

# **EX5 - Examination of the International Advanced Manufacturing Park (IAMP) Area Action Plan (AAP)**

## **Matters and Questions**

### **Matter 1 - Duty to Co-operate and other legal requirements**

- 1.1 Have the Councils adequately discharged any obligations on them in respect of the Duty to Co-operate in the preparation of the plan?
- 1.2 Has preparation of the plan complied with the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act and the relevant Regulations? Is the plan consistent with the relevant adopted development plans as required by Reg 8(4) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012?
- 1.3 Does the plan accord with the adopted Local Development Schemes for Sunderland and South Tyneside?
- 1.4 Has consultation, undertaken in preparing the plan, been adequate and carried out in accordance with the adopted Statements of Community Involvement of Sunderland City Council and South Tyneside Council?
- 1.5 Is the Sustainability Appraisal of the plan adequate and has it appropriately informed the preparation of the plan?
- 1.6 Is the Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report adequate and persuasive in its conclusion that Appropriate Assessment is not necessary in connection with the plan?

### **Matter 2 – Overarching Issues**

- 2.1 Is the boundary of the AAP soundly based? And in particular:
  - Does it include land which is not necessary to be included within the plan area, notably the triangle of land broadly between the northern and southern areas of proposed safeguarded land, which would remain as Green Belt?
- 2.2 In broad terms is the list of matters which the AAP seeks to address soundly based? And in particular:
  - Would the plan pre-determine decisions to be taken in the preparation of forthcoming plans in respect of land outside the AAP boundary?
  - Have the implications of the plan for the remainder of Sunderland and South Tyneside, particularly in terms of housing, employment land and agriculture, been robustly assessed? Is the plan soundly based having regard to these implications?

- Is modification of the plan to allocate land for aspirational family housing necessary for the plan to be sound?
- Is reference within the plan to the potential for development to take place on land between the plan area and Washington necessary for it to be sound?

### **Matter 3 – Principal Uses, the Mix of Uses and the Hub**

(Policies S1, S3, S4, S5 and S6)

- 3.1 Is the case for the International Advanced Manufacturing Park supported by convincing evidence of need and viability?
- 3.2 Are the principal uses and mix of uses allowed for in policies S1, S3 and S4 soundly based? And in particular:
- Are policies S1, S3 and S4 likely to be effective in preventing development which would not accord with the IAMP concept?
  - Is there a need for more flexibility to allow development consistent with the IAMP concept coming forward in advance of an IAMP Development Consent Order?
  - Is a statement in policy S4 that the majority of premises will be larger units necessary for the plan to be sound?
  - Are the modifications which the Councils have proposed (Docs PSD6/PSD7) to policies S1, S3 and S4 necessary for the plan to be sound?
  - Is policy S3 and its supporting text (para 103) consistent with policy S5 (as proposed by the Councils to be modified) in relation to the cumulative total size of retail units which would be permitted?
- 3.3 Is the concept of The Hub, and are the detailed requirements in respect of it, set out in policies S5 and S6 soundly based? And in particular:
- Is the Hub appropriately located?
  - Are policies S5 and S6 clear as to what ancillary uses will be permitted and where?
  - Does the plan provide adequate and soundly-based guidance on the future of the North East Land Sea and Air Museums? Is the proposed modification to paragraph 91 of the supporting text of policy S1, in respect of the museums, necessary for the plan to be sound? Are similar references in policies S5 and /or S6 necessary for the plan to be sound?
  - Are the modifications which the Councils have proposed (Docs PSD6/PSD7) to policies S5 and S6 necessary for the plan to be sound?

- Is the restriction on retail uses as proposed by the Councils (Docs PSD6/PSD7) to a total of 1,500 sqm floorspace of A1 and A3 uses with a 250sqm maximum single unit size soundly based?

#### **Matter 4 – Proposed Revision of the Green Belt boundary**

(Policy S1 and S2)

- 4.1 Having regard to (a) the need for/viability of IAMP; (b) the potential for it to be located elsewhere; (c) the harm caused as a result of the loss of Green Belt; and (d) any other potential harm, does the submitted evidence convincingly demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist to justify a revision to the boundary of the Green Belt in the AAP? And in particular:
- Has consideration been given to the location of IAMP on sites not currently allocated for employment use and not located in the Green Belt?
  - What is the mitigation referred to in section 6 of the *Exceptional Circumstances for Releasing Land from the Green Belt Technical Background Report*?
  - Does section 7 of the *Exceptional Circumstances for Releasing Land from the Green Belt Technical Background Report* adequately explain and justify the planning balance which has been undertaken in concluding that there is “a clear exceptional circumstances case” for removal of land currently in the Tyne and Wear Green Belt?
- 4.2 Is the revised Green Belt boundary proposed in the plan soundly based and consistent with national policy, having particular regard to:
- Land around West Moor Farm?
  - Land in the River Don corridor between the northern and southern Employment Development areas
- 4.3 Does the plan provide adequate guidance on the possible future release of safeguarded land? Are any modifications to the plan in respect of this necessary for it to be sound?
- 4.4 Are the modifications which the Councils have proposed (Docs PSD6/PSD7) to policy S2 necessary for the plan to be sound and are they consistent with national policy?

## **Matter 5 – Design and the Historic Environment**

(Policies D1 and D2)

- 5.1 Are the requirements of policies D1 and D2, in respect of masterplanning and the public realm, soundly based?
- 5.2 Is the plan consistent with national policy, and otherwise soundly based, in relation to the protection of heritage assets? Are there extant policies of the Sunderland and South Tyneside development plans which provide appropriate protection for these assets?
- 5.3 Are the modifications which the Councils have proposed (Docs PSD6/PSD7) to policies D1 and D2 and section 2.5 necessary for the plan to be sound?

## **Matter 6 – Infrastructure, Transport and Access**

(Policies T1, T2, T3, T4, IN1 and IN2)

- 6.1 Have the implications of the plan for transport and other infrastructure been robustly assessed and are there arrangements in place to ensure that the necessary mitigation is provided at the appropriate time in relation to the development of IAMP?
- 6.2 Does the plan provide for adequate links between IAMP and Follingsby Park Industrial Estate?
- 6.3 Is policy T1, in respect of highway infrastructure, soundly based? Are the modifications to the policy proposed by the Councils (Docs PSD6/PSD7) necessary for the plan to be sound?
- 6.4 Are policies T2 and T3, in respect of walking, cycling and horse riding and public transport, soundly based? And in particular:
  - Does the plan go far enough in seeking to promote alternatives to the use of the private car?
  - Does the plan provide adequate and soundly based guidance on public rights of way?
  - Are the modifications to policies T2 and T3 proposed by the Councils (Docs PSD6/PSD7) necessary for the plan to be sound?
- 6.5 Is policy T4, in respect of parking, soundly based? Are the modifications to this policy proposed by the Councils (Docs PSD6/PSD7) necessary for the plan to be sound?

- 6.6 Is policy IN1, in respect of utilities infrastructure provision, soundly based? Are the modifications to the policy proposed by the Councils (Docs PSD6/PSD7) necessary for the plan to be sound?
- 6.7 Is policy IN2, in respect of flood risk, water management and drainage, soundly based? And in particular:
- Is it necessary for the policy to seek to ensure that development alleviates flood risk downstream?
  - Are the modifications to the policy proposed by the Councils (Docs PSD6/PSD7) necessary for the plan to be sound?

## **Matter 7 – Environment and Ecology**

(Policies EN1, EN2, EM3 and EN4)

- 7.1 Are policies EN1 and EN3, in respect of the landscape and green infrastructure, soundly based? And in particular:
- Are the requirements of part A of policy EN1 inappropriately restrictive?
  - Are the modifications to policies EN1 and EN3 proposed by the Councils (Docs PSD6/PSD7) necessary for the plan to be sound?
- 7.2 Is policy EN2, in respect of ecology, soundly based? And in particular:
- Are modifications necessary in respect of the specific comments of the Durham Bird Club?
  - Does the plan adequately reflect the Water Framework Directive?
  - Is the requirement to enhance various aspects of ecology, as proposed by the Councils as modifications to policy EN2 (Docs PSD6/PSD7), necessary for the plan to be sound?
- 7.3 Does the plan provide adequate and soundly based guidance in respect of the role, protection and enhancement of the River Don corridor?
- 7.4 Does the plan provide for adequate monitoring of the ecological impacts of its implementation?
- 7.5 Is policy EN4, in respect of amenity, soundly based? Is the modification of the policy as proposed by the Councils (Docs PSD6/PSD7) to extend its applicability to all proposed development in the plan area necessary for the plan to be sound?

## **Matter 8 – Implementation, Delivery and the Policies Map**

(Policies Del1 and Del2)

- 8.1 Are the requirements of policy Del1, in respect of a phasing strategy, mitigation strategy and a management strategy, soundly based? Are the modifications to the policy proposed by the Councils (Docs PSD6/PSD7) necessary for the plan to be sound?
- 8.2 Does the plan provide sufficient and appropriate guidance on land assembly to ensure its effective implementation?
- 8.3 Are the requirements of policy Del2 likely to be effective in ensuring that mitigation required in respect of development within the AAP area is secured at the appropriate time? Are the modifications to the policy proposed by the Councils (Docs PSD6/PSD7) necessary for the plan to be sound?
- 8.4 Is it necessary for the soundness of the plan for Table 1 (Infrastructure Delivery Schedule) to be deleted, as proposed by the Councils, and instead for there to be a separate Infrastructure Delivery Plan? Is this revised approach soundly based?
- 8.5 Having regard to paragraphs 173-174 of the National Planning Policy Framework is there evidence that, cumulatively, national and local policy standards/requirements would not put implementation of the AAP at serious risk?
- 8.6 Is the Policies Map (Appendix A of the plan) justified? Are the alterations to the Map proposed by the Councils (Appendix A of PSD7) necessary for it to be justified?