

Dear Planning Inspector,

Can you please accept this email below and the 5 attached emails as my Hearing Statement relevant to..

Session 2, Matter 2 - and - Session 8, Matter 7

As a Sunderland City Councillor and Ward Cllr for Castle Ward, I am representing Cllrs and Residents who like myself are not educated in Planning Law but we do know right from wrong, and we sincerely believe that removing field 416, then HY2, now HGA7 (North Hylton) is Wrong and that the Core Strategy Green Belt Review is Unsound Therefore we object to the Field at North Hylton being removed from Green Belt for the following reasons....

It was just Convenient

It was not Objective

It was not Impartial

Did not give sufficient weight or consideration to NPPF

Did not give sufficient weight or consideration to SHLAA 416

Is Unsustainable

Would be an Irreplaceable loss of a Landscape and Visual Amenity

And that any Exceptional Circumstances or Very Special Circumstances in relation to HY2 (HGA7) being removed from the Green Belt - do not exist.

Residents and Cllrs have asked to discuss these reasons in the past, but as the attached emails will show, although we have asked very many questions of very many people - we have never had very many answers

You say that the hearing will be Inquisitorial; so Cllrs, residents and members of the public hope that I will be allowed to inquire and ask questions relevant to the attached emails - and maybe this time we can get some answers.

The General Public's Perception of the Planning System is not very good, and many believe it is all 'cut & dried' before even entering the Public Domain

So by allowing me to ask questions from the attached emails (which are out in the Public Domain anyway) we can restore some faith for the General Public and Residents of Sunderland.

Points we would like to discuss

Point 1

To lots of people and those of us who have looked at very many SHLAA's, there is not another SHLAA in Sunderland that compares with the one for field 416 now HGA7 (North Hylton) - It is magnificent

This is a super-field and no one can understand.....

- a) What were the reasons a Developer (after reading the SHLAA) could ever believe that this field could ever be built on and have the confidence to spend real money and buy half of it? – see attachment 4

- b) What were the reasons Officers in Sunderland City Council Planning Department (after reading this SHLAA) could seriously recommend this field being removed from the Green Belt?
- c) What were the reasons no Sunderland City Council Ecologist (after Writing this SHLAA) could not defend it – or was everything in the SHLAA that the Ecologists wrote all Untrue & False? – please read SHLAA below

Development of this Greenbelt site would be contrary to the Local Plan for Regeneration of an Urban area

Provides much of the setting to one of the Principle and Identifiable panoramic viewpoints of Sunderland.

Site lies within an area of high landscape value.

Forms a major portion of the Strategic Green infrastructure and Wildlife Corridor alongside the river Wear.

The river Wear Estuary provides a vital green Lung within the Urban area of Sunderland which supports the attraction of Inward investment to the City.

The site lies within 6km of the Coastal Wildlife Corridor, and is therefore subject to Habitat Regulations Assessment (HAA).

Priority Species are recorded in the area.

Development of this Greenbelt site would have an adverse affect on Ramsar site, Special Protection Area (SPA), Special Area of Conservation (SAC)

Adverse Impact on a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)

Adverse impact on Local Wildlife site (LWS) and Protected species/habitats.

Attached email 01, shows how Pedantic and 'caring' the Council Ecology team can be when some Parents and Children are digging a few little holes with an Archaeologist on an old Pottery spoil heap at North Hylton.

Yet the same 'pedantic & caring' Ecology team are Inaccessible/invisible when Residents and Cllrs want to discuss the 416 SHLAA at North Hylton, and seek their professional opinions about the very last field in the North Area of Sunderland being removed from Green Belt for Development.

Point 2

We are not NIMBYs - Cllrs and Residents support jobs and growth provided they are realistic – Evidence shows we have all fully supported the IAMP

Nissan is classed as a Regional Employer not a City employer, attracting personnel who live far and wide across the whole of the North East Region and beyond - and the IAMP will be the same.

We believe that the housing figure has been increased (by 30%) for economic growth and that this is too ambitious.

(Nissan has been here for 33 years and its influence on economic growth is reflected in the household projections anyway)

There is No doubt, Brexit has put Nissan's future in jeopardy as laid out below in an Extract from the New European 12 March 2019

"The Japanese manufacturer said it was stopping production of the Q30 and QX30 premium ranges on Wearside - where around 300 employees work on the line.

The Nissan subsidiary has said it was closing its operations in Western Europe to focus its efforts in North America and China where market share continues to grow.

Steve McLennan, head of Infiniti Europe, said: “The commercial reality for Infiniti in Western Europe is that there is simply no visibility of a viable and sustainable business either currently or in the years to come.”

At the time of writing this I am led to believe that Nissan are asking for Redundancies

Point 3

We have no Settlement Breaks in the North Area of Sunderland – none.

To move from one Ward (settlement) to another, you just cross over the streets of Tarmac and Concrete

From the Beach on the East Coast boundary to the Western boundary of the A19, Every piece of land that can be built on - is built on

This very last arable field in the whole of the North of Sunderland

It is the very last piece of open countryside in the North of Sunderland.

It has unique views across the river valley to a replica Greek Temple set on top of the largest Iron Age Hill Fort in the North of England

This field is a Public Amenity, which should benefit the many and not just a few

Thousands of people a year use the setting of this field for recreation, walking, jogging and cycling, as it is also part of the picturesque and National C2C route

Families also come for the chance to look at the wildlife, birds, rabbits and Deer

This field is very important and very special the City of Sunderland.

It is very Important and Special, not just because Cllrs, Residents and General Public think it is - but because all the Facts in the SHLAA tell everyone it is - and the SHLAA needs to be fully discussed and taken into Account

Best Regards

Cllr Denny Wilson

Cc Cllrs Miller, Macknight and Foster

Lynne Ebdale, Alan Liddle, John Roberts

Jimmy Burnicle & Neil Martin

From: Denny Wilson [REDACTED]

Sent: 17 June 2018 14:19

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Subject: FW: Archaeology Sites - Sunderland

Hi Andrew, Residents of Castle Ward and Sunderland, have asked Castle Ward Cllrs to contact you about your email below to Durham Wildlife Trust (DWT) re the Archaeology Sites at North Hylton.

This is/was probably Sunderland's biggest combined communities Archaeology project that the people of the city have ever organised themselves – which you have now placed in jeopardy of ever being completed.

Can you please inform all of us why you did not ask for this further information when you outlined the initial Ecological Assessment you wanted DWT to carry out prior to work being started?

And why did someone from Sunderland Council Ecology Team not do it in the first place?

Only days after the project has began you now say "I think a more detailed ecological assessment.. is necessary"

This will add even more costs, and delay work starting on some of the sites - possibly ending the whole project as the Summer weather will soon be gone.

While Residents appreciate your extensive 'ecological concerns' in your email below for people working with Archaeologists digging a few holes in fields at North Hylton. They have asked Castle Ward Cllrs to ask you why you appear to have no 'ecological concerns' re the sunken boat leaking oil in the river. They also ask why you appear to have no 'ecological concerns' regards the Planners removing from the Greenbelt the last agricultural field in the whole of the North Area

Residents sincerely question if your email below is an OTT retaliation from the Planning Department, because some Residents and all three Ward Councillors are against the development of this field for the Ecological and Wildlife concerns listed in the Council's very own SHLAA Report, that Planners and you yourself as Senior Ecologist appear (to residents) couldn't care less about, with Wildlife Habitat being destroyed forever by building a whole new housing estate, yet you compile an extensive overzealous list of 'ecological concerns', just for some ordinary people

digging little temporary holes with hand trowels. E.G. **“Excavation expose risk of fire? Really?”**

They also ask, to save time money and possibly save the project - that you as Senior Ecologist for the Council or one of your Team, come out of the Civic Centre and do the assessment yourself, which they believe is what you and your team get paid for - and that Residents pay their Council Tax & Rates for.

Sent on behalf of Residents of Castle Ward and Sunderland

Cllrs Wilson Foster and MacKnight.
Castle Ward Cllrs

From: Denny Wilson [REDACTED]

Sent: 19 June 2018 09:06

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Archaeology Sites - Sunderland

Hi Dan, Thanks for taking the time to talk with Castle Ward Cllrs yesterday about 'ecological concerns' re various sites at North Hylton. To assist Castle Ward Cllrs understand the situation better we would very much appreciate the Council's Ecological Team's answers to some questions below.

- 1 - What is the role of the Council Ecology Team ?
- 2 – What role have they played in the Planning Department's decision to remove the last Agricultural Field in the North Area from Green Belt - 416 now HY2 ?
E.g. Did they raise any objections?
- 3 – Does the Ecology Team agree with Planners that this field will better serve the city as a housing estate and that it has no Ecological value?
- 4 – When the Leader of the Council visited this field a couple of weeks ago he saw a Deer with its young fawn - What is the deer population of Sunderland North Area?
- 5 – Does the Ecology Team believe that destroying this Wildlife Habitat forever will make Sunderland a better place for people to live?

We have lots more questions which we will send when time allows

Many thanks and looking forward to your response

Cllrs Wilson, Foster & Macknight. Castle Ward

From: Denny Wilson [REDACTED]

Sent: 20 June 2018 13:16

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Subject: Core Strategy Public Perception

Hi Dan/Louise - re Public Perception of Sunderland City Council

One of the many concerns Residents and Castle Cllrs have is - How a Developer apparently knew that the very agricultural last field (416) in the North Area was to be removed from Green Belt, even before Cllrs and the Core Strategy Public Consultation was even announced.

Surely any Developer would be immediately discouraged from buying Field (416) by reading Sunderland City Council's, Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) which very clearly states....

"Development of this Greenbelt site would be contrary to the Local Plan for Regeneration of an Urban area"

and

"Development of this Greenbelt site would have an adverse affect on Ramsar site, Special Protection Area (SPA), Special Area of Conservation (SAC)"

and

Adverse Impact on a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)

and

Adverse impact on Local Wildlife site (LWS) and Protected species/habitats.

But the Developer took a 'speculative punt' anyway and bought field (416) before the Consultation began

But the Developer did not buy all the field - the Developer only bought half the field. And guess what?

When the Core Strategy Public Consultation began, it was discovered that field (416) had now been renamed and divided in to two parts HY1 & HY2

And guess what?

The half of the field (now HY2) that the Developer bought - just happened to be the very half of field that is now included in the Core Strategy Plan to be removed from Green Belt to have a Housing Estate built on it.

How lucky a punt was that?

Also it appears that the Developer was very lucky that the Council's Ecology team, who can recommend pedantic rules and regulations on Sunderland residents and schoolchildren for digging a few temporary Archaeological holes in some fields, don't seem to care that our Planning Department and a Housing Developer are intent on destroying a unique part of Sunderland's most scenic wildlife habitat forever.

We would appreciate what you think the Public Perception of Sunderland City Council is, when Sunderland North Area has 7 large Brownfield sites and there no understandable need to develop this unique field.

To assist your opinion, please see full SHLAA below and picture of the Field – I have also added a picture of some Deer, similar to what the Leader saw on his visit to the field - as nobody will ever see them again if the Council allows development – What do you think Public Perception will be?

Denny



Provides much of the setting to one of the Principle and Identifiable panoramic viewpoints of Sunderland.

Site lies within an area of high landscape value.

Development of this Greenbelt site would be contrary to the Local Plan for Regeneration of an Urban area

Forms a major portion of the Strategic Green infrastructure and Wildlife Corridor alongside the river Wear.

The river Wear Estuary provides a vital green Lung within the Urban area of Sunderland which supports the attraction of Inward investment to the City.

The site lies within 6km of the Coastal Wildlife Corridor, and is therefore subject to Habitat Regulations Assessment (HAA).

Priority Species are recorded in the area.

Development of this Greenbelt site would have an adverse affect on Ramsar site, Special Protection Area (SPA), Special Area of Conservation (SAC)

Adverse Impact on a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)

Adverse impact on Local Wildlife site (LWS) and Protected species/habitats.

From: Denny Wilson [REDACTED]

Sent: 25 June 2018 11:39

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Core Strategy Public Perception

To Leader, Cllrs and Officers, re Castle Ward Cllrs for forthcoming meeting with Planning Dept, re Core Strategy, Archaeology Dig and Public Perception of Sunderland City Council.

Public Perception is that Sunderland City Council appear to care more for assisting Development to destroy our irreplaceable natural environment, than enabling city residents and schoolchildren to enjoy it

To allow Development on field HY2, all three (and we only have 3) of Sunderland's **Internationally** designated ecology areas will be Adversely affected. according to SHLAA (416) below.

Also, One **National** area Adversely Affected - and **Local** Wildlife site and Protected species/habitats Adversely impacted

It appears to the Public that the Council does not apply ecological rules and regulations to Developers.

But when some Residents and school children want to work with an Archaeologist for a few days, the full weight of the Council ecological rules and regulations are unnecessarily applied OTT.

Please carefully read below which should explain why the Reputation and Public Perception of Sunderland City Council should be of important concern.

Extract from page 90/91 Core Strategy and Development Plan 2015-2033 (DRAFT)

Biodiversity and Geodiversity

10.59 Sunderland's natural environment is one of its greatest assets and includes a network of identified wildlife and geological sites as well **priority species and habitats** which in turn contributes to our economy, our health and wellbeing while enriching our lives.

Designated sites in the city comprise:

- **International** – 1 Special Area of Conservation (**SAC**), 1 Special Protection Area (**SPA**) and 1 **RAMSAR**

- **National** – 17 Sites of Special Scientific Interest (**SSSI**), 5 Local Nature Reserves

- **Local** – 6 Local Geological Sites, 63 Local Wildlife Sites (**LWS**) and 14 proposed Local Wildlife Sites.

10.60 Wildlife is not confined to designated sites and many features serve as **wildlife corridors**, links and stepping stones.

Sunderland's **wildlife corridors** coupled with our designated sites will be the means to deliver ecological networks and **habitat** connectivity within and beyond Sunderland.

The location of new development will deliver sites that avoid, protect and/or enhance Sunderland's wildlife and geology.

10.61 Natural England has provided conservation objectives for our international and national sites which will help guide and inform decisions made on applications that may affect these sites.

Sites will not be allocated for development if they are likely to have a significant effect on International and national sites within and beyond our boundary.

Please now compare the statements from the Core Strategy (CS) above and Council's (SHLAA) below, for field (416) now HY2, now to be recommended for Development and removed from Green Belt.

SHLAA (416)

Development of **this Greenbelt** site would have an **Adverse affect** on **Ramsar site**, **Special Protection Area (SPA)**, **Special Area of Conservation (SAC)** –

*See CS above, all 3 **International** areas affected and note highlighted sentence*

Adverse Impact on a Site of Special Scientific Interest (**SSSI**) - *see CS above, **National** and note highlighted sentence*

Adverse impact on Local Wildlife site (**LWS**) and **Protected species/habitats**. *See CS above*

Forms a major portion of the Strategic Green infrastructure and **Wildlife Corridor** alongside the river Wear. *See CS above*

The site lies within 6km of the **Coastal Wildlife Corridor**, and is therefore subject to **Habitat** Regulations Assessment (HAA). - *See CS above*

Priority Species are recorded in the area. - *See CS above*

Development of this Greenbelt site would be **contrary to the Local Plan** for Regeneration of an Urban area - *See CS above*

The river Wear Estuary provides a **vital green Lung** within the Urban area of Sunderland which supports the attraction of Inward investment to the City. – *See CS above*

Provides much of the setting to one of the Principle and Identifiable **panoramic viewpoints** of Sunderland. *See CS above*

Site lies within an area of **high landscape value**. See CS above

The Public ask –

Why do Sunderland Council allow/condone a Development to ignore all in the SHLAA above?

Yet smother Residents and Kids in rules and regulations, who only want to dig a few holes in some fields for a couple of days – with an Archaeologist ?

What do you think Public Perception of Sunderland City Council is?

Sent on behalf of Cllrs and Residents of Castle Ward



From: Andrew Bewick [REDACTED]

Sent: 15 June 2018 11:23

To: Victoria Telford [REDACTED]

Cc: Ian Craft [REDACTED]

Subject: FW: Archaeology Sites - Sunderland

Victoria

I have had a bit more of think about the latest proposals you emailed yesterday and in relation to previous versions from Wardell Armstrong. I think a more detailed ecological assessment and, if the sites and working methods are acceptable, ecological method statement is necessary. I have listed some of the areas of importance and concern that should be addressed:

LWS and ASNW

Nesting birds

Badger

Habitats (diversity) and species/flora (spurge laurel, dog violet, orchids, trees)

Non-native and invasive species

Clarity and surety over the project's methods and locations

Means of access and routes

Number of people

Large areas + trampling

Ground floraremoval and replacement

Washing of material and removal from site

Fixed working areas. Temporary barriers/boundary tape – theft or discarded into wood/river

Preferred weather conditions and time of year from ecological perspective

Press and media and personal digital media encouraging people to visit and dig during project and anytime thereafter all over High Wood.

H&S potential issues: Excavation expose risk of fire? Contaminated land? Leaving excavations unattended, or exposed overnight. Welfare provision.

Ecological assessment and method statement should be applied to all works and locations, not just Council (SCC) land.

Current SCC licence is only for site 2, Old kiln/clay pit.

See also notes in blue in your email below.

Thanks

Andrew

Andrew Bewick

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]