

Agenda

Session 10 – 09.30 Thursday 6 June

Matter 7

The Strategy and Housing Growth Areas for The Coalfield

This matter considers the strategic policies (SP6 and SS7), the Housing Growth Areas (HGA9 - 11) and delivery of housing sites and infrastructure for The Coalfield.

Proposed Main Modifications (MMs) 14 to 16 are relevant to this session.

Issues

1. Strategic Policies

1.1 Are Policies SP6 and SS7 justified and effective?

MM14 is relevant – replacing ‘inappropriate’ with ‘unacceptable’ in Criterion 1 of Policy SP6.

Note for the Council – consideration should be given to the consistency of wording between Policies SP5 and SP6 in relation to Settlement Breaks.

1.2 Are any modifications required to Policies SP6 and SS7 to ensure that they are justified and effective, taking account the need for consistency between policies of the Plan?

2. Identification of Sites and Protected Areas

2.1 Do the Green Belt assessments support the HGAs in The Coalfield and demonstrate exceptional circumstances for the removal of land from the Green Belt?

The Council refers to the Compliance Statement and the Green Belt Assessments in support of the HGAs.

2.2 If exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated have these been clearly articulated in the Plan?

The Council refers to MM16 which summarises the Council's position in terms of impact on Green Belt purposes.

2.3a Are the configuration and scale of the HGAs justified taking into account development needs and the Green Belt assessments?

The Council notes that significant development has taken place around The Coalfield in the past but some sustainable growth in the northern part of the Coalfield is justified. The Council considers that the scale of growth proposed in the HGAs will not unduly alter the semi-rural character of the area.

2.3b Would the location of the HGAs lead to an over-concentration of housing development in one part of The Coalfield over the Plan period?

2.3c Does the south-east boundary of HGA9 need to be adjusted to take into account landscape features/field boundaries?

2.4a Are the configurations of the Settlement Breaks justified?

The Council refers to the Compliance Statement and Settlement Break Review to justify the configuration.

2.4b What is the justification for including the Russell Foster Football Centre, west of Newbottle, within the settlement break?

3. HGA9 – Penshaw

3.1a Is the Council satisfied that the landscape, heritage, biodiversity, access, transport, drainage and other constraints are capable of being mitigated so that development of the site would be acceptable?

The Council refers to the Compliance Statement, the site-specific criteria and the SOCGs with various bodies.

3.1b In particular

(i) Would the impacts on the setting of Herrington Country Park and Penshaw Monument be acceptable; and,

(ii) Would the high voltage electricity lines crossing the site allow an acceptable living environment to be created?

3.2a Are all the policy requirements within HGA9 necessary and clear to the decision maker?

The Council considers that the policy requirements are necessary and are informed by statutory consultees and the Development Frameworks.

3.2b In particular are criteria ii, iii, vi, vii and x necessary and/or clear to the decision maker?

3.3 Is the site deliverable or developable?

The Council refers to the Green Belt Site Selection Report, the Development Frameworks and the Whole Plan Viability Assessment as evidence that the such greenfield sites are viable and will be forthcoming in the Plan period.

4. HGA10 – New Herrington

4.1 Is the Council satisfied that the landscape, biodiversity, access, transport, drainage and other constraints are capable of being mitigated so that development of the site would be acceptable?

The Council refers to the Compliance Statement, the site-specific criteria and the SOCGs with various bodies.

4.2a Are all the policy requirements within HGA10 necessary and clear to the decision maker?

The Council considers that the policy requirements are necessary and are informed by statutory consultees and the Development Frameworks.

4.2b In particular are criteria i, iii, iv, and vi positively prepared, necessary and/or clear to the decision maker?

4.3a Is the site deliverable or developable?

The Council refers to the Green Belt Site Selection Report, the Development Frameworks and the Whole Plan Viability Assessment as evidence that the site is viable and will be forthcoming in the Plan period. The Council has clarified that the site promoter intends to provide a new club as part of the development which would be taken into account in land acquisition costs.

4.3b Taking into account the need to replace the club building and retain the bowling green and preserved trees is the site likely to be viable and deliver 20 homes during the Plan period (predicted to deliver 20 homes by 2025/26)?

5. HGA11 – Philadelphia

5.1 Is the Council satisfied that the landscape, heritage, biodiversity, access, transport, drainage and other constraints are capable of being mitigated so that development of the site would be acceptable?

The Council refers to the Compliance Statement, the site-specific criteria and the SOCGs with various bodies.

5.2 Are all the policy requirements within HGA11 necessary and clear to the decision maker?

The Council considers that the policy requirements are necessary and are informed by statutory consultees and the Development Frameworks. MM15 is relevant (criterion iii).

5.3a Is the site deliverable or developable?

5.3b As development of the site is dependent on access via the Philadelphia Complex, is there a reasonable prospect that the Complex will be built-out within the timeframe anticipated by the trajectory?

The Council refers to the Green Belt Site Selection Report, the Development Frameworks and the Whole Plan Viability Assessment as evidence that the such greenfield sites are viable and will be forthcoming in the Plan period. It is noted that development is projected to commence towards the end of the Plan period with some 75 units not coming forward until after 2032/33.

6. Infrastructure

6.1 Will the infrastructure to support the scale of development proposed in The Coalfield be provided in the right place and at the right time, including that related to transport, the highway network, health, education and open space?

The Council refers to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and the supporting Transport Assessment (SD.51-53) and Education Plan (SD.62). Essential infrastructure is referred to in Policies SS7 and HGA9 to HGA11.

6.2 Are the adverse impacts of the Central Section of the Coalfield Regeneration Route capable of being mitigated?

The Council refers to the Compliance Statement and the intention that the alignment will avoid archaeological remains, the Leamside Line and contaminated ground. Detailed design would minimise environmental impacts.

7. Delivery

7.1 Are the assumptions about the rate of delivery of houses from sites in The Coalfield realistic (anticipated delivery is shown in Appendices A, B, F and P of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA))?

The Council refers to the SHLAA methodology which includes updating information on an annual basis, discussing sites with the SHLAA panel and seeking information from developers. None of the HGA sites have been included within the five-year supply.

Main Evidence Base

SD.22 – SHLAA

SD.29 - 34 – Green Belt Assessments

SD.35 - Sunderland Development Frameworks

SD.48 – Settlement Break Review 2018
 SD.59 – IDP
 SD.60 - Whole Plan Viability Assessment
 SD.66 - Compliance Statement
 EX1.008 & EX1.010 – Council responses to Inspector’s preliminary questions
 EX1.018 - Schedule of Main Modifications
 EX1.020 – SHLAA Update May 2019

Statements

EX11.001 - Sunderland City Council
 EX11.002 - Gillan Gibson - CPRE (ID1175874)
 EX11.003 -Andrew Moss - Ward Hadaway (Ray Delaney) (ID1036112)
 EX11.004 - James Cullingford - Lambert Smith Hampton (Harworth Group) (ID1175935)
 EX11.005 - Andrew Rose - Spawforths (Barratt & David Wilson Homes) (ID992525)
 EX11.006(a) - Chris Smith - Lichfields (Taylor Wimpey) (ID1120527)
 EX11.006(b) - Chris Smith - Lichfields (Taylor Wimpey) (ID1120527)
 EX11.007(a) - James Taylor - Lichfields (Esh Developments Ltd) (ID1131182)
 EX11.007(b) - James Taylor - Lichfields (Esh Developments Ltd) (ID1131182)
 EX11.008 - Richard Swann - Barton Willmore (Persimmon Homes) (ID1129305)
 EX11.009 - James Reid - Hedley Planning (Miller Homes) (ID497082)
 EX11.010 - Robin Wood - R&K Wood Planning (Mr C S Ford) (ID1170835)

Participants

Sunderland City Council

Name	Company	Representing	ID Number
Chris Smith Neil Westwick Steve Willcock	Lichfields	Taylor Wimpey	1120527
Chris Smith Neil Westwick Katie Rumble	Lichfields	Hellens	1169009
Andrew Moss	Ward Hadaway	Mr Delaney	1036112
Robin Wood	R & K Wood Planning LLP	Mr C S Ford	1170835
Richard Swann	Barton Willmore	Persimmon Homes	1129305
Jonathan Wallace	Lichfields	Esh Developments Ltd	1131182
Gillan Gibson		CPRE (NE)	1175874
Chris Pipe	Planning House	Ms Taylor & Ms McClelland	1139133
Stephen Litherland	Hedley Planning	Miller Homes	497082
Mark Dodds	Lambert Smith Hampton	Harworth Group	1175935