like to express my desire for the East Boldon Neighbourhood Plan to be given the credence that the references to it in this Draft Local Plan would indicate that it will. There is no way that this can be the case if the scale of |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|---------------|--|----------------------|------|--|-----------|---|
| | | | | | | | development proposed goes ahead or if the Green Belt boundary is changed. The Neighbourhood plan will have a design code for housing and green infrastructure, and designated Green Spaces, and we expect these to be considered first and foremost when housing is allocated. |
| ST2358 | Jack Attewell | | 12 Infrastructure | IN03 | | Object | 6.0 Taking into account the emerging Neighbourhood Plan – policy IN3, policy S4 Quoting Chapter 4.29, “Securing sustainable development is therefore the central theme which runs through this Local Plan and will also bind with any Neighbourhood Plans that are made.” I would like to express my desire for the East Boldon Neighbourhood Plan to be given the credence that the references to it in this Draft Local Plan would indicate that it will. There is no way that this can be the case if the scale of development proposed goes ahead or if the Green Belt boundary is changed. The Neighbourhood plan will have a design code for housing and green infrastructure, and designated Green Spaces, and we expect these to be considered first and foremost when housing is allocated. |
| ST2365 | Delia McNally | | 12 Infrastructure | IN07 | | Objection | Policy IN7 Accessible and Sustainable Travel –Object We have long campaigned for the expansion of the Park and Ride facilities at East Boldon station. The current car park is constantly at capacity and demand leads to parking problems in surrounding roads and streets. The statement in this policy must be, more specific with regard to additional parking. The policy proposes to safeguard land to enable additional park and ride facilities at existing metro stations but is not specific about East Boldon. The proposed improvement of the local highway |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|---------------|--|----------------------|------|--|-----------|---|
| | | | | | | | <p>network at Boldon and Tiledshed Level Crossing Scheme with new bridge and carriageways is causing concerns to local residents.</p> <p>It is at the very early stages of design and full public consultation on its design is required as a matter of urgency. The Council has made a bid to the Department of Transport for funding and if this is not successful then there are also concerns. The Council have stated that full barriers as proposed by Network Rail "will significantly increase the time in which the level crossings are in operation and will increase delays and congestion." The addition of new housing in this area will only make this worse.</p> <p>We are also concerned about its impact on existing properties and on Tiledshed Nature Reserve.</p> |
| ST2365 | Delia McNally | | 12 Infrastructure | IN03 | | Objection | <p>6.0 Taking into account the emerging Neighbourhood Plan – policy IN3, policy S4</p> <p>Quoting Chapter 4.29, "Securing sustainable development is therefore the central theme which runs through this Local Plan and will also bind with any Neighbourhood Plans that are made." I would like to express my desire for the East Boldon Neighbourhood Plan to be given the credence that the references to it in this Draft Local Plan would indicate that it will.</p> <p>There is no way that this can be the case if the scale of development proposed goes ahead or if the Green Belt boundary is changed. The Neighbourhood plan will have a design code for housing and green infrastructure, and designated Green Spaces, and we expect these to be considered first and foremost when housing is allocated.</p> |
| ST2366 | Ian Palmer | | 12 Infrastructure | IN07 | | Objection | <p>THE ROAD BRIDGE</p> <p>The bridge will actually allow more development –</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|----------------|--|----------------------|------|--|-----------|--|
| | | | | | | | and so even more traffic in the area . I believe there are more (very dangerous) negatives than positives against this proposal: the main one being the reduced air quality which this will bring. The purpose of the road bridge is to give the infrastructure required for development of 4 sites, (from Chuter Ede to Cleadon Lane) of over 1,000 houses. In effect, it allows for possibly 2,000 MORE cars on the roads in this area and with EVEN MORE TRAFFIC from the developments in Cleadon, and Whitburn, will be a major cause of congestion in the village. The traffic pollution this will cause will significantly reduce the air quality in Cleadon and will impact the health of all residents. |
| ST2367 | Pauline Palmer | | 12 Infrastructure | IN07 | | Objection | THE ROAD BRIDGE The bridge will actually allow more development – and so even more traffic in the area . I believe there are more (very dangerous) negatives than positives against this proposal: the main one being the reduced air quality which this will bring. The purpose of the road bridge is to give the infrastructure required for development of 4 sites, (from Chuter Ede to Cleadon Lane) of over 1,000 houses. In effect, it allows for possibly 2,000 MORE cars on the roads in this area and with EVEN MORE TRAFFIC from the developments in Cleadon, and Whitburn, will be a major cause of congestion in the village. The traffic pollution this will cause will significantly reduce the air quality in Cleadon and will impact the health of all residents. |
| ST2380 | Steve Clingly | | 12 Infrastructure | IN07 | | Objection | Road Bridge- The road bridge, proposed to replace Tiledshed and Benton Road/Boldon Lane level crossings, will open up development of 4 sites outside of Cleadon, but it is Cleadon which will be most affected by the increase in traffic these developments |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|-----------------------------|--|----------------------|------|--|-----------|--|
| | | | | | | | <p>will cause; and the bridge will attract; and the congestion it will cause. Development within the village, and also in Whitburn, will also cause a huge increase in traffic on all roads through the village to join the main 'strategic network' at Testos, and also on routes to Sunderland and South Shields.</p> <p>The road bridge will also be constructed on Green Belt land. There will also be great impact on the green infrastructure and biodiversity of the area the bridge will cover. As no details are given in the draft Plan, this prevents full public scrutiny and detailed consultation on the impact the bridge will have.</p> <p>Pollution will increase across the area due to the construction of the development sites and the road bridge. The road bridge will also allow for more development, an increase of traffic, and the ensuing congestion and pollution caused by this. The main pollutants which affect human health are generated by road traffic. Traffic programmes should be aimed at alleviating congestion (e.g. Testos and Lindisfarne). Why has it been suggested that to save time at the level crossing (which would be caused by the Nexus proposal to replace the half barriers with full barriers) the health of our residents should be put at risk? How could this ever be mitigated?</p> <p>Pollutants from traffic fumes are also known to have a detrimental effect on biodiversity. It is not just humans who will suffer.</p> <p>There will also be a greater amount of noise pollution caused by the amount of traffic using the bridge.</p> |
| ST2384 | John Fogg Rosalind Maira | | 12 Infrastructure | IN07 | | Objection | <p>Re: Proposed Development at TILSHEDS</p> <p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>We have just heard about your proposed above</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|--------------|--|----------------------|------|--|-----------|--|
| | | | | | | | development. We would like to OBJECT to the proposed development of a new Road Bridge, Metro Station and Car Park at Tilesheds. The authorities seem to be attempting to plough on with their relentless quest to amalgamate the small individual areas of Boldon, East Boldon, Celadon, Boldon Colliery and South Shields. The construction of a road bridge and Metro Station and associated Car Park which would be situated on GREEN BELT, pastures and arable land at the the centre of these communities. This would lead to even further Urban Sprawl and worse, an greater loss of habitat snd wildlife corridors in the ares. The effect on the Nature Reserve and surrounding area cold be devastating. On television recently, a report published by The National Trust highlighted the loss of over 130 species from the United Kingdom since 1970 with many more on the brink of extinction due to loss of habitat. South Tyneside Council seem to be trying to turn a semi rural area into an urban environment. |
| ST2388 | Stephen Todd | | 12 Infrastructure | IN07 | | Objection | <p>Objection to plans to build house in Cleadon the Green Belt / plans to put a bridge at Tile sheds over the Metro lines.</p> <p>Sir , I wish to register an objection against the above proposals , for the following reasons</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The infrastructure , schools , shops and roads could not cope with additional traffic . Front Street is already heavily congested resulting in delays. 2. Boldon Lane floods close to the junction with Fern Avenue and is already dangerous to existing road users . 3. Various areas of Cleadon flood , area behind and adjacent to Cleadon Lea and Moor Lane in particular . |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|----------------------|--|-------------------|------|--|-----------|---|
| | | | | | | | <p>4. There is a thriving horse riding community who use the area of Boldon Lane additional traffic would be to the detriment of such activities .</p> <p>5. Increased road pollution , contractors working on behalf of the council have already cut back a hedge by approximately 4 feet opposite North Drive that previously blocked a lot of noise visual and fume pollution .</p> <p>Please note my objections.</p> |
| ST2389 | Emma Johnston | | 12 Infrastructure | IN03 | | Objection | <p>6.0 Taking into account the emerging Neighbourhood Plan – policy IN3, policy S4</p> <p>Quoting Chapter 4.29, “Securing sustainable development is therefore the central theme which runs through this Local Plan and will also bind with any Neighbourhood Plans that are made.” I would like to express my desire for the East Boldon Neighbourhood Plan to be given the credence that the references to it in this Draft Local Plan would indicate that it will.</p> <p>There is no way that this can be the case if the scale of development proposed goes ahead or if the Green Belt boundary is changed. The Neighbourhood plan will have a design code for housing and green infrastructure, and designated Green Spaces, and we expect these to be considered first and foremost when housing is allocated.</p> |
| ST2393 | Mr William Wilkinson | | 12 Infrastructure | IN07 | | Objection | <p>4. Is the rumour true that South Tyneside Council propose to build a flyover/bridge, call the monstrosity/ blot on the landscape what you will, at Tiled railway Crossings. I believe that this is to facilitate access from Boldon Lane, Cleadon Village across to New Road, Boldon Colliery as the railway crossing is due to be closed. This would be horrendous</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|--------------|-----------------------|-------------------|------|---|---------|--|
| | | | | | | | and would massively detract from the semi rural appearance of the affected area. |
| ST2405 | Graham Black | Durham County Council | 12 Infrastructure | IN01 | h | Comment | <p>South Tyneside Local Plan, Publication Draft for Regulation 18 Consultation, September 2019</p> <p>Durham County Council welcomes the opportunity to comment on Northumberland’s Local Plan Publication Draft.</p> <p>It is not considered that its provisions will give rise to an unacceptable adverse impact upon County Durham’s environment or the amenity of its local communities. The council has considered the potential impacts of the draft plan upon County Durham’s strategic interests and these are summarised below.</p> <p>Minerals and Waste Policy IN1: Our Strategic Approach to Infrastructure (Strategic Policy)</p> <p>In Criteria h) It is suggested that this criterion is amended because there is not a “regional minerals landbank”. The following wording is suggested, “the steady and adequate supply of aggregates and brick making raw materials and landbanks of crushed rock aggregate and sand and gravel within Tyne and Wear”. This suggestion is made because landbanks of aggregates are maintained on a sub-regional level and provision for brick making raw material is based on specific brickworks.</p> |
| ST2405 | Graham Black | Durham County Council | 12 Infrastructure | IN09 | | Comment | <p>Waste Facilities Policy IN9: Waste Facilities (Strategic Policy) –</p> <p>The council welcomes the incorporation of this policy within the Local Plan and considers that it will provide the framework to allow planning applications for proposals for new waste management facilities to be determined over the plan period.</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|--------------|-----------------------|-------------------|------|-------|---------|--|
| | | | | | | | <p>Reference is made within the supporting text to a jointly commissioned a study on waste: Model of Waste Arisings and Waste Management Capacity 2012 by Urban Mines, which was produced by councils in the North East working together in accordance with the duty to cooperate.</p> <p>In addition to this document, it may be helpful for the supporting text to refer also to the jointly produced document which related to the Production and Disposal of Low-Level Radioactive Waste in the North East of England in 2013 by Urban Mines. Both documents were a consequence of the ongoing joint working which has undertaken on waste management issues undertaken by authorities in the North East in accordance with the duty to cooperate.</p> |
| ST2405 | Graham Black | Durham County Council | 12 Infrastructure | IN09 | 12.55 | Comment | <p>Paragraph 12.55 refers to landfill capacity. It is suggested that reference should be made to Marsden Quarry, which is understood, currently has a regionally important role in accommodating inert/construction and demolition waste and will do so during the first half of the plan period.</p> |
| ST2405 | Graham Black | Durham County Council | 12 Infrastructure | IN10 | | Support | <p>Policy IN10 (Protection of Existing Waste Facilities (Strategic Policy) – The council welcomes the protection which is proposed to be afforded to existing waste management facilities.</p> |
| ST2405 | Graham Black | Durham County Council | 12 Infrastructure | IN11 | | Comment | <p>Mineral Supply Policy IN11 (Minerals Safeguarding and Extraction (Strategic Policy)) - The council welcomes the commitment of the Borough Council to work with wider North East authorities to ensure that there are appropriate landbanks for the supply of minerals in the region.</p> |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>Reference is made within the supporting text to the 2017 the Joint Local Aggregate Assessment for County Durham, Northumberland and Tyne and Wear and the landbank figures it contains, these landbank figures for Tyne and Wear have now been updated in the latest published local aggregate assessment which was published in December 2018. The council welcomes the policy criteria which will allow proposals for further extraction to be determined.</p> <p>Nonetheless, in accordance with paragraph 6.33 of the latest Local Aggregate Assessment it is recommended that the Borough Council include a general statement that further proposals for aggregate working will be supported where environmentally acceptable in order to assist in maintaining respective landbanks in Tyne and Wear for both crushed rock and sand and gravel in the longer term.</p> <p>Reference is made to Red Barns Quarry which was granted in 2018 to underpin recent investment at Throckley Brickworks, to the west of Newcastle. This is welcomed. Unfortunately, the plan as drafted does not provide any further information in relation to the supply position at Red Barnes and the adequacy of this site to meet the longer-term needs of Throckley brickworks. It would help provide certainty of supply, if this is addressed. It is also recommended that the Borough Council include a general statement that proposals for the working of further brick making raw materials to meet the longer-term needs of Throckley brickworks will be supported where environmentally acceptable.</p> <p>In accordance with the recommendations of the Joint Local Aggregate Assessment for County Durham,</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|--------------|-----------------------|-------------------|------|--|---------|---|
| | | | | | | | <p>Northumberland and Tyne and Wear (December 2018), the council welcomes the designation of mineral safeguarding areas and the safeguarding of marine wharfs in South Tyneside.</p> <p>Unfortunately, map 36 which shows the extent of the proposed mineral safeguarding areas in South Tyneside is not legible and it is not clear which areas have been safeguarded for different types of mineral resources. It is also not clear why and upon what justification large areas of the Borough underlain by economically important mineral resources appear to have been excluded. It is also suggested that consideration should be given to the actual mechanism to safeguard these economically important mineral resources from encroaching proximal development.</p> <p>It is difficult to identify the actual marine wharfs which are safeguarded on the Policies Map. It is suggested that consideration should be given to ensure that these sites are marked legibly on the Policies Map. Rather than just safeguarding the specific site, it is also suggested that consideration should be given to the actual mechanism to safeguard these sites from encroaching proximal development.</p> |
| ST2405 | Graham Black | Durham County Council | 12 Infrastructure | IN06 | | Support | <p>Transport</p> <p>The council support Policy IN6: Travel – New Development (Strategic Policy)</p> <p>The council note the comprehensive support of sustainable transport when planning new developments, the emphasis on providing charging infrastructure for ultra-low emission vehicles in nearly all developments.</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|------|-------|---------|---|
| ST2405 | Graham Black | Durham County Council | 12 Infrastructure | IN07 | | Support | <p>The council Support Policy IN7: Accessible and Sustainable Travel (Strategic Policy) and welcome the support for enhancements to the Metro and the ECML and the positive policy intentions regarding supporting the Leamside Line, Northern Powerhouse Rail and HS2.</p> <p>Is there potential to strengthen the policy of Metro enhancements by referencing the relationship to the Durham Coast Line?</p> |
| ST2408 | Dr Jonathan Richardson | | 12 Infrastructure | IN03 | | Comment | <p>6.0 Taking into account the emerging Neighbourhood Plan – policy IN3, policy S4</p> <p>Quoting Chapter 4.29, “Securing sustainable development is therefore the central theme which runs through this Local Plan and will also bind with any Neighbourhood Plans that are made.” I would like to express my desire for the East Boldon Neighbourhood Plan to be given the credence that the references to it in this Draft Local Plan would indicate that it will.</p> <p>There is no way that this can be the case if the scale of development proposed goes ahead or if the Green Belt boundary is changed. The Neighbourhood plan will have a design code for housing and green infrastructure, and designated Green Spaces, and we expect these to be considered first and foremost when housing is allocated.</p> |
| ST2409 | David Tutill | | 12 Infrastructure | IN01 | 12.01 | Support | <p>5.0 Open Green Spaces and community infrastructure – Policy N3 and paragraph 12.1</p> <p>I would like to state my support for Policy N3. In East Boldon we intend to identify some Green spaces within our Neighbourhood Plan. One of the sites which is in question is the area in front of St George’s Church. This area is neglected and unsightly and detracts from the Church, making it very difficult to</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|-------------------|--|----------------------|------|--|-----------|---|
| | | | | | | | attract congregation. I would like to see it become accessible and landscaped, while respecting the wildlife which habits it. |
| ST2409 | David Tutill | | 12 Infrastructure | IN03 | | Comment | 6.0 Taking into account the emerging Neighbourhood Plan – policy IN3, policy S4 Quoting Chapter 4.29, “Securing sustainable development is therefore the central theme which runs through this Local Plan and will also bind with any Neighbourhood Plans that are made.” I would like to express my desire for the East Boldon Neighbourhood Plan to be given the credence that the references to it in this Draft Local Plan would indicate that it will. There is no way that this can be the case if the scale of development proposed goes ahead or if the Green Belt boundary is changed. The Neighbourhood plan will have a design code for housing and green infrastructure, and designated Green Spaces, and we expect these to be considered first and foremost when housing is allocated. |
| ST2412 | Christopher Scott | | 12 Infrastructure | IN07 | | Objection | Roads, Traffic and Road Bridge I have major concerns about the effect of the proposed developments in Cleadon will have on already congested roads in the area, particularly those linking the Village to the West through Boldon towards the A19 and Newcastle and the A1018 which cuts through the centre of the Village linking Sunderland and South Shields. I understand that a road bridge is proposed to replace the level crossings at Tiledshed and Boldon Lane, partly to develop sites outside of Cleadon, but the effect will inevitably increase traffic through Cleadon via Moor Lane and Boldon Lane. I understand that a new Metro station is being proposed, the details of which, like the |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|-------------|--|----------------------|------|-------|-----------|---|
| | | | | | | | <p>road bridge, are currently not available. Both, however, will increase rather than alleviate the traffic problems in Cleadon.</p> <p>Major changes at the A1018 / Moor Lane junction would be necessary if H3.70 was developed and would further destroy the openness of the Green Belt. I think it is likely that a high proportion of occupants of houses in the proposed developments would not be people working in South Tyneside, therefore, significantly increasing commuter traffic in and around the Village.</p> |
| ST2415 | Lucy Taylor | | 12 Infrastructure | IN07 | k) v. | Objection | <p>Roads, Traffic and Road Bridge</p> <p>I have major concerns about the effect of the proposed developments in Cleadon on the already busy roads in the area, particularly those linking the village to the West through Boldon to the A19 and Newcastle. I understand that a road bridge is proposed to replace the level crossings at Tiledshed and Boldon Lane partly to develop sites outside Cleadon, but the effect will inevitably be to increase traffic through Cleadon on either Moor Lane or Boldon Lane. I also understand that a new Metro station is proposed, the details of which, like the road bridge, are not available from the Council. Both however will increase rather than alleviate the traffic problems in Cleadon. Major changes to the Sunderland Road / Moor Lane junction which would be necessary if H3.70 were developed, would further destroy the openness of the Green Belt. Due to the average number of cars per household, this will significantly increasing the volume commuter traffic on roads which cannot currently cope as they are.</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|-------------------|--|-------------------|------|-------|-----------|---|
| ST2418 | Christopher Nixon | | 12 Infrastructure | IN07 | k) v. | Objection | <p>I object to the proposed Boldon and Tiledshed Level Crossing Closure Scheme and the building of a new bridge and carriageways, because: -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) It will attract additional traffic through Cleadon from across South Tyneside and Sunderland which will increase the volume of traffic flowing through Cleadon and increase congestion. 2) The increase in volume of traffic will increase noise levels. 3) The infrastructure will have a detrimental effect on the eco system and the near by Boldon Nature Reserve. 4) With the increase in proposed housing development within Cleadon, Sunderland and South Tyneside it allows the possibly of thousands of MORE cars travelling through the village, polluting the air and impacting the health of all residents. <p>Also I strongly oppose to any proposal of building a Metro Station and car parking facility at Tiledshed for the above reason .</p> |
| ST2419 | Sheila Nixon | | 12 infrastructure | IN07 | k) v. | objection | <p>I object to the proposed Boldon and Tiledshed Level Crossing Closure Scheme and the building of a new bridge and carriageways, because: -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) It will attract additional traffic through Cleadon from across South Tyneside and Sunderland which will increase the volume of traffic flowing through Cleadon and increase congestion. 2) The increase in volume of traffic will increase noise levels. 3) The infrastructure will have a detrimental effect on the eco system and the near by Boldon Nature Reserve. 4) With the increase in proposed housing |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|-----------------|--|----------------------|------|--|---------|--|
| | | | | | | | development within Cleadon, Sunderland and South Tyneside it allows the possibly of thousands of MORE cars travelling through the village, polluting the air and impacting the health of all residents. Also I strongly oppose to any proposal of building a Metro Station and car parking facility at Tiledshed for the above reason . |
| ST2423 | Matthew McKenna | | 12 Infrastructure | IN04 | | Comment | Whilst I welcome the support for renewable energy, I would like to see the plan offer a concrete pathway towards increased renewable energy generation within our borough. Best practice would be to conduct a survey (determining renewable energy generation capacity and then physical and policy constraints for all sites across the borough), the results of which would be published within the local plan. As a consequence of gathering this data, 'suitable sites for energy generation' would be identified in the plan. This would act to highlight the potential of key sites, thereby inviting energy companies to seriously consider our area for their projects. |
| ST2425 | Lesley Hanson | | 12 Infrastructure | IN04 | | Comment | * Whilst I welcome the support for renewable energy, I would like to see the plan offer a concrete pathway towards increased renewable energy generation within our borough. Best practice would be to conduct a survey (determining renewable energy generation capacity and then physical and policy constraints for all sites across the borough), the results of which would be published within the local plan. As a consequence of gathering this data, 'suitable sites for energy generation' would be identified in the plan. This would act to highlight the potential of key sites, thereby inviting energy companies to seriously consider our area for their projects. |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|-----------------|--|----------------------|------|--|---------|---|
| | | | | | | | * As policy IN4 does not identify 'suitable sites for onshore wind energy generation' it , in effect, bans it for the lifetime of the plan. Given that we're in a climate emergency, I'd ask the council to reverse this decision. |
| ST2425 | Lesley Hanson | | 12 Infrastructure | IN04 | | Comment | <p>* Whilst I welcome the support for renewable energy, I would like to see the plan offer a concrete pathway towards increased renewable energy generation within our borough. Best practice would be to conduct a survey (determining renewable energy generation capacity and then physical and policy constraints for all sites across the borough), the results of which would be published within the local plan. As a consequence of gathering this data, 'suitable sites for energy generation' would be identified in the plan. This would act to highlight the potential of key sites, thereby inviting energy companies to seriously consider our area for their projects.</p> <p>* As policy IN4 does not identify 'suitable sites for onshore wind energy generation' it , in effect, bans it for the lifetime of the plan. Given that we're in a climate emergency, I'd ask the council to reverse this decision.</p> |
| ST2428 | Howard Lawrence | | 12 Infrastructure | IN01 | | Comment | <p>Policy IN1</p> <p>The number of houses proposed in the draft Local Plan will put an unsustainable strain on infrastructure and facilities, including roads, drainage and sewerage systems, health services, shops and in particular, schools. There is inadequate analysis of these issues within the draft Local Plan and little appreciation of how the increase in the number of residents will affect the lives of the people who already live and work in East Boldon. At this stage, infrastructure proposals are</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|------------------|--|-------------------|------|------|---------|--|
| | | | | | | | totally inadequate with regard to the provision of an additional 950 new homes in East Boldon. |
| ST2428 | Howard Lawrence | | 12 Infrastructure | IN06 | | Comment | <p>Policies IN6 & 7</p> <p>The Local Authority is aware of the serious parking issues affecting East Boldon, particularly around the Metro station. The scale of the proposals set out within the Draft Local Plan will make this already difficult problem intolerable for those who live and work there. The Local Plan does little to adequately address this issue and it is therefore of serious concern.</p> |
| ST2428 | Howard Lawrence | | 12 Infrastructure | IN07 | | Comment | <p>Policies IN6 & 7</p> <p>The Local Authority is aware of the serious parking issues affecting East Boldon, particularly around the Metro station. The scale of the proposals set out within the Draft Local Plan will make this already difficult problem intolerable for those who live and work there. The Local Plan does little to adequately address this issue and it is therefore of serious concern.</p> |
| ST2430 | Gillian Attewell | | 12 Infrastructure | IN01 | 12.1 | Support | <p>5.0 Open Green Spaces and community infrastructure – Policy N3 and paragraph 12.1</p> <p>I would like to state my support for Policy N3. In East Boldon we intend to identify some Green spaces within our Neighbourhood Plan. One of the sites which is in question is the area in front of St George’s Church. This area is neglected and unsightly and detracts from the Church, making it very difficult to attract congregation. I would like to see it become accessible and landscaped, while respecting the wildlife which habits it.</p> |
| ST2430 | Gillian Attewell | | 12 Infrastructure | IN03 | | Comment | 6.0 Taking into account the emerging Neighbourhood Plan – policy IN3, policy S4 |

| | | | | | | |
|--------|--------------------|------------|-------------------|------|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>Quoting Chapter 4.29, "Securing sustainable development is therefore the central theme which runs through this Local Plan and will also bind with any Neighbourhood Plans that are made." I would like to express my desire for the East Boldon Neighbourhood Plan to be given the credence that the references to it in this Draft Local Plan would indicate that it will. There is no way that this can be the case if the scale of development proposed goes ahead or if the Green Belt boundary is changed. The Neighbourhood plan will have a design code for housing and green infrastructure, and designated Green Spaces, and we expect these to be considered first and foremost when housing is allocated.</p> |
| ST2473 | Cllr David Francis | Councillor | 12 Infrastructure | IN04 | | <p>Objection</p> <p>* Whilst I welcome the support for renewable energy, I would like to see the plan offer a concrete pathway towards increased renewable energy generation within our borough. Best practice would be to conduct a survey (determining renewable energy generation capacity and then physical and policy constraints for all sites across the borough), the results of which would be published within the local plan. As a consequence of gathering this data, 'suitable sites for energy generation' would be identified in the plan. This would act to highlight the potential of key sites, thereby inviting energy companies to seriously consider our area for their projects.</p> <p>* As policy IN4 does not identify 'suitable sites for onshore wind energy generation' it , in effect, bans it for the lifetime of the plan. Given that we're in a climate emergency, I'd ask the council to reverse this decision.</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|---------------------------------------|----------|----------------------|------|--------|-----------|---|
| ST2486 | James Brown | Resident | 12 Infrastructure | IN01 | f | Support | I strongly support the policy to promote walking and cycling as well as other sustainable travel modes such as public transport and the use of low-emission vehicles. |
| ST2486 | James Brown | Resident | 12 Infrastructure | IN07 | f to j | Comment | Comment on Policy IN7 f) to j) (page 163) Other parts of the Local Plan and this policy itself are very specific as to what future developments the Council would like to support. Whilst I strongly support these policies in relation to Pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders, I think they should be more specific. Which footways will be upgraded to bridleways? Where will new bridleways be supported? |
| ST2486 | James Brown | Resident | 12 Infrastructure | IN07 | k | Objection | Objection to Policy IN7 k) v. Boldon and Tiledshed Level Crossing Closure Scheme with new bridge and carriageways I strongly object to the enormous investment of Council and other public money on a road bridge at this location. This is clearly at odds with the intention to increase active travel. It will encourage additional traffic through Cleadon, in particular along Boldon Lane. Already too many drivers speed and become overly aggressive when asked to stop at the Cleadon Academy school crossing by the crossing attendant / school patrol officer. This would only worsen with more traffic. There will be increased risk of injury to children and increased air pollution. The increase in traffic will likely offset any benefits in terms of journey times. Have there been any major incidents on the railway that would give rise to concern about the existing arrangements? |
| ST2496 | Rosalind Hughes & Warren Hughes | | 12 Infrastructure | IN7 | kv | Objection | In line with a transparent approach why haven't the public been made aware of the future plans to build a bridge in a semi-rural location (Tiledsheds Boldon)? This |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|---------------|--|----------------------|------|--|-----------|---|
| | | | | | | | proposal would lead to further and additional eradication of greenbelt space. Can you disclose further details of this? Can you explain the purpose of this or the rationale behind the proposal? It seems entirely disproportionate and unnecessary in our view. Can you confirm whether there will be further greenbelt deletion as a result? If so, what proportion. |
| ST2499 | David Herbert | | 12 Infrastructure | IN04 | | Objection | Policies requiring development to connect to district heating networks should be made much stronger. |
| ST2504 | Samuel Fisher | Gleeson Regeneration Limited | 12 Infrastructure | IN02 | | Objection | 8.6 Infrastructure (Chapter 12) 8.6.1 Policy IN2 – Developer Contributions, Infrastructure Funding and Viability 8.6.2 The emphasis within this policy is on viability and we await the Council’s evidence on viability before commenting on this further. Whilst it is noted and broadly welcomed that viability will be a factor when determining levels of planning obligations for development proposals, this needs to bear in mind that the NPPF is clear that obligations should not undermine the deliverability of the plan (paragraph 34). 8.6.3 Any finalised version of this policy will also need to acknowledge that the Borough is diverse in terms of values and the costs of delivering sites. This will ensure that future housing within South Tyneside can be brought forward. |
| ST2505 | Martyn Earle | Bellway Homes Limited (North East) | 12 Infrastructure | IN01 | | Objection | 23.1 Policy IN1 – Our Strategic Approach to Infrastructure (Strategic Policy) 23.1.1 Our Client notes that this policy has been informed by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) (paragraph 12.3) and this approach is broadly supported. However, it is imperative that this also needs to be accompanied by the relevant viability |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|--------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|------|--|-----------|---|
| | | | | | | | information to ensure that the delivery of infrastructure outlined in the IDP is possible and will not cause deliverability issues on key development sites. Currently Part B of the policy seeks to ensure that infrastructure required to support new development is bought forward at the appropriate stage. Whilst this approach is understood, viability will play a key role in this and that link between infrastructure and viability needs to be much clearer in order that Policy IN1 can be found sound. |
| ST2505 | Martyn Earle | Bellway Homes Limited (North East) | 12 Infrastructure | IN02 | | Objection | <p>24.0 Policy IN2 – Developer Contributions, Infrastructure Funding and Viability</p> <p>24.1 This policy is intended to guide the approach to developer contributions in relation to new development proposals. Our Client notes and supports the approach that planning obligations should only be used where it is not possible to use planning conditions. This is consistent with the NPPF (paragraph 54). However, the policy should also reference the statutory tests for planning obligations contained in Regulation 122 of the 2010 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations (as amended). This will make it clear as to the scope of the Council to request planning obligations and ensure that policy is sound by being consistent with national policy. We would also request that where the policy states ‘New development will be required to contribute to infrastructure...’ that this should be replaced with ‘New development may be required to contribute to infrastructure...’. This makes the policy effective and more accurately reflects the policy’s aim.</p> <p>24.2 The emphasis within the policy is on viability and we await the Council’s evidence on viability before</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|--------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|------|--|-----------|---|
| | | | | | | | commenting on this further. Whilst it is noted and broadly welcomed that viability will be a factor when determining levels of planning obligations for development proposals, this needs to bear in mind that the NPPF is clear that obligations should not undermine the deliverability of the plan (paragraph 34). This should include allocated sites given that these will be vital to the deliverability of the growth outlined over the plan period. |
| ST2505 | Martyn Earle | Bellway Homes Limited (North East) | 12 Infrastructure | IN04 | | Objection | <p>25.0 Policy IN4: Renewables and Low Carbon Energy Generation (Strategic Policy)</p> <p>25.1 Part 4 of this policy encourages major development that is proposed within 100m of a local district heating network to link up to the network (subject to viability). To ensure this policy is sound (by being effective) it needs to be emphasised that this can be encouraged 'where feasible' as it may be the case that certain developments may be close to local district heating networks but there may be physical or other barriers that may mean linking up to it cannot be done in practice.</p> <p>25.2 For clarification, the Local Plan should show the existing locations for district heating systems (this is only briefly referenced in paragraph 12.21). Currently this is unclear.</p> |
| ST2505 | Martyn Earle | Bellway Homes Limited (North East) | 12 Infrastructure | IN05 | | Objection | <p>26.0 Policy IN5: Telecommunications and Utilities</p> <p>26.1 This policy requires developers to ensure that all new build developments are served by an ultrafast broadband connection (fibre to the premises, FTTP). Whilst our Client understands the merits of providing FTTP connections, the ability to provide this is not in the direct control of housebuilders. Given this, the policy as drafted could cause deliverability issues for</p> |

| | | | | | | |
|--------|--------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|------|--|---|
| | | | | | | <p>housing development.</p> <p>26.2 Whilst paragraph 112 of the NPPF establishes that local planning authorities should seek to support the expansion of electronic communications networks, it does not seek to prevent development that does not have access to such networks.</p> <p>26.3 The Council should also note that Part R of the Building Regulations clearly sets the appropriate standards for high speed electronic communication networks. It is not considered appropriate for the Council to seek additional local technical standards over and above this requirement. This applies to the requirement to provide an 'Ultrafast/Gigabit-Capability Statement' to support planning applications. This will add further expense, delays and complications to development proposals. It is considered that this conflicts with paragraph 44 of the NPPF which highlights that local planning authorities should only request supporting information that is relevant, necessary and material to the application in question. In this instance, we do not believe such information is necessary given the requirements of Building Regulations. As this is the case, we object to this policy.</p> |
| ST2505 | Martyn Earle | Bellway Homes Limited (North East) | 12 Infrastructure | IN06 | | <p>Objection</p> <p>27.0 Policy IN6: Travel – New Development (Strategic Policy)</p> <p>27.1 Our Client does not have any fundamental objections to this policy, although our previous comments in relation to including references to SPDs within development plan policies apply in this case. The Parking Standards SPD is referenced in this policy and by doing this, it effectively gives the SPD development plan status. Reference to this SPD should</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|--------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|-----|--|-----------|---|
| | | | | | | | <p>therefore be removed from the policy text.</p> <p>27.2 The policy also places a requirement to provide charging facilities for vehicles in all major developments. Such a request requires justification as to whether there is need (outlined in paragraph 105 of the NPPF) and we cannot see any such justification. This would indicate this element of the policy is unsound. Such requirements should also be tested in terms of viability and we would expect this to be included in any future Local Plan Viability Assessment.</p> |
| ST2506 | Mark Gabrele | Bellway Homes Limited (North East) | 12 Infrastructure | IN1 | | Objection | <p>6.1 Policy IN1 – Our Strategic Approach to Infrastructure (Strategic Policy)</p> <p>6.1.1 Our Client notes that this policy has been informed by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) (paragraph 12.3) and this approach is broadly supported. However, it is imperative that this also needs to be accompanied by the relevant viability information to ensure that the delivery of infrastructure outlined in the IDP is possible and will not cause deliverability issues on key development sites. Currently Part B of the policy seeks to ensure that infrastructure required to support new development is bought forward at the appropriate stage. Whilst this approach is understood, viability will play a key role in this and that link between infrastructure and viability needs to be much clearer in order that Policy IN1 can be found sound.</p> |
| ST2506 | Mark Gabrele | Bellway Homes Limited (North East) | 12 Infrastructure | IN2 | | Objection | <p>6.2 Policy IN2 – Developer Contributions, Infrastructure Funding and Viability</p> <p>6.2.1 This policy is intended to guide the approach to developer contributions in relation to new development proposals. Our Client notes and supports the approach that planning obligations should only be</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|--------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|-----|--|-----------|--|
| | | | | | | | <p>used where it is not possible to use planning conditions. This is consistent with the NPPF (paragraph 54). However, the policy should also reference the statutory tests for planning obligations contained in Regulation 122 of the 2010 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations (as amended). This will make it clear as to the scope of the Council to request planning obligations and ensure that policy is sound by being consistent with national policy. We would also request that where the policy states 'New development will be required to contribute to infrastructure...' that this should be replaced with 'New development may be required to contribute to infrastructure...'. This makes the policy effective and more accurately reflects the policy's aim.</p> <p>6.2.2 The emphasis within the policy is on viability and we await the Council's evidence on viability before commenting on this further. Whilst it is noted and broadly welcomed that viability will be a factor when determining levels of planning obligations for development proposals, this needs to bear in mind that the NPPF is clear that obligations should not undermine the deliverability of the plan (paragraph 34). This should include allocated sites given that these will be vital to the deliverability of the growth over the plan period.</p> |
| ST2506 | Mark Gabrele | Bellway Homes Limited (North East) | 12 Infrastructure | IN4 | | Objection | <p>6.3 Policy IN4: Renewables and Low Carbon Energy Generation (Strategic Policy)</p> <p>6.3.1 Part 4 of this policy encourages major development that is proposed within 100m of a local district heating network to link up to the network (subject to viability). To ensure this policy is sound (by being effective) it needs to be emphasised that this</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|--------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|-----|--|-----------|---|
| | | | | | | | <p>can be encourage 'where feasible' as it may be the case that certain developments may be close to local district heating networks but there may be physical or other barriers that may mean linking up to it cannot be done in practice.</p> <p>6.3.2 For clarification, the Local Plan should show the existing locations for district heating systems (this is only briefly referenced in paragraph 12.21). Currently this is unclear.</p> |
| ST2506 | Mark Gabrele | Bellway Homes Limited (North East) | 12 Infrastructure | IN5 | | Objection | <p>6.4 Policy IN5: Telecommunications and Utilities</p> <p>6.4.1 This policy requires developers to ensure that all new build developments are served by an ultrafast broadband connection (fibre to the premises, FTTP). Whilst our Client understands the merits of providing FTTP connections, the ability to provide this is not in the direct control of housebuilders. Given this, the policy as drafted could cause deliverability issues for housing development.</p> <p>6.4.2 Whilst paragraph 112 of the NPPF establishes that local planning authorities should seek support the expansion of electronic communications networks, it does not seek to prevent development that does not have access to such networks.</p> <p>6.4.3 The Council should also note that Part R of the Building Regulations clearly sets the appropriate standards for high speed electronic communication networks. It is not considered appropriate for the Council to seek additional local technical standards over and above this requirement. This applies to the requirement to provide an 'Ultrafast/Gigabit-Capability Statement' to support planning applications. This will add further expense, delays and complications to development proposals. It is</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|--------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|-----|--|-----------|--|
| | | | | | | | considered that this conflicts with paragraph 44 of the NPPF which highlights that local planning authorities should only request supporting information that is relevant, necessary and material to the application in question. In this instance, we do not believe such information is necessary given the requirements of Building Regulations. As this is the case, we object to this policy. |
| ST2506 | Mark Gabrele | Bellway Homes Limited (North East) | 12 Infrastructure | IN6 | | Objection | <p>6.5 Policy IN6: Travel – New Development (Strategic Policy)</p> <p>6.5.1 Our Client does not have any fundamental objections to this policy, although our previous comments in relation to including references to SPDs within development plan policies apply in this case. The Parking Standards SPD is referenced in this policy and by doing this, it effectively gives the SPD development plan status. Reference to this SPD should therefore be removed from the policy text.</p> <p>6.5.2 The policy also places a requirement to provide charging facilities for vehicles in all major developments. Such a request requires justification as to whether there is need (outlined in paragraph 105 of the NPPF) and we cannot see any such justification. This would indicate this element of the policy is unsound. Such requirements should also be tested in terms of viability and we would expect this to be included in any future Local Plan Viability Assessment.</p> |
| ST2506 | Mark Gabrele | Bellway Homes Limited (North East) | 12 Infrastructure | IM1 | | Objection | <p>7.1 Policy IM1 – Implementation and Monitoring</p> <p>7.2 We support this policy which, if implemented, will ensure that housing delivery is maintained over the plan period. However, this is only as effective as the information which is provided for the monitoring. Whilst the supporting text mentions that monitoring</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|-----------------------|---------------|-------------------|------|----|-----------|---|
| | | | | | | | will be provided annually (paragraph 13.2), this needs to be made more explicit within the policy itself as well as detailing the methodology which will be used to calculate the Council's housing land supply position. This will enhance the Council's commitment to ensuring housing delivery levels do not fall. This could potential tie in with the annual published data on the Housing Delivery Test. |
| ST2510 | Prof Faith M Williams | | 12 Infrastructure | IN07 | kv | Objection | Re 12 Infrastructure I absolutely object to the proposed large development at Tiledsheds with associated bridge and metro station. Tiledsheds is a quiet back -water with nature reserve, open space, virgin north forest which will be lost for ever. There will be more traffic, pollution associated with the need for more infrastructure to support the large number of houses. |
| ST2514 | Dave McGuire | Sport England | 12 Infrastructure | IN07 | | Objection | Policy IN7: Accessible and Sustainable Travel. We welcome the recognition of the importance of Active Travel to sustainable travel. For this to more than lip-service however it is necessary to design the highway network to give primacy to pedestrians and cyclists. |
| ST2515 | Mrs Joan Fleetwood | | 12 Infrastructure | IN07 | kv | Object | 4.4 Proposed Road Bridge There is reference within the proposals to a possible new road bridge to replace Benton Road/Boldon Lane and Tiledshed Crossings which will, if it goes ahead, relieve congestion generated at these crossings. However this new bridge, the funding for which has not been identified, will probably have to be built on Green Belt land with a detrimental effect on the green infrastructure and biodiversity. A further effect of this will potentially be that traffic flow through Cleadon Village will increase even more than through the housing development as drivers |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|-----------------|---------------------------------|-------------------|-----|--|-----------|---|
| | | | | | | | <p>coming from the main road network use the bridge to get to Whitburn, Marsden and the southern part of South Shields</p> <p>It is unfortunate that full details of this proposal are not included within the draft plan as this prevents public scrutiny and a realistic assessment of the likely impact of the bridge.</p> |
| ST2516 | Dave Hutchinson | East Boldon Neighbourhood Forum | 12 Infrastructure | IN1 | | Objection | <p>The NPPF at paragraph 20 of the NPPF states that strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and quality of development, and make sufficient provision for community facilities (such as health, education and cultural infrastructure). The NPPF at paragraph 94 states that it is important that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of existing and new communities. Local planning authorities should take a proactive, positive and collaborative approach to meeting this requirement, and to development that will widen choice in education. They should give great weight to the need to create, expand or alter schools through the preparation of plans.</p> <p>The full infrastructure requirements arising from the proposed development set out in the Pre-Publication Draft Local Plan are currently unknown.</p> <p>The South Tyneside Local Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2019) states 'the Planning for School Places team have identified that there is pressure on primary and secondary school capacity in the Whitburn, Cleadon and Boldon area'. It goes on to state the Council will be in a position to determine the education infrastructure requirements once the Department of Education Methodology for calculating pupil yield is published. When will this be published and consulted</p> |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>on? It is likely that the high level of proposed housing development in East Boldon will result in the need to provide additional school places. Should a new school be required the Local Plan should allocate a site for this and the community should be consulted prior to the publication of the pre-submission Local Plan.</p> <p>The South Tyneside Local Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2019) states 'South Tyneside Clinical Commissioning Group and the Council's Public Health and Spatial Planning teams are currently working in partnership to assess the potential impact of the delivery of these allocations on the provision of Primary Care in the Borough. The outcome of this work will be important in the context of determining priorities for investment in the context of health infrastructure needs arising from development'. When will this be published and consulted on? Should a new surgery be required the Local Plan should allocate a site for this and the community should be consulted prior to the publication of the pre-submission Local Plan.</p> <p>The South Tyneside Local Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2019) does not address the need for additional dental services which forms part of health provision.</p> <p>The South Tyneside Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (2019) only provides information on flood and transport infrastructure. It does not provide a complete assessment of the infrastructure requirements arising from the proposed development set out in the Pre-publication Draft Local Plan.</p> <p>Concerns were voiced about infra-structure to support large scale housing at EBNF consultation event March 2019 (3 comments)</p> <p>Specifically proposed housing site H3.59 and fields</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|-----------------|---------------------------------|-------------------|-----|--|---------|--|
| | | | | | | | surrounding the village (5 comments) Contain vast array of wildlife. RSPB identified the need to protect wildlife on this site |
| ST2516 | Dave Hutchinson | East Boldon Neighbourhood Forum | 12 Infrastructure | IN2 | | Support | Support subject to comments expressed. Para 12.13: "The Community Infrastructure Levy allows councils to impose a levy on new developments in order to raise funds to support development. We are considering whether it would be appropriate to introduce the Community Infrastructure Levy in South Tyneside." Regarding the introduction of the Community Infrastructure levy in South Tyneside, we believe that this levy is essential for the implementation of Neighbourhood Plans and therefore request that it should be a requirement of the Local Plan that it be allocated to Neighbourhood Forums to determine its use in supporting local projects. |
| ST2516 | Dave Hutchinson | East Boldon Neighbourhood Forum | 12 Infrastructure | IN3 | | Support | Spatial Vision of LP EBNF - it is essential that residents have access to a range of Educational and Training Facilities, including choice of schools, new services community and healthcare provision, shops and services and employment and recreational facilities. EBNF will identify Community Assets if they arise as part of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan and we support the adherence to this NP when considering development of community and social infrastructure. |
| ST2516 | Dave Hutchinson | East Boldon Neighbourhood Forum | 12 Infrastructure | IN6 | | Support | Support in principle but with reservations. EBNF support the general principles of this policy, especially with reference to paragraphs: a) iv) – Give first priority to pedestrian and cycle movements, and addresses public transport connectivity. b) ix) – Protect/enhance access to public rights of way. |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|-----------------|---------------------------------|-------------------|-----|--|-----------|--|
| ST2516 | Dave Hutchinson | East Boldon Neighbourhood Forum | 12 Infrastructure | IN6 | | Objection | <p>Paragraph b) does not go far enough – ALL new developments must include charging infrastructure.</p> <p>c) – Development proposals must be designed to meet the needs of public transport users, including maximising opportunities to improve access to the Metro station.</p> <p>Paragraph 12.30 – Developments that generate significant amounts of movement will need a Travel Plan. Document SPD7 Travel Plans states that these plans are required for new housing over 50 dwellings – please clarify.</p> <p>Paragraph 12.32 – Makes important reference to the provision of real travel choices.</p> <p>Paragraph 12.34 – Makes reference to the Council’s Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy 2019) - where can this document be found?</p> <p>Inset Map 35 is not fully legible (scale is too small) – a larger map or individual area maps are required.</p> <p>South Tyneside Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2019. This document emphasises the importance of cycling and walking routes. Cycling activity (as a transport mode) has doubled in the last five years. Paragraph 4.90 states that the Council is developing a Cycling and Walking Investment Plan CWIP) – EBNF must be consulted on this document.</p> <p>Under Supplementary Planning Documents, SPD7 Travel Plans (April 2010) gives guidance about travel plan requirements. However, is this document to be revised to take into consideration the implications of the Draft local Plan?</p> <p>Regarding policy IN6 a) xi “Ensure that sufficient car parking spaces will be provided having regard to the Parking Standards SPD (or its successor document)”:</p> |
|--------|-----------------|---------------------------------|-------------------|-----|--|-----------|--|

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|-----------------|---------------------------------|-------------------|-----|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With regard to SPD Parking Standards for residential development, we have concerns that this is now not fit for purpose and that guidance in the NPPF acknowledges the need for a more pragmatic approach. We would ask that this is reviewed and updated alongside the Local Plan. • We believe that private parking provision should be proportionate to the number of bedroom spaces/size/occupancy of the property, and SPD 6 must be amended accordingly. • The proposed Cleadon Lane site (R5) next to the East Boldon Metro Station, a site where higher density is prescribed, illustrates the seriousness of the issue for the Forum. Not only will on street parking problems result from the maximum private parking levels imposed by SPD 6, but additional on street parking will result because of the site's proximity to the Metro Station and the inadequate park and ride facilities that currently exist....perfect storm! • We anticipate a much greater take up of cycle use, especially with the advent of battery assisted cycles, and consider that there should be a greater provision made in family housing. • We also think that secure storage with charging points should be a requirement and not just "considered" in areas of high density housing, flats etc. • We do not think there is a compelling reason to distinguish between private and social housing. | |
| ST2516 | Dave Hutchinson | East Boldon Neighbourhood Forum | 12 Infrastructure | IN7 | | Objection | IN7a)ii – we note the proposals for two new metro stations. If the proposed development of 950 new houses in EBNF area, (1,828 in the Boldons and Cleadon Village combined) should consideration be |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>given to a new metro station in the vicinity of Tiledsheds crossing?</p> <p>IN7a) iii – The car park at East Boldon Metro Station has been at capacity for many years. The continuing demand has meant parking is displaced to the roads nearby , particularly Cleadon Lane, Langholm Road and St John's Terrace. This causes access problems to residents and businesses. Our community consultation has shown strong support for additional park and ride facilities at the station, and the Local Plan should commit to this.</p> <p>This is also referred to in the Transport Study Update 2010 (listed under Supporting Documents and Evidence Based Studies), paragraph 7.1 - safeguarding of land to enable additional park and ride facilities at East Boldon Metro Station by 2021.</p> <p>IN7 c) iii – the proposal is not specific enough, land should be allocated in the Local Plan.</p> <p>EBNF will make such proposals in its emerging Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>IN7h) refers to inset map 31 – this should read inset map 35. This map is not fully legible (scale is too small) – a larger map or individual area maps are required.</p> <p>IN7k) v – this improvement to the Local Highway Network is at the very early stages of assessment. The Draft Local Plan contains no further details. The Public Consultation Drop In Session included a poster titled Boldon Tiledshed Level Crossing Risk Reduction. This contained a statement that once investigations have been finalised, a public consultation will be undertaken.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan, referred to in Para 12.3, provides further detail at Paras 4.25 to 4.29.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|------------------------------|--|----------------------|------|--|-----------|--|
| | | | | | | | <p>Para 4.28 states that this scheme also unlocks development sites that further the growth aspirations of South Tyneside.</p> <p>EBNF requires details discussions with the Council concerning its implications to the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Detailed alignments must be made available as soon as possible to assess the impact of the scheme on existing properties and on Tiledsheds Nature Reserve and cycleways.</p> |
| ST2531 | David Herbert | | 12 Infrastructure | IN04 | | Objection | <p>Policies requiring development to connect to district heating networks should be made much stronger.</p> |
| ST2537 | Laverck Hall Park Limited | | 12 Infrastructure | IN1 | | Objection | <p>5.1. Chapter 12 of the DLP concerns infrastructure provision. It explains that an Infrastructure Delivery Plan ('IDP', August 2019) has been prepared which "identifies the infrastructure required to deliver the draft site allocations and policies in the DLP and also provides a guiding framework as to the timing of the delivery of infrastructure required and which bodies have responsibility for delivery and the funding sources".</p> <p>5.2. The IDP makes reference to a series of transport models that have been used to assess the impact of the DLP. These include a local transport model developed by the Council, a strategic highways model developed by Highways England and other supporting information provided by neighbouring authorities to inform the determination of cross-boundary impacts. None of these transport models have been made available for review and comment as part of this consultation and therefore it is not possible to verify the Council's conclusions regarding which Spatial Options or individual development sites do / do not</p> |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>require mitigation without sight of this baseline evidence. This is a major shortcoming of this DLP consultation. In addition to this, the IDP notes that the modelling work is ongoing and subject to change - therefore it is not clear how the Council has reached its conclusions on the acceptability of the DLP draft allocations in advance of the required modelling work having been completed.</p> <p>5.3. The IDP also includes an assessment of the mitigation requirements associated with each of the draft site allocations. This assessment identifies whether mitigation is required and if so, whether the mitigation is required prior to the development coming forward and / or the scale of mitigation required.</p> <p>5.4. The Council's assessment concludes that a total of 2,232 dwellings spread across ten sites (H3.1, H3.12, H3.32, H3.38, H3.39, H3.56, H3.62, H3.68, RG1 and RG5) cannot be delivered until the identified transport infrastructure has been implemented (categorised as red in the Council's appraisal scoring). A further 37 sites are identified as requiring mitigation of some degree (categorised as amber / yellow in the Council's scoring). The IDP identifies that a number of corridors will be adversely affected as a result of background traffic growth and the DLP sets out a range of infrastructure solutions which range from major junction improvements to junction optimisation and packages of sustainable transport solutions.</p> <p>5.5. Many of the schemes are listed in the IDP schedule of infrastructure projects / schemes, with details of the costs and implementation timescales set out. Whilst the schedule identifies schemes as being</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>delivered by S106 and CIL in many cases, no details are presented as to which developments are required to deliver which schemes. There is therefore no clarity on which sites are required to deliver which elements of infrastructure and therefore there is no clarity on when the 2,232 dwellings which are only able to come forward when the infrastructure has been delivered, will be able to be developed.</p> <p>5.6. The IDP also identifies the need for improvements to be delivered to the Whitemare Pool junction to accommodate background traffic growth and the DLP proposals. The IDP notes (at paragraph 4.34) that: “Whilst we are looking at interim junction improvements to facilitate the impending traffic growth at White Mare Pool junction, there may be a need for a longer term project beyond the plan period. Highways England is presently considering the options.” The IDP schedule identifies a scheme for the enhancement / realignment of Whitemare Pool junction costing £300 million, to be delivered in 2030. This scheme is indicated as being delivered by Highways England RIS and CIL.</p> <p>5.7. There are no drawings to identify what this scheme would include, no modelling results to indicate what level of capacity improvement could be achieved from the scheme or whether this scheme represents the interim or longer term project identified in the report – albeit the timescales indicated would clearly place this improvement scheme within the current Plan period. Again, there are no details of which developments are reliant upon such a significant infrastructure scheme within the Council’s DLP documents. The IDP also identifies an</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | <p>IAMP Metro Extension scheme costing £300 million which would be delivered in 2024 with a range of stakeholders identified as being responsible for the delivery of the scheme, albeit no details of whether any funds have already been secured or whether the necessary consents are in place to enable the works to be delivered within the timescales indicated are set out in the document. There is no viability evidence produced alongside the DLP to demonstrate that these measures are viable and deliverable.</p> <p>5.8. The Laverick Park proposals are supported by a package of infrastructure improvements which includes works to the Whitemare Pool junction, associated widening of the A194 and a link through the Laverick Park site, all of which deliver capacity benefits to the Whitemare Pool junction and mitigate the impacts of the development-generated traffic. In addition to this, the Laverick Park proposals include a Metro Shuttle route which would connect IAMP to the existing Metro line at Fellgate, also serving Laverick Park, delivering a high quality and viable public transport service which could be implemented in the short term. All of these measures have been costed and are included in the Laverick Park Viability Assessment. This demonstrates that the infrastructure requirements of Laverick Park are viable and deliverable.</p> <p>5.9. Overall, it is concluded that there is insufficient evidence provided to support the draft proposals outlined in the DLP documents or the accompanying IDP to demonstrate that the Plan proposals are soundly evidence-based, viable and deliverable. At this stage, therefore, Draft Policies IN1: Our Strategic</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|---------------------------|--|-------------------|-----|--|-----------|--|
| | | | | | | | Approach to Infrastructure (Strategic Policy) and IN2: Developer Contributions, Infrastructure Funding and Viability are not justified or effective and are unsound. |
| ST2537 | Laverck Hall Park Limited | | 12 Infrastructure | IN2 | | Objection | <p>5.1. Chapter 12 of the DLP concerns infrastructure provision. It explains that an Infrastructure Delivery Plan ('IDP', August 2019) has been prepared which "identifies the infrastructure required to deliver the draft site allocations and policies in the DLP and also provides a guiding framework as to the timing of the delivery of infrastructure required and which bodies have responsibility for delivery and the funding sources".</p> <p>5.2. The IDP makes reference to a series of transport models that have been used to assess the impact of the DLP. These include a local transport model developed by the Council, a strategic highways model developed by Highways England and other supporting information provided by neighbouring authorities to inform the determination of cross-boundary impacts. None of these transport models have been made available for review and comment as part of this consultation and therefore it is not possible to verify the Council's conclusions regarding which Spatial Options or individual development sites do / do not require mitigation without sight of this baseline evidence. This is a major shortcoming of this DLP consultation. In addition to this, the IDP notes that the modelling work is ongoing and subject to change - therefore it is not clear how the Council has reached its conclusions on the acceptability of the DLP draft allocations in advance of the required modelling work having been completed.</p> <p>5.3. The IDP also includes an assessment of the</p> |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>mitigation requirements associated with each of the draft site allocations. This assessment identifies whether mitigation is required and if so, whether the mitigation is required prior to the development coming forward and / or the scale of mitigation required.</p> <p>5.4. The Council's assessment concludes that a total of 2,232 dwellings spread across ten sites (H3.1, H3.12, H3.32, H3.38, H3.39, H3.56, H3.62, H3.68, RG1 and RG5) cannot be delivered until the identified transport infrastructure has been implemented (categorised as red in the Council's appraisal scoring). A further 37 sites are identified as requiring mitigation of some degree (categorised as amber / yellow in the Council's scoring). The IDP identifies that a number of corridors will be adversely affected as a result of background traffic growth and the DLP sets out a range of infrastructure solutions which range from major junction improvements to junction optimisation and packages of sustainable transport solutions.</p> <p>5.5. Many of the schemes are listed in the IDP schedule of infrastructure projects / schemes, with details of the costs and implementation timescales set out. Whilst the schedule identifies schemes as being delivered by S106 and CIL in many cases, no details are presented as to which developments are required to deliver which schemes. There is therefore no clarity on which sites are required to deliver which elements of infrastructure and therefore there is no clarity on when the 2,232 dwellings which are only able to come forward when the infrastructure has been delivered, will be able to be developed.</p> <p>5.6. The IDP also identifies the need for improvements</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | <p>to be delivered to the Whitemare Pool junction to accommodate background traffic growth and the DLP proposals. The IDP notes (at paragraph 4.34) that: “Whilst we are looking at interim junction improvements to facilitate the impending traffic growth at White Mare Pool junction, there may be a need for a longer term project beyond the plan period. Highways England is presently considering the options.” The IDP schedule identifies a scheme for the enhancement / realignment of Whitemare Pool junction costing £300 million, to be delivered in 2030. This scheme is indicated as being delivered by Highways England RIS and CIL.</p> <p>5.7. There are no drawings to identify what this scheme would include, no modelling results to indicate what level of capacity improvement could be achieved from the scheme or whether this scheme represents the interim or longer term project identified in the report – albeit the timescales indicated would clearly place this improvement scheme within the current Plan period. Again, there are no details of which developments are reliant upon such a significant infrastructure scheme within the Council’s DLP documents. The IDP also identifies an IAMP Metro Extension scheme costing £300 million which would be delivered in 2024 with a range of stakeholders identified as being responsible for the delivery of the scheme, albeit no details of whether any funds have already been secured or whether the necessary consents are in place to enable the works to be delivered within the timescales indicated are set out in the document. There is no viability evidence produced alongside the DLP to demonstrate that</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|--------------|--|-------------------|------|-------|-----------|--|
| | | | | | | | <p>these measures are viable and deliverable.</p> <p>5.8. The Laverick Park proposals are supported by a package of infrastructure improvements which includes works to the Whitemare Pool junction, associated widening of the A194 and a link through the Laverick Park site, all of which deliver capacity benefits to the Whitemare Pool junction and mitigate the impacts of the development-generated traffic. In addition to this, the Laverick Park proposals include a Metro Shuttle route which would connect IAMP to the existing Metro line at Fellgate, also serving Laverick Park, delivering a high quality and viable public transport service which could be implemented in the short term. All of these measures have been costed and are included in the Laverick Park Viability Assessment. This demonstrates that the infrastructure requirements of Laverick Park are viable and deliverable.</p> <p>5.9. Overall, it is concluded that there is insufficient evidence provided to support the draft proposals outlined in the DLP documents or the accompanying IDP to demonstrate that the Plan proposals are soundly evidence-based, viable and deliverable. At this stage, therefore, Draft Policies IN1: Our Strategic Approach to Infrastructure (Strategic Policy) and IN2: Developer Contributions, Infrastructure Funding and Viability are not justified or effective and are unsound.</p> |
| ST2548 | Beryl Massam | | 12 Infrastructure | IN07 | k) v. | Objection | <p>10) The only possible consideration being given is for a bridge over one of the two crossings at Tilesheds. How high would that have to be? Not to mention the blot on diminishing Greenland. When I asked the Planner where that traffic would be diverted to, he couldn't</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|----------------|--|----------------------|------|----|-----------|--|
| | | | | | | | say as it was in it's initial stages – perhaps more proof that Infrastructure isn't a priority. |
| ST2556 | Elaine Francis | | 12 Infrastructure | IN04 | | Objection | * As policy IN4 does not identify 'suitable sites for onshore wind energy generation' it , in effect, bans it for the lifetime of the plan. Given that we're in a climate emergency, I'd ask the council to reverse this decision. |
| ST1923 | Anna Tyler | | 12 Infrastrucutre | IN07 | kv | Objection | <p>6.5. Biodiversity The biodiversity will be negatively impacted to the delicate balance of the ecosystems these areas support. This is extremely high risk in which I would appreciate an outline of your mitigation and intentions of monitoring the fauna and flora. Development will create hazards for wildlife and destroy areas of grassland and shrubs. The 'plant a tree' South Tyneside initiative has already failed to deliver and further trees will be demolished and not replaced further worsening the already fore mentioned air pollution, flooding, wildlife and noise pollution.</p> <p>6.6. Road Bridge & Tiledshed Metro Station I object to further Road Bridge (policy IN7) and proposed Metro Station at Tiledsheds. Firstly Tiledsheds is within walking distance of East Boldon and therefore it is a further unnecessary development which would attract further traffic as there a very few houses situated at Tiledsheds. A carpark would be required, therefore further loss of fields, fauna, wildlife to increase residents waiting times at the metro barriers. Please can you share your footfall, demand and capacity analysis which identifies the need of a further station in that location? The road bridge would create further traffic rather</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|-------------|--|----------------------|------|-------|-----------|---|
| | | | | | | | than appease any congestion, bringing additional emphasis to points 6.2, 6.3 and 6.4. This could allow a further 2,000 cars which in addition to the proposed local housing plans is absolutely disproportionate to the size of the village. |
| ST2414 | Brian Nixon | | 12 Infrastrucutre | IN07 | k) v. | Objection | <p>I object to the proposed Boldon and Tiledshed Level Crossing Closure Scheme and the building of a new bridge and carriageways, because: -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) It will attract additional traffic through Cleadon from across South Tyneside and Sunderland which will increase the volume of traffic flowing through Cleadon and increase congestion. 2) The increase in volume of traffic will increase noise levels. 3) The infrastructure will have a detrimental effect on the eco system and the near by Boldon Nature Reserve. 4) With the increase in proposed housing development within Cleadon, Sunderland and South Tyneside it allows the possibly of thousands of MORE cars travelling through the village, polluting the air and impacting the health of all residents. Also I strongly oppose to any proposal of building a Metro S tation and car parking facility at Tiledshed for the above reason . |