



**Core Strategy Growth Options  
Consultation Responses Report  
July 2016**

## **1. Introduction/Background**

The Council is preparing a Local Plan to help guide how Sunderland develops between now and 2033. All local authorities are required by government to prepare a Local Plan.

A key part of the Local Plan is the Core Strategy and Development Plan (CSDP). The CSDP will set out an overarching strategy for future change and growth in the City and include detailed development management policies. It is a strategic Plan which covers the period 2015 to 2033. The CSDP will cover the whole of the area within Sunderland's administrative boundaries. The CSDP will, once it is adopted, become part of the City's statutory planning framework guiding decisions on all development and regeneration activity over the period to 2033. The CSDP will replace some of the saved policies of the Sunderland Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 1998 and UDP Alteration No. 2 (2007) which covers the Central Sunderland Area.

Although work on the plan commenced as early as 2005, and consultation responses from these earlier stages have been taken into consideration when preparing this plan, it was decided to rebase the plan with a start date of 2015, to take account of the passage of time, updated evidence and changes to Government guidance.

At every stage the Council, in accordance with its Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), has undertaken extensive consultation to enable people to have their say. Consulting and engaging with local communities has been a long established and important part of the planning process with opportunities provided to make representations in the development plan system and the decision making process. The National Planning Policy Framework's emphasis on the plan led decision making system (whereby planning applications which are in accordance with the development plan should be approved without delay unless there are good reasons for not doing so), means that it is very important that there is effective and widespread involvement of communities in the making of planning policy and drafting of development plans.

As part of the review we need to consider options for how growth in Sunderland could take place. The purpose of the consultation is to gather views on the options so that the Council can determine which option is the best for Sunderland and the people who live and work in the City so it can be built into the future plan.

Between the 18<sup>th</sup> May 2016 and the 1<sup>st</sup> July 2016 the Council consulted on three growth options for the City. Low, medium and high growth options were proposed and what this would entail for development in the City in terms of housing, transport, the environment, sustainable communities and the economy

and employment was outlined in detail so that people could make an informed decision.

## 2. Purpose of this Report

The requirements for community involvement in the production of planning policy documents are set out in the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The regulations identify those stages of plan production where consultation is required;

- **Preparation** of a Local Plan (Regulation 18);
- **Publication** of a Local Plan (Regulations 19 & 20); and
- **Submission** of a Local Plan to the Secretary of State (Regulation 22).

The CSDP is at the preparation stage and Regulation 18 states that a Local Planning Authority must

- a) Notify each of the bodies or persons they consider appropriate of the subject of a local plan which the authority propose to prepare, and
- b) Invite each of them to make representations to the authority about what a local plan with that subject ought to contain.

The authority must then take into account any representations made to them when preparing their Local Plan.

The Council must also be in accordance with its Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) (February 2015) which sets out how the Council will engage with local communities and stakeholders in the preparation of development plan documents. The SCI then goes on to set out who will be consulted and how.

The purpose of this report is to set out where, when and how the information was made available, how comments could be made and outlines the comments that were received.

Between the 18<sup>th</sup> May 2016 and 1<sup>st</sup> July 2016 all of the evidence documents listed in section 3 of this report were made available to the public to view online and in local libraries across the City and at the Civic Centre. The main forms of communication were leaflets, press releases and adverts, drop in events, displays, online, social media, posters, communications through area officers, pop up banners, the Hub and Hub Carousel and verbal presentations. People were encouraged to leave their comments on line or they could make their views known in writing via email or letter.

### 3. Consultation on the Growth Options

The purpose of this consultation was to consult on the growth options and the following evidence documents:

- A Strategic Housing Market Assessment, which provides a detailed overview of the future housing needs of Sunderland;
- An Employment Land Review, which looks into expected employment growth in the City;
- A Demographic Analysis, which provides forecasts for Sunderland’s population and household changes;
- A Strategic Land Review, which details and assesses all potential development sites in the City;
- A Green Belt Review, which looks at the role of the Green Belt and examines whether any parts could be amended; and
- An updated Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

#### The Proposed Growth Options

The documents listed above have informed the development of three growth options for the City which are detailed in the table below.

**Table 1: Proposed Growth Options**

	<b>Low Growth</b>	<b>Medium Growth</b>	<b>High Growth</b>
	<p>The low growth option is broadly based on current predictions from Central Government about population growth. This will see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A declining working age population in the City.</li> <li>• Likely to see declining public services such as schools</li> <li>• Could further reduce shopping activity in the city centre and local centres</li> <li>• Limited choices in new housing.</li> </ul>	<p>This option is based on the Objectively Assessed Need for the City and would see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved growth that could help to maintain existing services</li> <li>• An increase in overall population</li> <li>• Decrease out migration</li> <li>• Increase the working age population</li> <li>• Greater choice in housing types</li> <li>• Economic benefits as more people choose to live in Sunderland</li> <li>• A moderate increase of commuting to</li> </ul>	<p>This option would see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The biggest increase in housing numbers and choice including type and tenure</li> <li>• Significant decrease out migration</li> <li>• A growing population.</li> <li>• Increase in working age population</li> <li>• Increased population will help support vibrant town and local centres.</li> <li>• Could result in additional schools being needed due to increasing pressure from the higher population.</li> <li>• High growth would</li> </ul>

		meet the expected jobs growth	see an increase in traffic and congestion however this would be offset by the reduction in in-commuting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased risk to landscape character as land would need to be released from Settlement Breaks and Green Belt.</li> </ul>
<b>Housing</b>	Construction of around 515 new homes a year across the city. This would give a limited choice in the housing types needed to meet the needs of a resident workforce. It would not meet the Objectively Assessed Need for housing.	Construction of around 820 new homes each year across the city, with more choice in types of housing encouraging fewer people to leave Sunderland.	Construction of around 1,055 new homes each year across the city with significant improvement in the choice of housing types and tenures.
<b>Economy and Employment</b>	Likely decline of almost 10,000 in the working age population by 2033. Economic growth in the City could be harmed through a lack of local workforce to fill potential new jobs. This will have an adverse impact on investment and the planned economic growth for Sunderland.	An increase of around 2,000 in the working age population of the City. Some improvement in access to local employment, with jobs across all skill levels.	An increase of around 7,000 in the working age population. Improved access to local employment, with more jobs across all skill levels.
<b>Sustainable Communities</b>	The continued decrease in the working age population and in the number of	A modest increase in the population of the city. The higher working age population supports	Increased resident population will help support vibrant town and local centres. There may also be

	children means that there may be a need to close some services as demand reduces. In parallel there will be an increase in the proportion of residents who are over 70, placing greater pressures on healthcare provision.	economic growth, protects local services such as schools and maintains demand for shops and services in local centres and the city centre.	other benefits for communities through funding of services through Section 106 money and potentially CIL. Could result in additional schools being needed due to increasing pressure from the higher population.
<b>Transport</b>	Would not provide all the homes needed for a local resident labour force. High levels of commuting would still occur, having the significant impact on transport infrastructure across the city.	The limited increase in the working age population means that commuting into Sunderland will continue to increase.	High growth would see an increase in traffic and congestion across the city. To an extent this would be offset by the reduction in in-commuting.
<b>Environment</b>	Development would on currently identified 'brown field' and 'green field' sites. No additional areas of greenfield land will be required.	Likely that additional greenfield sites and land in Settlement Breaks will be required. Option could potentially accommodate growth but does not provide for flexibility in the land supply in the long term, so some Green Belt land could be required.	Increased risk to landscape character as significant land would need to be released from Settlement Breaks and Green Belt.
<b>Assumptions</b>	Based on ONS published Sub National Population Projections (2012) adjusted to take account of migration rates for the last 5 years. This is higher than using the main projections, as there	Uses ONS published SNPP (2012) as the baseline and makes adjustments to this to take account of jobs growth in the city (as predicted under Experian jobs growth forecast). This scenario assumes	Uses ONS published SNPP (2012) as the baseline and makes adjustments to this to take account of jobs growth in the city (as predicted under Experian jobs growth forecast). This scenario assumes unemployment falling

	<p>have been reductions in the levels of outmigration in recent years.</p>	<p>unemployment falling to 6.5% by 2020 and remaining static thereafter and commuting rate continuing to fall in line with recent trends (i.e. more people will commute to the city for work). There are also adjustments to participation rates for older workers and females consistent with OBR projections.</p>	<p>to 6.5% by 2020 and a fixed commuting rate. There are also adjustments to participation rates for older workers and females consistent with OBR projections.</p>
--	--	---	---

The key difference between the med and high scenarios is that medium growth relies on some extra in-commuting to fill some of the jobs (as well as increasing population to fill the rest), whereas the high growth seeks to build enough houses so that the vast majority of new workers live in Sunderland.



## **4. Engagement/Consultation**

The SCI states that the Council will strive to achieve maximum coverage, inclusiveness and accessibility balanced against resource and time constraints. The minimum requirements for public involvement are set out in the 2012 Local Planning Regulations. As a minimum the Council must notify by letter or email, the specific and general consultation bodies at all stages of the process.

The following section sets out who, how and when the consultation on the Growth Options was carried out and it is considered to go above and beyond the requirements of the 2102 Local Planning Regulations.

### **When Did the Consultation Take Place**

The consultation lasted for over six weeks in total. The period began on the 18<sup>th</sup> May 2016 and the public and local stakeholders were asked to give their views/comments by the 1<sup>st</sup> July 2016.

### **Who was Consulted**

The consultation was open to all Sunderland residents, businesses and stakeholders. All comments that have been received will be considered in the next round of the plan making process.

Due to the recent reduction in resources available it was considered uneconomical to write to every household and business in the City and that other methods were available to inform people that consultation was taking place. However a letter or email was sent to all statutory consultees, general consultation bodies and anybody who has expressed an interest previously in the Local Plan.

Appendix A is a copy of the letter/email that was sent. In total 940 letters and emails were sent (719 letters and 221 emails). Appendix B is a spreadsheet of these contacts and the statutory consultees have been highlighted in yellow.

### **How was the Consultation Carried Out**

During the consultation period the background evidence was available at all of the Council run libraries across the City and at the Civic Centre, as well as boxes where people can leave their comments.

The main forms of communication were:

- Leaflets (copy available in Appendix C) were made available in local libraries, customer service centres and the Civic Centre;
- Press releases and adverts (Appendix D);
- Drop in events (which were detailed in the leaflets, press releases etc);
- Displays
- Online (<http://www.sunderland.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=8476>);
- Social media;
- Posters (appendix E);
- Area Officers;
- Pop up banner:
- The Hub and Hub Carousel;
- Verbal Presentations at various group meetings; and
- Member briefings.

### **Leaflets**

Copies of the leaflets (Appendix C) were made available at local libraries, customer service centres, children's centres, doctor's surgeries and the Civic Centre. They were also given to Area Officers to hand out to the groups they work with. They outlined the purpose of the consultation and some of the issues facing Sunderland, the growth options and how the City has been split into 5 different areas and what their characteristics are. It then went on to explain where people could find more information, where and when they could come and speak to planning officers if they had any questions and what happens next. It also included a short questionnaire mainly asking which growth option they preferred and where they thought development should go.

### **Press Releases and Adverts**

Advertisements were published which detailed the drop in events and where people could find further information on the Growth Options. They were published in the Sunderland Echo as it has the greatest readership in the City.

Press releases were made on the 20<sup>th</sup> May (picked up by Sun FM online), 9<sup>th</sup> June (picked up and published by the Sunderland Echo) and the 28<sup>th</sup> June (not aware of this being published).

Copies are available in Appendix D.

### **Drop in Events**

A total of 23 drop in events were held throughout the City, mainly within the Council run libraries. Table 2 below illustrates when and where the drop ins took place, the number of people that officers spoke to and approximately how many leaflets were handed out.

**Table 2: Details of Drop In Events**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Venue</b>	<b>Number of Consultees</b>	<b>Number of Leaflets Distributed</b>
21/05/16	City Library	15	15
23/05/16	Houghton Library	10	10
	Bunnyhill Centre	3	6
24/05/16	Kayll Road Library	3	1
	Ryhope Library	3	8
25/05/16	Washington Library	3	3
	Fulwell Library	0	6
26/05/16	Sandhill Centre	1	3
	Shiney Row Library	0	2
27/05/16	Hetton Library	1	20
	Washington Millennium Centre	2	2
06/06/16	City Library	10	8
	Washington Millennium Centre	2	2
07/06/16	Shiney Row Library	3	6
	Ryhope Library	2	2
08/06/16	Hetton Library	1	1
	Sandhill Centre	0	0
09/06/16	Bunnyhill Library	0	0
	Wearside Health and Racquets Club	12	30
10/06/16	Kayll Road Library	1	1
	Fulwell Library	2	2
11/06/16	Houghton Library	10	30
	Washington Library	8	8

**Displays**

During the consultation period copies of the leaflets and supporting evidence were left on display in the local libraries and at the Civic Centre. The purpose of this was to enable interested parties to view paper copies of the material. Boxes were also available for parties to leave any comments they might have.

**Online/Social Media**

Throughout the entire consultation period a link (<http://www.sunderland.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=8476>) to the page outlining the Growth Options Consultation was made available on the homepage of the Council's website. The webpage gave a brief outline of the options, provided links through to the evidence that supports the options, gave details on how people can submit their comments and provides a link where people can do this online.

Links through to this page were also been posted regularly on Facebook and Twitter. Table 3 and 4 below demonstrates the number of people who engaged via social media. Although nobody made any comments regarding the Growth Options it does illustrate the number of people who would have seen the link to the webpage

**Table 3: FaceBook Engagement**

Post Date	People Reached	Number of Likes	Number of Share
26/5/16	1791	3	4
27/5/16	65		
8/6/15	234		1
9/6/16	834	2	
9/6/16	31		
10/6/16	39		
11/6/16	60		
30/6/16	114		

**Table 4: Twitter Engagement**

Tweet Dated	Number of Likes	Number of Retweets
26/5/16	1	3
27/5/16	0	0
8/6/16	4	4
9/6/16	0	1
10/6/16	2	1
11/6/16	1	3
30/6/16	1	5
1/7/16	6	5

### **Posters**

A3 posters advertising the drop in events and directing people to the website were displayed in a number of different venues, including libraries, customer service centres and doctors surgeries. A copy is included in Appendix E. They were also given to the Area Officers to display where they thought was appropriate.

### **Area Officers**

As mentioned above the Area Officers were given copies of the leaflets and A3 posters to distribute amongst their networks. The Area Officer also draft and e-bulletin/email to distributed amongst their networks and they were requested to include details of the consultation with them. In total there are 5 Area Officers each with a network of between 100 – 200 contacts. Therefore this bulletin has potentially been forwarded to between 500 and 1,000 contacts.

## **Pop up Banner**

A pop up banner appears when Sunderland City Council colleagues log on to the ICT network. During the consultation period the banner has directed colleagues to the Growth Options webpage.

## **The Hub and Hub Carousel**

The Hub is the intranet site for Sunderland City Council employees. The homepage of Internet Explorer is also the Hub and a link to the Growth Options webpage has been displayed on the carousel of the Hub during the consultation period.

## **Verbal Presentations to Various Group Meetings**

Officers have attended a number of meetings to provide further information and answer as many questions as possible. These meetings included:

- The Wear Catchment Partnership on Friday 20<sup>th</sup> May at Rainton Meadows.
- The Springwell Residents Committee on the 31<sup>st</sup> May at Springwell Methodist Church.
- The Sunderland Youth Inspectors Group on the 23<sup>rd</sup> June at the Civic Centre.
- Sunderland's Youth Parliament on the 29<sup>th</sup> June at the Civic Centre.

## **Members Briefings, Updates and Emails**

Briefing sessions were held with members before the consultation period began which outlined the purpose of the Local Plan and the Core Strategy, why we need growth options and what they are, gave an explanation of the key evidence, how the consultation was going to be delivered and what the next steps are. A total of 34 members attended three briefing sessions.

## 5. Responses Received

Consultees were given a number of different ways of submitting their comments on the Growth Options. They could use:

- The comments form attached to the back of the leaflet which could be posted into the boxes left at the libraries, customer service centres and the Civic Centre or to the address on the leaflet;
- The electronic version of the comments form that was available online via objective
- Email their comments to the address on the leaflet, [planningpolicy@sunderland.gov.uk](mailto:planningpolicy@sunderland.gov.uk); or
- Write to the address on the leaflet with more detailed comments.

All of the responses received to this consultation have been considered and will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy. A summary of the number of consultees by submission type is identified in Table 5.

**Table 5: Number of consultees by submission type**

Submission type	Number of consultees	Percentage of consultees
Objective	89	43%
Leaflets	47	22%
E-mails	72	35%
<b>Total</b>	<b>208</b>	<b>100%</b>

Objective was the preferred method of consultation by consultees, yielding 43% of responses.

**Q1: Of the three Growth Options proposed which one do you think is the most appropriate for the city and should be taken forward in the Core Strategy?**

**Table 6: Summary of responses to the three growth options presented in Q1**

Submission type <sup>1</sup>	Low Growth	Low to Medium Growth	Medium Growth	Medium to High Growth	High Growth	No response/no preference
Objective	7	0	9	0	66	7
Leaflets	13	1	13	0	10	10
E-mails	8	0	2	1	26	35
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>52</b>

<sup>1</sup> Figures provide an indicative summary of the number of responses received through each consultation method. A cross checking exercise has been carried out to ensure that the figures represented in the table do not duplicate responses that may have been received through more than one submission method.

The orange highlighted columns of low, medium and high growth options were the choices available within the consultation documentation. Some consultees felt that an intermediate option between the three choices was more appropriate and as such, low to medium and medium to high options have also been presented in Table 6 above.

*Developer and parties with land interests:* Developers and parties with land interests expressed preference for the higher growth option in order to reduce the level of in-commuting and provide a more sustainable option for the growth of Sunderland in line with its economic aspirations. Bellway, Persimmon, Story, ESH, BDW, Taylor Wimpey and Hellens made submissions. The House Builders Federation (HBF) also supported the high growth option.

*Neighbouring Local Authorities:* Gateshead MBC and Newcastle CC implied that the lower growth option would be more acceptable. Both council's along with South Tyneside MBC raise concerns regarding the population, which neighbouring local authority areas it would come from and what impact this would have upon them and their adopted or emerging strategies. Duty to Cooperate meetings with neighbouring authorities will be arranged at the earliest opportunity to discuss these issues further and resolve issues where possible.

*Statutory Stakeholders:* Statutory stakeholders have reserved the right to make further comment until more detail is released in the publication plan and the impact of site specific considerations can be considered fully. All stakeholders welcomed further and continued dialogue. Historic England, Environment Agency, Northumbrian Water, Highways England, Coal Authority, Natural England and National Grid responded to the consultation.

*Public and local groups:* The majority of residents and local groups supported the medium to high growth option. Where support for no development or low growth options were expressed, matters of capacity of existing infrastructure and erosion of the Green Belt and its purposes were raised as concerns.

The number of no responses/no preferences is bolstered by a significant number of consultees who wished only to make comments in relation to specific supporting reports such as the Green Belt Report, Strategic Land Review or SHLAA. Most developers and parties with land interests made detailed comments on these reports. The Spatial Policy team will be required to sift through these responses; in particular, detailed consideration is required for SHLAA site submissions, which may warrant changes to SHLAA site assessments and the overall number of suitable housing sites that can be drawn upon when determining if there is a sufficient supply of sites against to deliver the chosen growth option. The outcome of the supply of sites will then need to be considered in the context of the conclusions within the Green Belt report and the Strategic Land Review and the comments submitted

through the consultation, to determine if land is required to be released from the Green Belt and where.

**Q2: Are there any other options that you think should be considered?**

A summary of the alternative growth option approaches emerging from the consultation are as follows:

1. A higher growth option should be presented that reflects the economic aspirations of the SEP and IAMP to deliver a step change in housing over and above the High Growth Option.
2. Provision for flexibility within the preferred growth option to move from one to the other (higher and lower), allowing compensation for economic uncertainty from impending Brexit and the cyclical nature of the housing market.
3. Housing growth should be focused on brownfield land as a priority within the chosen growth option to facilitate city renewal and reduce the need to release land from the Green Belt (existing brownfield clearance sites and bringing empty homes back into use);
4. Medium and High Growth Options should reflect the requirement for wider connectivity to the region, including a Metro link to the wider area of Sunderland and further afield to Durham.

**Q3: As set out previously, the 2013 draft Core Strategy divides into the 5 sub-areas and proposed a different approach to how each of these areas might be developed over the next 20 years.**

**Do you think that these approaches are still appropriate and should be used as a basis for the next version of the Core Strategy?**

**Table 7: Summary of responses to Q3**

<b>Submission type</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No response</b>
Objective	22	14	53
Leaflets	16	25	6
E-mails	17	12	30
<b>Totals</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>89</b>

In general, responses correspond to land interests, development opportunities and areas of Green Belt pressure and follow no set pattern. In general, residents prefer the focus for development to be on urban brownfield land rather than greenfield land.

**Q4: If No, do you think different approaches should be used? What proportion of land development do you think should be used in each sub-area? More/less**



## **for housing? More/less for employment? What are your views on the location of new retailing?**

Overall, no new alternative approaches were suggested in regard to the apportionment of development to the sub-areas. Instead, consultees raised specific issues with the evidence base and methodology used to justify the approach to development distribution, some of which will require further consideration when considering spatial distribution to sub-areas in the context of the preferred Growth Option for Sunderland.

Appendix F is a record of all the responses that were received via the libraries, Objective, Post and via Email. All of the comments received have been summarised and a response given. Some responses are more detailed than others but this is dependent on the comment that was made. Below is a summary of the main views submitted by sub-area location and feedback received to the growth proposals for housing, employment and retail.

### Central

- Sunderland University would like to see Central sub-area expanded to include adjacent land areas within its boundary.
- Concern regarding development proposals in relation to Habitats Regulations Assessment.
- A number of responses would like to see retail development focused in the City Centre.

### Sunderland South

- General support for the level of housing proposed in the Sunderland South sub-area, although developers and those with land interests in the area supported more housing in this location. Story Homes/ Persimmon/ Taylor Wimpey / Bellway / HCA all wish to see development of South Sunderland Growth Area (SSGA).
- Resident objection to scale of SSGA development and absence of phased land release proposals.
- Suggestion that Sunderland North and South sub-areas should be considered as one, with development (housing and employment) being located in the north where possible to make use of new infrastructure (new bridge) and improved connectivity.
- Concern regarding development proposals in relation to Habitats Regulations Assessment.
- Developer proposals for Green Belt incursion at Hastings Hill / Middle Herrington
- Sunderland County Council Ecologists have raised concerns regarding the cumulative effect of multiple development sites within corridors and the damage this could cause to green infrastructure and protected species and sites. Ecologists have expressed concern regarding any proposals for development around Hastings Hill SSSI and Middle Herrington Green Belt, and Green Belt to the south of Sunderland.

## Sunderland North

- Member concern that additional development will have a negative impact on congestion, highway safety and environmental infrastructure in Sunderland North sub-area.
- Concerns raised regarding development growth in the sub-area in relation to Habitats Regulations Assessment.
- Concern expressed by Sunderland South Tyneside Ecologists regarding development proposals at Seaburn and around Fulwell Quarries SSSI.

## Washington

- Consultation responses identified a disconnect between the sub-area's spatial strategy identified in the 2013 draft Core Strategy and the evidence base assessment of the Washington sub-area which presents a sustainable location for growth. Propose that the spatial strategy be changed to accommodate more housing in Washington sub-area.
- Developer support for Washington sub-area to accommodate higher housing growth to complement Nissan growth, IAMP proposals and capture the economic growth potential of the SEP. Notably support is offered by those developers with land interests in Washington sub-area.
- Developers support and promote the release of Green Belt sites around the periphery of Washington (north Washington and North of Nissan) and Springwell Village, as sustainable locations for housing growth with good connectivity and access to a range of infrastructure support services.
- Developers concerned that the Green belt boundary is drawn too tightly around the settlement, while Springwell Village residents oppose Green Belt release for housing around the village and support low growth.
- Gateshead MBC has raised concerns in relation to medium and high housing growth options; in particular, development in the Green Belt at Springwell Village would threaten coalescence with settlements in their GMBC area.
- Sunderland City Council Ecologists have raised concerns regarding the cumulative effect of multiple development sites within corridors and the damage this could cause to green infrastructure and protected species and sites. Ecologists have requested that development of greenfield sites be avoided around Springfield Village, north of Washington and north of Nissan due to its ecological sensitivity.
- Support for employment role of Washington, the IAMP proposals and Nissan role.

## Coalfield

- Member and resident concern expressed that existing highways infrastructure cannot support additional growth in the sub-area over the plan period, with existing development exacerbating the current highway infrastructure.

- Resident concerns regarding impact of development on environmental infrastructure, loss of green space and impact of flood plains.
- Developers with land interests in the Coalfields sub-area support the spatial distribution of housing to this sub-area and would be reluctant for it to change.
- The Wear Catchment Plan (and Environment Agency) identified that the Core Strategy should reflect the emerging results from the surface and groundwater studies (UK Topsoil Project) surrounding the Lumley Park Burn in Coalfield area.
- Sunderland City Council Ecologists have raised concerns regarding the cumulative effect of multiple development sites within corridors and the damage this could cause to green infrastructure and protected species and sites. Ecologists have requested that development should not come forward in the major green infrastructure corridor to the East of Houghton and Hetton, and other main corridors, plus greenfield sites close to SSSI's.

During the drop in events a number of points were made verbally to officers, which were noted afterwards. Appendix G provides more detail of these comments and where they were made but the following provides some overview:

- Impact of development on the environment/ water quality/green spaces/Green Belt
- Interest in ELR sites
- Querying the validity of the demographic modelling
- Query whether the central route is still progressing
- The Coalfields is no longer seen as a priority
- Need jobs growth
- SSTC and the new wear crossing
- Need to improve the City Centre
- Comments on IAMP
- Concern over the volume of housing proposed in particular areas
- Impact on the road network
- Impact on local schools
- Interest in new housing sites

## 6. Conclusions

In total 208 responses were received and 331 comments have been drawn from them. A summary of all the comments that have been made are set out in Appendix F with a response.

Almost half (43%) of the responses were made via objection and again almost half (102) of the responses support the higher growth option that was proposed. It must be noted however that there is no correlation between the two.

The main conclusions to be drawn from the consultation include:

- The comments vary in their detail with many developers and landowners providing quite a lot of detail and justification as to why their sites should be considered for development and why they support the growth option that they have, the majority of which support the higher growth option.
- The medium to high growth option was supported mainly by residents and local groups.
- The low growth option was mainly supported by neighbouring Local Authorities who are concerned over where the growth in population would come from. It has been agreed that this will be discussed further in future Duty to Co-operate meetings.
- Others groups/individuals that support the low growth option expressed concern over the impact higher rates of development would have on existing infrastructure and facilities and the erosion of the Green Belt.
- The Statutory Stakeholders reserved the right to make further comments until more detail is available in the publication plan. Others would had no preference over the level of growth tended to make specific comments on an individual document in the evidence base, e.g. the SHLAA or the SLR.
- Of those who responded to question 3 regarding the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy, 51 did not think that it was still appropriate while 53 did (almost 50:50 split)
- A desire to see more development in the City Centre that would make it a more attractive place for young professionals to live and work.
- Both support and objection to residential development in South Sunderland and concern over the impact it would have on ecology in the area.
- Concern in North Sunderland over the impact that development will have on the existing highways and ecology in the area.
- Both support and objection to further development in Washington. There is generally support from developers to allow more housing in Washington than was set out in the 2013 draft of the Core Strategy and that the development of IAMP should be complemented with higher housing

growth. However residents of Springwell and Gateshead MBC are opposed to Green Belt release for housing around the village.

- Concern over the amount of development that has taken place in the Coalfields recently and the pressure it has put on the road network, the impact on environmental infrastructure, flooding and loss of greenspace.

## **7. What Happens Next**

All of the comments that have been received will be considered and used along with an up to date evidence base to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.

The Publication Draft of the Core Strategy will go before the Council's Cabinet in April 2017 and if approved will be presented to the public and local stakeholders in May 2017 for statutory consultation.

The statutory consultation period will last for 6 weeks as set out in the Town and Country Planning Regulation 2012. All of the Statutory Bodies will be consulted directly as well as those from have previously expressed an interest in the Local Plan and any other general bodies that the Council consider appropriate. A number of events will be held to inform people further of the document and enable them to ask any questions they may have. Once the details have been finalised they will be publicised further. The document and the supporting evidence will be made available at the Council's offices and in local libraries and customer service centres as well as online. If anybody should require an individual copy of the documents then they can be provided but at a reasonable cost.

## **Appendix A – Direct Mailing**

**Commercial Development**

Planning and Regeneration

Civic Centre

Burdon Road

Sunderland

Date: 17 May 2016  
Our ref: CS/GO  
Your ref:

**SUNDERLAND LOCAL PLAN: CORE STRATEGY GROWTH OPTIONS  
CONSULTATION**

I am writing to inform you that consultation on the Sunderland Local Plan: Core Strategy Growth Options is taking place between 19 May and 1 July 2016.

Sunderland City Council is in the process of preparing a new Local Plan to help guide how Sunderland develops between now and 2033.

A key part of the Local Plan is the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy sets out the direction for planning in the city including the number of new homes needed, where offices and factories could be built and what new roads and other infrastructure will be needed to support development.

The last draft of the Core Strategy was produced in 2013. Since then, new developments have taken place in the city and new opportunities have arisen, such as the emerging proposal to develop an International Advanced Manufacturing Park near the current Nissan factory. These changes mean that we need to review and update the Core Strategy. New evidence on the city's population and economy has been prepared to support this review.

As part of this review, we need to consider options for how growth in Sunderland

Delivering services for a better future



could take place. The City Council needs to know which option is best for Sunderland and the people who live and work here so it can be built into our future plan. The council is therefore seeking your views on three different growth options.

Details of the Local Plan Growth Options can be viewed online on the council's website at [www.sunderland.gov.uk/growthoptions](http://www.sunderland.gov.uk/growthoptions) or at the Civic Centre, Burdon Road, Sunderland, Monday to Thursday from 8.30am till 5.15pm, and on a Friday from 8.30am till 4.45pm. Copies of the documents will also be available to view in all of the council's libraries.

In addition to details of the growth options themselves, the Sustainability Appraisal, Habitats Regulations Screening Assessment and the other background evidence papers which have been used to inform the growth options will be made available on the council's website. Copies of these will also be made available to view at the Civic Centre and all libraries during the consultation.

The council will also be holding a number of drop-in events, where Policy Officers will be available to answer any questions that you may have on the growth options, or any other aspect of the Local Plan. The schedule of consultation events is as follows:

<b>Date</b>	<b>Venue</b>	<b>Time</b>
Saturday 21 May	City Library, Fawcett Street, SR1 1RE	10am – 12.30pm
Monday 23 May	Houghton Library, Newbottle Street, DH4 4AF	10am – 12pm
	Bunnyhill Centre, Hylton Lane, SR5 4B	3.30pm – 6.30pm
Tuesday 24 May	Kayll Road Library, SR4 7TW	10am – 1pm
	Ryhope Library, Black Road, SR2 0RX	2pm – 5pm
Wednesday 25 May	Washington Library, The Galleries, NE38 7RZ	10am – 1.30pm
	Fulwell Library, Dene Lane, SR6 8EH	4.30pm – 6.30pm
Thursday 26 May	Sandhill Centre, Grindon Lane, SR3 4EN	10am – 1pm
	Shiney Row Library, Chester Road, DH4 4RB	2pm – 4pm
Friday 27 May	Hetton Centre Library, Welfare Road, DH5 9NE	10am – 12pm
	Washington Millennium Centre,	2pm – 5pm

	Concord, NE37 2QD	
Monday 6 June	City Library, Fawcett Street, SR1 1RE	10am – 2pm
	Washington Millennium Centre, Concord, NE37 2QD	3.30pm – 6pm
Tuesday 7 June	Shiney Row Library, Chester Road, DH4 4RB	10am – 12pm
	Ryhope Library, Black Road, SR2 0RX	2pm – 4pm
Wednesday 8 June	Hetton Centre Library, Welfare Road, DH5 9NE	10am – 1pm
	Sandhill Centre, Grindon Lane, SR3 4EN	2pm – 5pm
Thursday 9 June	Bunnyhill Centre, Hylton Lane, SR5 4BW	10am – 12pm
	Wearside Health & Racquets Club, Camberwell Way, Doxford Park, SR3 3XN	3pm – 7pm
Friday 10 June	Kayll Road Library, SR4 7TW	11am – 1pm
	Fulwell Library, Dene Lane, SR6 8EH	3pm – 5pm
Saturday 11 June	Houghton Library, Newbottle Street, DH4 4AF	10am – 12pm
	Washington Library, The Galleries, NE38 7RZ	1pm – 3pm

Comments can be made online via the council's online consultation portal, which can be accessed at [www.sunderland.gov.uk/growthoptions](http://www.sunderland.gov.uk/growthoptions).

Alternatively you can submit your comments by email to [planningpolicy@sunderland.gov.uk](mailto:planningpolicy@sunderland.gov.uk) or in writing to Planning Policy Room 3.94, Civic Centre, Sunderland, SR2 7DN.

All comments must be received **no later than 5.00pm on 1 July 2016**.

Following this consultation exercise, any comments received will be taken into consideration when preparing the publication version of the Core Strategy.

If you have any queries regarding the growth options consultation, or any other aspect of the Sunderland Local Plan, please do not hesitate to contact Gary Clasper on (0191) 561 1537.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'I. Fairlamb', written in a cursive style.

Iain Fairlamb  
Head of Planning and Regeneration

## **Appendix B – Contacts**

## Postal Contacts

Title	First name	Surname	Organisation Details
	A M	Amour	
	A M	Hutton	Smiths Gore
	A	Pickering	
	Amanda	Sutherland	Pittington Parish Council
	Andrea	King	South Tyneside Spatial Planning
Mr	Andrew	Hutton	Smiths Gore
Mr	Andy	Leas	Partnership Officer Durham Biodiversity Partnership
	Anee	Ramshaw	Community Access Point
	Angela	Doige	Shiney Advice And Resource Project
	Anita	Lord	Wearside Women In Need
	Anna	Steanson	
	Anne	Ambrose	North Welfare Rights Service
	Anne	Storey	Disability Support Group North East
	B	Palmer	Silksworth Community Centre
	B	Tate	
	B	Tate	
Mr	Balal	Ali	
	Brenda	Browell	Farringdon Residents Association
	C	Herbert	British Geological Survey
Captain	Eddie	Arnold	Millfield CORPS Salvation Army
Captain	John	Murray	Aged Merchant Seamans Homes
	Charlotte	Howse	Northern Housing Consortium Ltd
Mr	Chris	Francis	Wildfowl And Wetlands Trust
	Christina	Ward	
	Clare	Turnbull	
	D	Fletcher	

Mr	D	McKinnon	MODIS
	D	Wilkinson	
	Delice	Thompson	
	Denise	Hannan	
	Denise	Wilson	Springboard Sunderland Trust
	Doreen	Buckingham	Pallion Action Group
Dr	Hugh	Newell	John Stelling
	Elaine	Davidson	
	Emma	Bond	Haslam Homes NE
	Emma	Hulley	Sanderson Weatherall
Mr	Eric	Chaffe	Seaton With Slingley Parish Council
Father		Coyle	
	Fiona	Brettwood	HLP Design
			Frank Haslam Milan
	G	McIntyre	
	Gill	McDonough	Sunderland Council For Voluntary Service
	Gillian	Robertson	
	Helen	Suddick	Gentoo
	IC	Blue	
	Iris	Myers	
	JD	Cullen	
	J	Forster	
	J	Nelson	
	J	Pickering	
	J	Tate	
	J U	Byron	
	Jean	Hart	Riverside And Wearmouth Housing Association
	Jennifer	Morrison	Tyne and Wear Archaeology Officer
	Jenny	Ludman	Land Use Planning Advisor National Trust Yorkshire

			And North East
	Jill	Davis	Davis Planning Partnership
	Jill	McKnight	
Mr	Jim	Cokill	Durham Wildlife Trust
	Joan	Cuthbertson	
	Kay	Elder	
	L	Tuff	
	Laura	Ross	Stewart Ross Associates
	Lesley	Williams	
	Linda	Brewis	Hendon Young Peoples Project
	Linda	Ede	
	Linda	Parker	Social Enterprise Sunderland
	Lisa	Wild	
	Lisa	Bacon	Ashbrooke Residents Association (Treasurer)
	Louise	Oakley	
	Louise	Wilson	SRB6 Co-Ordinator
	Lynda	Peacock	Four Housing Group/Three Rivers Housing Association
	M	Duke	
Mr	M P	Sawicki	
	M	Simpson	
	M	Stephenson	
	Margaret	Haywood	
	Marie	Jasper	
	Marion	McGuinness	Banardos
	Mary	Lisle	
	Maxine	Warrener	
	Michelle	Quinn	Castletown Community Assosication
Miss	A	Godfrey	Wearside Gateway

Miss	Annabel	Logan	
Miss	Ellie	Land	
Miss	Olivia	Steanson	
Mr & Mrs		Tennant	
Mr	Adrian	Goodall	Rokeby Development Ltd
Mr	Adrian	Miller	Esh Developments
Mr	Alan	Hunter	Historic England
Mr	Alan	Patchett	Age UK Sunderland
Mr	Alan	Patrick	
Mr	Alexander	Logan	
Mr	Allen	Close	Kepier Almshouses
Mr	Allen	Creedy	Ethical Partnership
Mr and Mrs		Brown	Darwin Motors
Mr and Mrs		Ellis	
Mr and Mrs		Miles	
Mr	Andrew	Flamming	Barton Willmore
Mr	Barry	Garside	Clerk South Hetton Parish Council
Mr	Ben	Taylor	
Mr	Bert	Huntley	
Mr	Bill	Lisgo	Akendale Wharf Ltd
Mr	Bob	Price	
Mr	Brian	Teggert	
Mr	Brian	Wilkinson	
Mr	Bruce	Perrie	
Mr	Bryan	Attewell	Cycling Touring Club
Mr	C	Narrainen	
Mr	Charles	Embleton	
Mr	Charlie	Clapp	
Mr	Christian	Kerr	



Mr	Christopher	Watson	Glenrose Developments Ltd
Mr	D	Mulholland	
Mr	Dale	Royce Wood	
Mr	Damien	Holdstock	Entec UK Ltd
Mr	David	Armstrong	Two Castles Housing
Mr	David	Bridge	Sunderland Civic Society
Mr	David	Curtis	Sunderland Volunteer Bureau
Mr	David	Moore	
Mr	David	Tatters	
Mr	Dean	Huggins	Programme Manager Sunderland BME Network
Mr	Donald	Cholston	Rotary Club Of Bishopwearmouth
Mr	Donald	Glynn	
Mr		Dorner	
Mr	Edward	Flood	
Mr	Ernie	Thompson	Alzheimers Society
Mr	Frant	Hannan	
Mr	Fred	Burton	
Mr	G	Taylor	
Mr	Gavin	Davis	
Mr	Geoff	Britton	Akenside Development Company Ltd
Mr	Geroge	Martin	
Mr	Geroge	Nicholson	
Mr	Gordon	Taylor	
Mr	Graham	Scanlon	Frank Haslam Milan
Mr		Griffin	Bournmoor Parish Council
Mr	Ian	Grant	Gentoo
Mr	Ian	Porter	Gentoo
Mr	James	Crawley	Muse Developments
Mr	James	Donnison Fletcher	

Mr	James	Magree	
Mr	James	Midwood	
Mr	Jeff	Boyd	Cheviot Housing
Mr	Jim	Rafferty	Home Housing Association
Mr	Joe	Bonalie	
Mr	John	Colclough	
Mr	John	Cooper	
Mr	John	Driver	Taylor Wimpey
Mr	John	Barnham	North Regional Association For Sensory Support
Mr	John	Turnbull	
Mr	K	Lorraine	Enterprise 5
Mr	K	Robinson	
Mr	Keith	Lightly	Director for Business Administration The Salvation Army
Mr	Keith	Lorraine	Nomad E5 Housing Association Limited
Mr	Kenneth	Walton	
Mr	Kevin	O'Sullivan	
Mr	Lawrence	Cook	Sunderland People First
Mr	Luke	Raymond	
Mr	M	Perriam	
Mr	Marcus	Logan	
Mr	Mark	Brooker	Town Planner storeys:ssp
Mr	Mark	Davis	
Mr	Mark	Hannan	
Mr	Mark	Mann	Associate Director Savills LTP Limited
Mr	Mark	Steanson	
Mr	Martin	Tibbo	
Mr	Michael	Harney	Durham Estates
Mr	Michael	Jenkins	Bank Top Residents Association

Mr	Michael	Middlemiss	Riverside And Wearmouth Housing Association
Mr	Michael	Wales	
Mr	Mike	Brunning	Sound Waves
Mr	Neil	Latkin	
Mr	Neil	Milburn	Barratt Newcastle (BDW Trading)
Mr	Neil	Turnbull	Bellway Homes Ltd
Mr	Nick	Sandford	Regional Policy Officer The Woodland Trust
Mr	Paul	Bell	
Mr	Perry	Vincent	North Of England Refugee Service
Mr	Peter	Beal	
Mr	Peter	Jordan	Home Builders Federation
Mr	Peter	Jordan	Persimmon Homes Ltd
Mr	Peter	Ottowell	Three Rivers Housing Group
Mr	Peter	Smith	Lovell
Mr	Phil	James	Taylor Wimpey
Mr	Philip	Marsh	University Of Sunderland
Mr	R	Lee	
Mr	R	Hillier	
Mr	R	Chilton	
Mr	Ray	Gibson	North Star Housing Group
Mr	Raymond	Murphy	
Mr	Richard	Nichol	
Mr	Robert	Taylor	Plot Of Gold Ltd
Mr	Robin	Midson	
Mr	Roy	Chamberlain	Haig Homes
Mr	S	Oliver (MRICS)	
Mr	Steve	Carnaby	The Planning Inspectorate
Mr	Steve	Hopkirk	
Mr	Steve	Murray	Shepherd Homes Ltd

Mr	Steven	Willcocks	Taylor Wimpey
Mr	Stewart	Tagg	Tees Valley Trust Limited
Mr	Stuart	Logan	
Mr	Syed	Musaddique Ahmed	Hendon Islamic Society
Mr	T	McCartney	
Mr	Timothy	Evershed	Springwell Gospel Hall Trust
Mr	Tony	Compton	Sunderland Deaf Society Limited
Mr	Willian	Evans	
Mr	William James	Ward	
Mr	Willian	Leong	Housing 21
Mrs	A	George	
Mrs	Alison	Logan	
Mrs	Allison	Clarke	
Mrs	B	Taylor	
Mrs		Bulmer	The Fulwell Society
Mrs	Clare	Wood	
Mrs	D	McCartney	
Mrs	E	Irwin	
Mrs	Edna	Rochester	Pennywell Community Association
Mrs	Elizabeth	Oliver	
Mrs	Elizabeth	O'Sullivan	
Mrs	G	Kellett	Boundary CA
Mrs	Gladys	Nicholson	
Mrs	I	Maw	Southwick Youth And Community Association
Mrs	J	Chilton	
Mrs	J	Nichols	Columbia Community Association
Mrs	Jayne	Stearson	

Mrs	Kathleen	Burns	
Mrs	Kelly	Brooks	Customer Service Advisor Accent Foundation
Mrs	I	Amstrong	Murton Parish Council
Mrs	L	Mulholland	
Mrs	Louisa	Cusdin	Framptons
Mrs	Lynn	Wales	
Mrs	M	Corrigan	
Mrs	M	Dawson	
Mrs	M	Peel	
Mrs	M	Lewins	
Mrs	M	Robinson	
Mrs	Margaret	Copeland	
Mrs	Maria	Vipond	Anchor Trust
Mrs	Marion	Gibb	Redhouse And District Community Association
Mrs	Mavis	Perrie	
Mrs	Pauline	Cooper	
Mrs	Susie	Clark	We're Talking Homes (North East)
Mrs	Y	Embleton	
Mrs	Carole	Vorley	
Mrs	Diane	Nelson	
	Evelyn	Postlethwaite	
	Gillian	Walker	Jane Gibson Almshouses
	Janice	Simm	
	Jean	Taylor	
	K	Mayman	Little Lumley Parish Council
	Lyndsey	Johnson	
	Muriel	Plempers	
	NI	Foggin	
	Norah	Brown	Hylton Castle Residents Association

Mr	Nigel	Cunis	St. Modwen Developments Limited
	Nuala	Wright	World Heritage Site Candidate
	PJ	Cullen	
	PW	Cullen	
	Pamela	Tate	SHAPS
	Pat	Burn	Sunderland Federation Of Community Accociations
	Pat	Finnon	Executive Regional Officer St Vincent De Paul Society
	Paula	Telford	Kaleidoscope (NSPCC)
	Pauline	Yorke	Durham Aged Minerworkers Homes Association
	Penelope	Steanson	
	RC	Fraser	
	R	Hughes	
	RJ	Hepburn	
	R	Patterson	
	R	Ritzema	
	Rachel	Cooper	
Mr	Richard	Pow	The Forestry Commission
	Rita	Nelson	Chief Officer Relate North East
	Rose	Freeman	The Theatres Trust
	Rose	Thompson	City Centre Residents Association
	Ruth	Robinson	
	Sandra	Thompson	Signet
	Sarah	Gordon	
	Sheila	Moffatt	
	Sheila	Rackstraw	Farringdon Community Association
Mr	Steve	Breeds	
	Susan	Houghton	
	Susie	Blyth	
Mr	Terry	Tiffen	

	Tracey	Cole	Project Manager REACH Project
	Tracy	Collins	Shiney Row CA
			Action For Blind People
			Adamson Developments
			Bowey Homes
			Broseley Homes
			Chief Constable Durham Constabulary
			Chief Constable Northumbria Police HQ
			Church Commissioners For England
			Citizens Advice Bureau
			Clerk to the Council Hetton Town Council
			Co-ordinator East End Community Association
			Council For Voluntary Service- Sunderland
			DEFRA
			Department for Culture, Media and Sport
			Emperor Property Management
			Environment Planning Policy Team Durham County Council
			Equal Opportunities Commission
			Forestry Commission GB
			God TV
			Grange Developments
			Great North Forest
			Head of Development Services Northumbria Tourist Board
			Headlight
			Helios Properties Plc
			Help The Aged
			JWS Construction

			Lambton Community Association
			Mandale Properties Ltd
			Max Housing Ltd
			McCarthy And Stone Ltd
			McLean Homes LTD
			Mobile Operators Association
			N Power
			NE Premier Homes
			Network Rail
			North East Pensioners Association
			Pele Housing Association
			Primo Gladedale
			Princess Royal Trust- Sunderland
			Project Manager Action For Children
			R J Construction And Developments UK Ltd
			Railway Housing Association And Benefit Fund
			Rickleton Community Association
			Riverside Developments UK Ltd
			Roker Developments Ltd
			Salvation Army Housing Association
			Scope London Offices
			SHAW Support Services
			Sunderland Carers Centre
			Sunderland Maritime Heritage
			Sunderland Mosque
			Sungate
			The Bridge Project
			The Forestry Authority (Northumberland And Durham)
			The Secretary Grangetown Community Association



			Town Clerk Seaham Town Council
			Town End Farm Community Association
			TWRI
			W Dot Homes
	Wendy	Sockett	Colliers CRE
Mr	Denis	Robinson	NCH Independent Visitors
	A	Beresford	
	A	Clements	
	A	Coleclough	
	A	Dinning	
Miss	Amy	Fife	
	Amanda	Hauxwell	
Mr	Anthony	Leonard	
Mrs	A M	Bradford	
Mrs	A	Rennie	
	A	Stevens	
	A	Tiffen	
	A	Wombwell	
	A	Templeton	Chair Springwell Village Residents Association
Mrs	Ada	Carr	
Mrs	A E	McKeon	
Mr	Alan	Davies	Bett Homes Ltd
Mr	Alan	Foley	
Mr	Alex	Reynolds	
	Amy	Tyzack	
	Ava	Anderson	
Mr	George	Anderson	
	Andrea	Scollen	
	Angela	Hardy	

	Angela	Templeman	
	Ann	White	
	Anne	Rathbone-Wells	
	Audrey	Hall	
	Audrey	Miller	
Mrs	Barbara	Hope	
	B	Houghton	
	Betty	Senior	
	Beverley Anne	Gray	
Mr	Barry	Taylor	
Mrs	Brenda	Foote	
	C A	Flinn	
	Caroline	Anderson	
Mrs	Constance	Applegarth	
	C	Etheridge	
	C	Meek	
	C	Nelson	
	C	Williams	
	Caitlyn	Williams	
	Cally	Bannister	
	Carol	Lynn	
	Carolyn	Carr	
	Catherine	Parker	
Mr	Christopher	Bishop	
	C J	Walker	Sheddons View
Mr & Mrs	Craig	Falcus	
Mr	Craig	McGill	
	D	Flinn	

	D	Graham	
Mr	David	Horrigan	
	D	Meek	
	D	Nesbitt	
Mr	D	Rae	
Mrs	D	Routledge	
Mr & Mrs	D	Southern	
	D	Whitfield	
	D A	McKenna	
Mr	Dan	Banning	
Mr	David	Weir	
	Debbie	Craig	
	Denise	Gillott	
Mr	Dennis	Lambton	
	Dorothy	Coleclough	
	Donna	Bishop	
Mrs	Doreen	Smith	
Mrs	E	Fife	
	E	Graham	
Miss	E	Henderson	
	E	Pleasants	
	Eileen	Potts	
	E	Tweedy	
	E E	Morris	
Miss	Emma	Faulkner	
Mr	Eric	Oliver	
	Eve	Burns	
Mrs	Frances	Cowie	
	F J	Thirlaway	

Mrs	F	Miller	
Mr	F P	Blue	
Mr	Foster	Stephenson	
	F	Whitfield	
	F D	Foote	
	Felicity	Ripley	
	Fiona	Marran	
	FMR	Bell	
Mr	George	Anderson	
Mr	George	Chicken	
Mr	Grahame	Fife	
Mr	G	Lennox	
Mr	G D	Foster	
Ms	Gemma	Lumsdon	
Mr	George	Wind	
	Gina	Smith	Sunderland Carers Centre
Mrs	Gracie	Burns	
Mr	Graham	Chantler	
Mr	Grahame	Parker	
	Gwen	Bannister	
	Gwenyth	Oliver	
Mrs	H	Florence	
	H J	Bishop	
	H	Nesbitt	
Mrs	H	Watson	
Mr	Jordan	Hauxwell	
	Hazel	Pringle	
	Helen	Weir	
	Ingrid	Chidgey	

Mr	Ingrid	Dalby	
Mrs	I	Metcalf	
	I	Nelson	
	I	Thirlaway	
Mr & Mrs	I T	Bell	
Ms	Joan	Ashman	
	J	Bell	
Mr	John	Clarke	
Mrs	J	Glaister	
	J	Graham	
	J H	Turnbull	
	J M	Amstrong	
	Joyce	McInnes	
Mr	J	McKeon	
	J	Nesbitt	
	J P	Pearson	
Mr	J	Strong	
Mr	J	Watson	
Mr	John	Young	
Mr	Jack	Faulkner	
Mr	Jacob	Carr	
Mr	James	Carr	
Mr	James	Ewing	
Mr	James	Mulholland	
Ms	Jane	Horrigan	
Mrs	Janet	Wind	
	J B	Irwin	
Mr	John D	Moore	
Mr	John D	Whittaker	

	Jennifer	Chantler	
	Joan	Perason	
	Joanne	Lisgo	
	Jodie	Bannister	
Mr	John	Carr	
Mr	John	Dowson	
Mr	Joseph	Brown	
Mr	Joseph	Clarke	
	Joyce	Mallon	
Mrs	K	Aitken	
	K	Brunger	
Mr	K	Faulkner	
Mrs	K H	Appleton	
	K	Hughes	
	K J	Curran	
	K	McGlen	
	K	Morris	
	K	Pickup	
	K	Pleasants	
	Kay	Blyth	Superintendent Northumbria Police
	Karen	McGill	
Miss	Kate	Faulkener	
	Katelynn	Bland	
	Katie	Roberts	
Mr	Keith	Hardy	
Mr	Keith	Horrigan	
Mr	Keith	Parker	
Mr	Kevin	Scott	Norcroft
Mr	Kevin	Fitzpatrick	Nissan Motor Manufacturing (UK)

Mr	Kevin	Sheppard	
	Lynne	McKevitt	
	L	Midwood	
Mrs	L	Potter	
	L	Purvis	
Mrs	L	Rae	
	Lesley	Sharpe	
	L	Williams	
Mr	Laurence	Fanin	
Mr	Lee	McGill	
Mr	Lee	Sharpe	
Mr	Lee	Williams	
	Leslie	Robson	
	Lily	Oxley	
	Linda	Cryan	
	Linzi	Tate	
	Lisa	Conlon	
Mrs	Lisa	Harris	
	Lucy	Rouse	
Mrs	L W	Wood	
Mrs	Lynn	Bridnall	
	Lynn	Hartridge	
Mrs	M	Arnott	
Mrs	M	Burrows	
Mrs	Maureen	Failes	
Miss	M	Lambton	
Mrs	M	Livingstone	
Mr	Malcolm	McArthur	
	M	Murphy	Flat 9

	M	Nesbitt	
	M P	Nelson	
	M	Parkin	
	M	Pleasants	
Mrs	M	Scott	
Mrs	M	Trewhitt	
	M	Tunbull	
	M	Walker	
Mrs	Maureen	Whittaker	
	M	Wood	
Mrs	M A	Jennings	
	M A	Scott-Grey	
	Marilyn	Moore	
	Marian	Morgan	
	Mary	Cartwright	
Mr	Matt	Banning	
	Maureen	Morrow	
Mrs	Maureen	Watson	
Mr	Max	Burns	
Mr	M B	Rennie	
Miss	M E	Glaister	
	M	Freeman	
	Margaret	McArthur	
Mr	Michael	Armstrong	Job Centre Plus
Mr	Michael	Hartnack	
	Michelle	Sweeney	
Mr	Mitchell	Templeman	
Mr	Morgan	Chantler	
Mr	A	Askew	



Mr	Ian	Harris	
Mr	J	Nesbitt	
Mr	John	Lee	
Mr	L	Morgan	
Mr & Mrs	J	Wood	
Mr	W	White	
Mr	R	Jackson	
Mrs	A	Askew	
Mrs	Carole	Stephenson	
Mrs	Jean	Mulholland	
	N D	Clements	
Mrs	N	Faulkner	
Mrs	N	Mclver	
	N	Potter	
	N	Potter	
	Nicola	Hurst	
Mrs	Norma	Houghton	
Mrs	O	Fletcher	
			O2
Mr	P	Aitken	
Mr	Paul	Alison	
Mr	P	Appleton	
Mrs	P	Gale	
Mrs	Peter M	Barrass	
	P	Nelson	
Mrs	P	Peele	
Mr	Philip	Ritzema	
Ms	Pauline	Stubbings	
Mr & Mrs	P	Weatherburn	

Mr	Paul	Craig	
Mr	Paul	Jefferson	
	P H	Anthony	
Mr	P J	Hibbery	
	R	Anderson	
Mr	R	Florance	
	R J	Robson	Flat 3
Mr	Robert	Johnson	
Mr	Richard	Lumsdon	
Mr	R	Miller	
	R	Philips	
Mr	Ronnie	Senior	
Mr	Ray	Smith	
Mr	R A	White	
Miss	Rachel	Andrews	
	Rebecca	Mello	
	R S	McKenna	
	S	Anderson	
	S C	Templeman	
	S	Jacques	
	S	McDougall	
Mr	Steven	McGill	
	S	Philips	
	S	Pleasants	
Mr	S	Potter	
Mr	S	Trewhitt	
	S W	O'Neill	
Mrs	S	Wilkinson	
	S	Young	

Ms	Samantha	Scott	Norcroft
Ms	Samantha	Burns	
	Sarah	Horrigan	
Mr	Scott	Marshall	
	S M	Holt	
			Sunderland Clinical Commissioning Group
	Susan	Booker	
	Susan	Nesbitt	
Mrs	T	Dalby	
Mr	T E	Bradford	
	T	Elliott	
	T	Pickup	
Mr	T	Scott	
Mr	Terry	Firman	
Mr	Terry	Jennings	
	V A	Pleasants	
	V A	Adgar	
	V A	Nesbitt	
			Vodafone
Mr & Mrs	Wilfred	Tindale	
Mr & Mrs	W	Black	
	W	Carrick	
	W	Hall	
	W	McKeon	
	W	Portsmouth	
Miss	Wendy	Ramsey	
Mr	W A	Pattison	
	Xenia	Webster	
Mr	Z	Gillbanks	

Mr & Mrs	J	Wood	
Mr	D	Rae	
	K	Pickup	
	K J	Curran	
	N	Potter	
Mr	Colin	Haylock	Ryder HKS
Mr	John	Brooks	GVA Grimley
Mr	P	Razaq	Kans And Kandy
Mrs	A	Birkbeck	Houghton Racecourse Community Association
			Fuller Peiser
Mr	Donald	Miles	
Mr	John	Burke	HBG Properties
Mrs	N	Dorward	Deptford And Millfield CA
Mr	Andy	Potts	Northumbria Police
Ms	Lynn	Pyburn	North East Ambulance Service
Mrs	R	Charlton	Donwell Community Association
Mr	Gavin	Holmes	
Ms	Annette	Guy	Village Community Association
Mrs	M	Lydiatt	St Matthews (Newbottle)
Mrs	S	Brown	Easington Lane Access Point
Mr	Gordon	Gardner	
Ms	Liz	Hughes	Sunniside Partnership
Mr	John	Adamson	
Ms	Jillian	Pate	Dickinson Dees
Mr	T D	Seymour	
Mrs		Depoll	De Pol Associates
Mr	Bruce	Raven	Healey And Baker
Mr	Paul	Taylor	Nexus
Mr & Mrs McConnell		McConnell	

Ms	Suzanne	Shaftoe	Springwell Community Association
Ms	J	Martin	Gilley Law/Lakeside CA
			Thompson Park Community Association
Mr	John	Carruth	
Mr	Alan C	Davidson	
			Oakapple Group Ltd
Mrs		Shale	Penshaw Community Association
Mrs	LA	Etherington	South Hylton Community Association
Mrs	M	Maddocks	Ouston Parish Council
			O H Properties
Mr	Jabin	Cussin	Cussins Homes Ltd
	Anne	Ramshaw	Houghton Racecourse Community Access Point
			Doxford Park Community Association
			Tyne And Wear Passenger Transport Authority
Mr	D	Hampton	Newbottle CA
Mr	Peter	Churchill	Red Box Design Group
Mr	J	Mawston	Shiney Row Community Association
Mrs	J	Hicks	West Community Association
Mrs	P	Burns	Silksworth Community Association
Mr	Brian	Hermiston	Deanway Development Limited
			M Nicol & Company
Ms	Ailie	Savage	Atkins Global
Mr	Simon	Williamson	Washington Millennium Centre
Mr	Matthew	Hard	DLP Consultants
Mr	P	Hadley	Ryhope Community Association
			British Airport Association Property
Mrs	J	Glenwright	Grindon Community Association
			John Martin Associates
Mr	P	Kendall	Harraton Community Association

Dr	David	Auld	Auld Brothers
Mrs Baker		Baker	Hetton Community Association
			The Crown Estate
	Lauren	Casey	ZED Homes Ltd

## Email Contacts

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
Adam McVickers	Planner Persimmon Homes
Mr Adam Stanley	Development Assistant Gentoo Homes Ltd
Adam Eden	
Mr Anthony Pharoah	Rapleys LLP
Anne Isherwood	Sunderland Partnership Board Members City of Sunderland College
Mr Alastair Skelton	Steven Abbott Associates
Alex Willis	BNP Real Estate UK
Mr Andrew Bradley	The Bridges Manager
Mr Andrew Moss	Wardhadaway
Mr Andrew Oliver	
Annemarie Wilshaw	Planning Manager SITA UK
Mr Ashley Godfrey	Ashley Godfrey Associates
Audrey Polkingham	
Mr Denis Bulman	
Barbara King	
Unknown	Blackett Hart And Pratt
Ben Stephenson	Planner Persimmon Homes
Bernadette Topham	
Brian Cree	
Mr Brian Jackson	Managing Director B Supplied Ltd
Cath Bradbury	Projects Development Manager Housing 21
Charlotte Boyes	Planning Potential
Mr Chris Checkley	
Mr Christopher Whitfield	UK Land Estates
Mr Chris Thorp	

Clair De Fries	
Mr David Couston	Silverlink Properties
Mr Colin Wood	Gentoo
	Tetlow King Planning
Natural England consultation service	Natural England
Miss Claire Simmons	
Mr David Brocklehurst	Associate GVA
Mr David Donkin	University of Sunderland
Mr David McNee	Galleries Manager
Mr David Graham	NLP Planning
Daniel Gregg	Nathaniel Lichfield And Partners
mr edward failes	
Mr Ed Alder	Land & Planning Director Gleeson Homes and Regeneration
Mr Eric Blakie	
mrs emma Hardy	
Mr Matthew Wyatt	Planning Assistant JWPC Limited
Mrs Julie Watson	
Fiona Snowball	Northumbria Police
Faye Whiteoak	Design & Development Director Gleeson Homes and Regeneration
Mr Gary Bunt	
mr gavin johnson	
Geoff Woodcock	Esh Group
Mr Gary Hutchinson	Commercial Director SAFC
Gillian Gibson	Sunderland City Council
Mr Gordon Metcalfe	GVA
Mr J Hall	Entec
Hannah Munroe	Signet Planning



Mrs Helen Fife	
Helen Ryde	Implementation Officer Land of the Three Rivers Local Nature Partnership
Mr Hugh Shepherd	
Mr Ian Radley	Highways England
Chris Alexander	Chief Operating Officer Sunderland Live
Jackie Nicholson	
Jacky Owen	
Jacqueline McDonald	
Jane Evans	Three
Mrs Rutherford	
Jayne Steanson	
Mrs Janine Edworthy	
Jennifer Hadland	Smiths Gore
Jessica May	Partnership Manager Sunderland Partnership
Mr James Falade	South Sunderland Member Gentoo Management Committee
Ms Jo Storie	Smiths Gore
Joanne Walker	
Mr John Hall	Sunderland District Group Manager Tyne And Wear Fire And Rescue Service
Mr John Lowther	Sunderland Green Party
Mr John Lowther	Tees Valley Unlimited
Mr John Mills	Nature after Minerals Planning Advisor
Mr John A Sample	Director Consultus Building Constultants Ltd
Mr John Bell	
Mr Jonathan Friend	Riley Consulting
Mr Jon Quine	
Mr Jules Brown	Conservation and Planning Manager North Of England Civic Trust
Katherine Brooker	DTZ

Miss Kathryn Tew	
Katie Bourne	BNP Paribas Real Estate
Kayleigh Brown	Assistant Development Planner
Captain J K Allison	
Mr Ken Bremer	Sunderland Partnership Board Member City Hospitals Sunderland NHS Trust
Mr Keith Reed	Keith Reed Consultancy
Laura Skitt	
Lauren Knox	Senior Planner White Green Young Planning
Linda Barron	
Lesley Pickup	
Lesley Etherington	
L A Etherington	South Hylton Community Association
Mr Lewis Stokes	
Alexandra Diamond	
mrs elizabeth reid	
Lisa Russell	Rapleys
Louise Oakley	Planning Officer Environment Agency
Lynn Scott	Asda
Mr Malcolm Graham	
Mr Mark Duggleby	Engagement Manager Department for Transport
Mr Mark McGovern	
Mr Mark Crosby	Design review officer RIBA North East
Mr Nornington	
Mr Martyn Boak	Managing Director U-Student
Mr Matthew Good	Planning Manager
Mr Max Goode	Fairhurst
mr Nick Mclellan	Assistant Planner Signet Planning

Miss Meriel Hardy	
Mr Michael Fearn	
Michael Gray	
Mrs Michele Johnson	
Mr Martin Terry	
Ms Julie Bland	
Matthew Spawton	Land and Partnership Manager Partner Construction
Neil Graham	Homes And Communities Agency
Mr Neil Wilkinson	Planning Policy Manager Gateshead Council
Openreach BT Unknown	Open reach new sites
Dr Nic Best	CPRE Sunderland
Nichola Traverse-Healey	
Mr Nick Mclellan	Story Homes
Mr Nick Sandford	Government Affairs Officer (Local) Woodland Trust
Nicky O'Conner	District Manager - Sunderland Anchor Trust
Mr Nigel Harrett	City Of Sunderland College
Mr Peter Lynn	
Mr Peter Walls	Chief Executive Gentoo Group
Mr Peter Cranshaw	Peter Cranshaw and Co
Mr Peter Batty	Simons Developments
Mr Peter Beal	
Phil Toal	Keep Moat
	DPDS
environment agency general environment agency	general consultations
McCarthy and Stone Ziyad Thomas	The Planning Bureau Ltd
Mr Kevin Waters	Planning and Development Manager Adlington
Mr Christopher Whitmore	Andrew Martin Associates

	The Coal Authority
Newcastle City Council	Planning Policy Newcastle City Council
Mr Oliver Mitchell	Planware Ltd
Alex Jackman	EE
Mr Paul Webster	Tolent Developments
Rebecca Kinmond	North East Local Enterprise Partnership
Rebecca Housam	
Mr Richard Newsome	Principal Planner GVA
Mr Richard Adams	Jones Day
Sara Holmes	Frank Haslam Milan
Mr Scott Monroe	GVA Lamb And Edge
Mr Sean Wildman	Fusion Online Ltd,
Mr Sean Hedley	Hedley Planning Services
Mrs Sheila Bell	
Simon Mearns	
Mr Simon Burdus	
Mr Steve Jackson	Gerrish Price Kay
Susann Miller	
Mr Steven Prosser	Regional Director St Modwen
Angela Gemmill	Relationship Manager Marine Management Organisation
Miss Stephanie Gray	
Mr Steve Jackson	Yuill Homes Ltd
Mr Steve Staines	FFT Planning
Mr Garry Rowley	Secretary Samaritans
Suzanne Crispin	Husband and Brown Limited
Mr Syed Hussain	Business Support Assistant Sunderland City Council
Mr Tim Harrison	National Grid/Capita

Mr Tom Swallow	BNP Real Estate UK
Mr Tom Walker	Genecon
Trish Kelly	Tees Valley Unlimited
Miss Vicki Richardson	office manager Walton and Co
Mr Victor Thompson	Village Lane Garage

## **Appendix C – Consultation Leaflet**

# Growth options consultation

## What is this consultation all about?

Sunderland City Council is preparing a Local Plan to help guide how Sunderland develops between now and 2033. All local authorities are required by central government to prepare a Local Plan.

A key part of the Local Plan is the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy sets out the direction for planning in the city including the number of new homes needed, where offices and factories could be built and what new roads and other infrastructure will be needed to support development.

The last draft of the Core Strategy was produced in 2013. Since then new developments have taken place in the city and new opportunities have arisen such as the emerging proposal to develop an International Advanced Manufacturing Park near the current Nissan factory. These changes mean that we need to review and update the Core Strategy. New evidence on the city's population and economy has been prepared to support this review.

As part of that review we need to consider options for how growth in Sunderland could take place. This consultation is about your views on those options. The City Council needs to know which option is the best for Sunderland and the people who live and work here so it can be built into our future plan.



## Some of the issues Sunderland faces

In recent years Sunderland has seen significant jobs growth, but figures suggest that an increasing number of these jobs are taken by people who live outside of Sunderland and commute into the city for work. This means that more people travel into the city for work, but live elsewhere. It also means that Sunderland is not getting the full financial benefit of the extra jobs created.

The number of new houses completed in Sunderland has been generally high; around 700 each year over the past 10-15 years, but this number has been affected quite considerably by demolitions that have taken place. These losses reduced the annual net average to around 300 houses per year. However, these demolitions have now largely come to an end and last year saw 895 new houses being built in the city.

Between 2001 and 2011, Sunderland's population fell from 284,000 to just under 276,000. Sunderland was the only city in the United Kingdom to see population fall during that period. Official Government projections show that Sunderland's population is expected to grow only slightly over the next 20 years. It is a concern that the number of people choosing to move out of Sunderland is highest amongst the 'working-age' population, particularly those aged 20-39.

These factors could have a major long term impact on the prosperity of the city and need to be addressed if the city is to prosper.

The Core Strategy is one of the most important documents that can influence future development and tackle some of these issues.

**Assessing the future level of housing need for new homes in Sunderland has been carried out with a new in-depth study. This study, carried out by experts, includes what is known as the 'Objectively Assessed Need for Housing'. It has helped us to understand how many new homes might need to be built in the city.**

## What are growth options?

Sunderland City Council has been carrying out extensive research to fully understand the development needs of Sunderland in the foreseeable future. This includes likely changes to population in the city, to housing needs and employment.

Some of the research carried out includes:

- A Strategic Housing Market Assessment, which provides a detailed overview of the future housing needs of Sunderland
- An Employment Land Review, which looks into expected employment growth in the city
- A Demographic Analysis, which provides forecasts of Sunderland's population and household changes
- A Strategic Land Review, which details and assesses all potential development sites in the city
- A Green Belt Review, which looks at the role of the green belt and examines whether any parts could be amended.
- An updated Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

These documents provide a robust basis to identify possible options for the growth of Sunderland between now and 2033. Copies of all of these documents are available to view in your local library, at the Civic Centre (during office hours) and also online at [www.sunderland.gov.uk/growthoptions](http://www.sunderland.gov.uk/growthoptions)

We would welcome your comments on any of these documents, particularly the Strategic Land Review and Green Belt Review.



# Growth options map

## Washington

55,200 residents

Key issues/constraints	Opportunities/growth
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is limited potential for new housing and employment allocations within the EU purse</li> <li>Limited brownfield land</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Washington's location on the strategic road network makes it highly marketable for industry and business</li> <li>The development of IAMP</li> </ul>

## Sunderland North

55,100 residents

Key issues/constraints	Opportunities/growth
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The area is highly urbanised and limited in land for new housing and future employment allocations</li> <li>The coast has Natura 2000 European wildlife protection</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Seafront Strategy and Marine Walk Masterplan will assist in redefining the seafront</li> </ul>



## Coalfield

46,000 residents

Key issues/constraints	Opportunities/growth
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Poor access to employment areas</li> <li>Poor housing choice leading to sub-optimal</li> <li>The Coalfield has more flood risk areas than elsewhere in the city</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Release of unutilised employment land provides regeneration opportunities</li> <li>The re-opening of the lane roads network would improve accessibility for the area</li> <li>The Central Route would improve access to the area</li> </ul>

## Central Area

3,200 residents

Key issues/constraints	Opportunities/growth
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Declining city centre vitality and viability</li> <li>Need to develop the city centre office market</li> <li>Limited residential population</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development of the Mars site will enhance the vitality and viability of the city centre</li> <li>The University and Solway City are key drivers in the city's knowledge-based economy</li> </ul>

## Sunderland South

116,000 residents

Key issues/constraints	Opportunities/growth
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parts of the coast has European wildlife protection</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The South Sunderland Growth Area will add to housing choice</li> <li>The South Sunderland Transport Corridor will provide access opportunities for sites along the river corridor</li> </ul>

© Crown Copyright. All rights reserved.  
Sunderland City Council 100018385. Published 2016.

# The options

## Low growth

The low growth option broadly follows current predictions from Central Government about population growth. This will see a declining working age population in the city. It is likely that continuing low population growth would see declining public services such as schools and could further reduce shopping activity in the city centre and local centres. The low level of housebuilding would result in limited choices in new housing.

### What this option could look like:

**Housing:** Construction of around 515 new homes a year across the city. This would give a limited choice in the housing types needed to meet the needs of a resident workforce. It would not meet the Objectively Assessed Need for housing.

**Economy and Employment:** Likely decline of almost 10,000 in the working age population by 2033. Economic growth in the city could be harmed through a lack of local workforce to fill potential new jobs. This will have an adverse impact on investment and the planned economic growth for Sunderland.

**Sustainable Communities:** The continued decrease in the working age population and in the number of children means that there may be a need to close some services as demand reduces. In parallel there will be an increase in the proportion of residents who are over 70.

**Transport:** Would not provide all the homes needed for a local resident labour force. High levels of commuting would still occur, having the significant impact on transport infrastructure across the city.

**Environment:** Development would be delivered on currently identified 'brown field' and 'green field' sites. No additional areas of greenfield land will be required.

## Medium growth

This option would see improved growth that could help to maintain existing services. There would be some increase in overall population. A higher number of new homes would help to reduce the number of people choosing to move out of the area and increase the working age population. With a greater choice in housing types, there would be economic benefits as more people choose to live in Sunderland. A moderate increase of commuting to meet the expected jobs growth would also mean a lower impact on transport infrastructure.

### What this option could look like:

**Housing:** Construction of around 820 new homes each year across the city, with more choice in types of housing encouraging fewer people to leave Sunderland.

**Economy and Employment:** An increase of around 2,000 in the working age population of the city. Some improvement in access to local employment, with jobs across all skill levels.

**Sustainable Communities:** A modest increase in the population of the city. The higher working age population supports economic growth, protects local services such as schools and maintains demand for shops and services in local centres and the city centre.

**Transport:** The limited increase in the working age population means that commuting into Sunderland will continue.

**Environment:** Very likely that additional greenfield sites and land in settlement breaks will be required. Option could potentially accommodate growth but does not provide for flexibility in the land supply in the long term, so some Green Belt land could be required.

## Higher growth

This option would see the biggest increase in housing numbers. Higher numbers and much improved choice in housing would significantly reduce the number of people choosing to leave the city and attract more people to live in Sunderland. The high levels of housing development would deliver a growing population, completely reversing current trends.

### What this option could look like:

**Housing:** Construction of around 1,055 new homes each year across the city with significant improvement in the choice of housing types and tenures. This is a high number bearing in mind the recent level of housing completions in the city.

**Economy and Employment:** An increase of around 7,000 in the working age population. Improved access to local employment, with more jobs across all skill levels.

**Sustainable Communities:** Increased resident population will help support vibrant town and local centres. There may also be other benefits for communities through funding of services through Section 106 money and potentially Community Infrastructure Levy from developers. This option could result in additional schools being needed due to increasing pressure from the higher population.

**Transport:** High growth would see an increase in traffic movement across the city. To an extent this would be offset by the reduction in in-commuting.

**Environment:** Increased risk to landscape character as significant land would need to be released from Settlement Breaks and Green Belt.

**'Green field' sites are those that have not been developed in any way. Sites that have previously been used for homes or industry or other development are known as 'brown field'. Settlement Breaks are areas of open land that lie between villages or between parts of the built area of the City, separating different communities. Green Belt is a specific term used for land that is formally protected from most types of new development unless an exceptional need can be shown.**

## In your area:

In order to deal with planning effectively, in the 2013 Core Strategy Sunderland is split into 5 areas. Each of these has a different character and range of planning issues and opportunities.

- The **Central Area** is a small area straddling both sides of the Wear, close to the mouth of the river. It has a modest population of 3,200 residents. It houses the main commercial and administrative area of Sunderland, including the city centre. On the northern bank of the river sits the Stadium Park and Sheepfolds development sites. **In the 2013 Core Strategy the Central Area is proposed to be the main location for major office, retail and leisure uses.**
- The **Sunderland South** area covers 4,284 hectares and is the most populated part of the city, with 116,000 people living in it (around 42% of the city population). It has natural boundaries of the River Wear to the north and the coast to the east. The A19 is the boundary to the west and south. **In the 2013 Core Strategy the Sunderland South area is proposed to be the location for major growth of new housing in the city.**
- The **Sunderland North** area is mainly urban with just over 55,100 residents, or 20% of the city's population. It is bounded by the coast to the east, the Green Belt to the north, the A19 to the west and River Wear to the south. **In the 2013 Core Strategy, emphasis in Sunderland North was given to the regeneration of the sea front with new housing in the area developed when opportunities arise.**
- **Washington** began building in the 1960s as part of the 'new towns' programme. It has the second largest population of all of the sub-areas, with approximately 55,200 residents (20% of the total population). Developed as a series of villages, it also has modern employment areas. Washington is surrounded by Green Belt. **In the 2013 Core Strategy, Washington is seen as a key location for new economic development and job creation. Only a low amount of new housing was proposed.**
- The **Coalfield** is the largest of the areas in the city, covering over 5,500 hectares or around 42% of the city. It is made up of a number of former mining towns and villages that include Houghton-le-Spring and Hetton-le-Hole. It is the least densely populated of the areas with 46,000 residents (17% of the city's population). **In the 2013 Core Strategy, regeneration in the Coalfield is proposed to focus on building new homes.**

Sunderland City Council needs to consider whether the approach for each area as set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate to meet the growth of the city. Findings from the recent evidence documents suggest that:

- There is a need for more housing in Washington; there is also a lack of employment land in this area;
- There may be a need to reconsider the capacity of the Coalfield to accommodate new housing due to infrastructure constraints such as road access;
- The role of North and South Sunderland could change with the completion of the new bridge across the Wear effectively joining these areas. There is a current lack of employment land in Sunderland North but an over-supply in Sunderland South.

Further work is being carried out on retail need in the city and at this stage we would welcome your thoughts on where any new shopping facilities might be located.

## More information

For further information on the Growth Options please visit the council's website:  
[www.sunderland.gov.uk/growthoptions](http://www.sunderland.gov.uk/growthoptions)

The best way to comment on the Growth Options is on-line and you can do this through the website  
You can also e-mail your comments to us at: [planningpolicy@sunderland.gov.uk](mailto:planningpolicy@sunderland.gov.uk)  
Or you can also write to us with your comments at:  
Policy Section (Growth Options) Room 3.94, Civic Centre, Sunderland, SR2 7DN

## Where can you meet us?

Policy officers will be available to answer your questions at the following venues:-

<b>Date</b>	<b>Venue</b>	<b>Time</b>
Saturday 21 May	City Library, Fawcett Street SR1 1RE	10am – 12.30pm
Monday 23 May	Houghton Library, Newbottle Street DH4 4AF Bunnyhill Centre, Hylton Lane SR5 4BW	10am – 12pm 3.30pm – 6.30 pm
Tuesday 24 May	Kayll Road Library SR4 7TW Ryhope Library, Black Road SR2 0RX	10am – 1pm 2pm – 5pm
Wednesday 25 May	Washington Library, The Galleries NE38 7RZ Fulwell Library, Dene Lane SR6 8EH	10am – 1.30pm 4.30pm – 6.30pm
Thursday 26 May	Sandhill Centre, Grindon Lane SR3 4EN Shiney Row Library, Chester Road DH4 4RB	10am – 1pm 2pm – 4pm
Friday 27 May	Hetton Centre Library, Welfare Road DH5 9NE Washington Millennium Centre, Concord NE37 2QD	10am – 12pm 2pm – 5pm
Monday 6 June	City Library, Fawcett Street SR1 1RE Washington Millennium Centre, Concord NE37 2QD	10am – 2pm 3.30pm – 6pm
Tuesday 7 June	Shiney Row Library, Chester Road DH4 4RB Ryhope Library, Black Road SR2 0RX	10am – 12pm 2pm – 4pm
Wednesday 8 June	Hetton Centre Library, Welfare Road DH5 9NE Sandhill View, Grindon Lane SR3 4EN	10am – 1pm 2pm – 5pm
Thursday 9 June	Bunnyhill Library, Hylton Lane SR5 4BW Wearside Health & Racquets Club, Camberwell Way, Doxford Park, SR3 3XN	10am – 12pm 3pm – 7pm
Friday 10 June	Kayll Road Library SR4 7TW Fulwell Library, Dene Lane SR6 8EH	11am – 1pm 3pm – 5pm
Saturday 11 June	Houghton Library, Newbottle Street DH4 4AF Washington Library, The Galleries NE38 7RZ	10am – 12pm 1pm – 3pm

## What happens next?

All responses that we receive on the Growth Options will be used to shape the next version of the Core Strategy. This will be known as the "Publication Plan" and marks the next stage in the preparation of the Core Strategy. It is due out later in 2016.

The Core Strategy will then be submitted to the Secretary of State in early 2017. It will be examined by an independent Government Inspector during summer 2017 before it can be formally adopted by the council as the statutory development plan for the city.

**Remember to submit your comments to us by 1 July 2016**

# What are your views on the growth options?

1. Of the three Growth Options proposed which one do you think is the most appropriate for the city and should be taken forward in the Core Strategy?

Low Growth       Medium Growth       High Growth

2. Are there any other options that you think should be considered?

As set out previously, the 2013 draft Core Strategy divides the city into 5 sub-areas and proposes a different approach to how each of these areas might be developed over the next 20 years.

3. Do you think that these approaches are still appropriate and should be used as a basis for the next version of the Core Strategy?

Yes       No

4. If No, do you think different approaches should be used? What proportion of land for development do you think should be used in each sub-area? More/less for housing? More/less for employment? What are your views on the location of new retailing? Please set out your views below:

Sub-area	Housing	Employment	Retailing	Your views or suggestions:
Central				
Sunderland South				
Sunderland North				
Washington				
Coalfield				

Your Name:

e-mail

Address:

Please tick here if you do not wish to be kept informed of future consultations on the Core Strategy

**Please submit your comments to us by 1 July 2016**

## **Appendix D – Press Releases and Adverts**

# Sunderland Growth options consultation



NPSE-A-1-025

## Sunderland City Council is preparing a Local Plan to help guide how Sunderland develops between now and 2033.

A key part of the Local Plan is the Core Strategy which sets out the direction for planning in the city including the number of new homes needed, where offices and factories could be built and what new roads and other infrastructure will be needed to support development.

To develop the Core Strategy we need to consider options for growth in Sunderland and we want your views on which option is the best for Sunderland and the people who live and work here.


### We want your views

Drop into one of our sessions where representatives from the council's project team will be on hand to give an overview on the Growth Options and answer questions.

Consultation starts on **Thursday 19 May 2016** and we need to receive your comments no later than **5pm on 1 July 2016**.

You can also visit any of the libraries in Sunderland to view a print copy of the consultation document and supporting information and complete the comments form.

For further information or to submit your views online visit: [www.sunderland.gov.uk/growthoptions](http://www.sunderland.gov.uk/growthoptions)



### Drop-in sessions:

#### Saturday 21 May

City Library, 10am – 12.30pm

#### Monday 23 May

Houghton Library, 10am – 12pm  
Bunnyhill Centre, 3.30pm – 6.30pm

#### Tuesday 24 May

Kayl Road, 10am – 1pm  
Ryhope Library, 2pm – 5pm

#### Wednesday 25 May

Washington Library, 10am – 1.30pm  
Fulwell Library, 4.30pm – 6.30pm

#### Thursday 26 May

Sandhill Centre, 10am – 1pm  
Shiney Row Library, 2pm – 4pm

#### Friday 27 May

Hetton Library, 10am – 12pm  
Washington Millennium Centre, 2pm – 5pm

#### Monday 6 June

City Library, 10am – 2pm  
Washington Millennium Centre, 3.30pm – 6pm

#### Tuesday 7 June

Shiney Row Library, 10am – 12pm  
Ryhope Library, 2pm – 4pm

#### Wednesday 8 June

Hetton Library, 10am – 1pm  
Sandhill View, 2pm – 5pm

#### Thursday 9 June

Bunnyhill Library, 10am – 12pm  
Wearside Health & Racquets Club, 3pm – 7pm

#### Friday 10 June

Kayl Road, 11am – 1pm  
Fulwell Library, 3pm – 5pm

#### Saturday 11 June

Houghton Library, 10am – 12pm  
Washington Library, 1pm – 3pm

MADRISON

W...



sunderlandechoonline



@sunderlandecho

# Wearside Local Plans goes on show

NPSE-A-1-003

A series of roadshows on Sunderland's Local Plan will come to Houghton and Washington tomorrow.

The plan is to help guide how Sunderland develops between now and 2033 and where thousands of homes could be built.

The roadshow will be at Houghton Library, from 10am to noon, and Washington Library, from 1pm to 3pm.

A key part of the plan is the core strategy, which sets out the direction for planning in the city including the number of new homes needed, where offices and factories could be built.

Councillor Mel Speding, the City Council's Cabinet Secretary, said: "We want people's views on the options.

"We need to know which option they think is the best for Sunderland and what they



**Coun Mel Speding**

"The council's project team are on hand to discuss the growth options and answer questions at the roadshows."

All local authorities must prepare a Local Plan, and more information is available online at: [sunderland.gov.uk/growthoptions](http://sunderland.gov.uk/growthoptions) and the dead-

## Appendix E – Poster

# Sunderland Growth options consultation



**Sunderland City Council is preparing a Local Plan to help guide how Sunderland develops between now and 2033.**

A key part of the Local Plan is the Core Strategy which sets out the direction for planning in the city including the number of new homes needed, where offices and factories could be built and what new roads and other infrastructure will be needed to support development.

To develop the Core Strategy we need to consider options for how growth in Sunderland could take place and we want your views on these options. We need to know which option is the best for Sunderland and the people who live and work here.

### **We want your views**

Drop into one of our sessions where representatives from the council's project team will be on hand to give an overview on the Growth Options and answer questions.

Consultation starts on Thursday 19 May 2016 and we need to receive your comments no later than 5pm on 1 July 2016.

Date	Venue and Time
Saturday 21 May	City Library, 10am - 12.30pm
Monday 23 May	Houghton Library, 10am - 12pm and Bunnyhill Centre, 3.30pm - 6.30 pm
Tuesday 24 May	Kayll Road, 10am - 1pm and Ryhope Library, 2pm - 5pm
Wednesday 25 May	Washington Library, 10am - 1.30pm and Fulwell Library, 4.30pm - 6.30pm
Thursday 26 May	Sandhill Centre, 10am - 1pm and Shiney Row Library, 2pm - 4pm
Friday 27 May	Hetton Library, 10am - 12pm and Washington Millennium Centre, 2pm - 5pm
Monday 6 June	City Library, 10am - 2pm and Washington Millennium Centre, 3.30pm - 6pm
Tuesday 7 June	Shiney Row Library, 10am - 12pm and Ryhope Library, 2pm - 4pm
Wednesday 8 June	Hetton Library, 10am - 1pm and Sandhill View, 2pm - 5pm
Thursday 9 June	Bunnyhill Library, 10am - 12pm and Wearside Health & Racquets Club, 3pm - 7pm
Friday 10 June	Kayll Road, 11am - 1pm and Fulwell Library, 3pm - 5pm
Saturday 11 June	Houghton Library, 10am - 12pm and Washington Library, 1pm - 3pm

You can also visit any of the libraries in Sunderland to view a print copy of the consultation document and supporting information and complete the comments form.

**For further information or to submit your views online visit: [www.sunderland.gov.uk/growthoptions](http://www.sunderland.gov.uk/growthoptions)**

## Appendix F - Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Mr David Gibson		Support for high growth option and the approaches set out in the 2013 Core Strategy document	Your comments have been noted and given due consideration. Please see the main report for Council's approach to growth in the City.
Ms Elizabeth Swann		Supports the high growth option and the approaches set out in the 2013 Core Strategy document. Would like to see more new development in the City Centre.	Your comments have been noted and given due consideration. Please see the main report for Council's approach to growth in the City.
Mr John Stoker		Supports medium growth option and the approaches to development set out in the 2013 Core Strategy document however would like to see more employment uses in the Central area and less housing in the Coalfields.	Your comments have been noted and given due consideration. Please see the main report for Council's approach to growth in the City.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
James Magog		<p>Supports the higher growth option but does not believe that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy document is still relevant. Believes there should be more residential and employment uses in the central area and that retail development would be concentrated around the City Centre. Would like to see more residential in Sunderland North and South and that they should be higher end units. Would also like to see more employment uses around the port and Hendon for those that don't have access to the new employment on the A19.</p>	<p>Your comments will be given due consideration and will be used along with other to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.</p>
Mr Ashley Curle		<p>Supports the medium growth option and the approaches set out in the 2013 Core Strategy document. Would like to see more brownfield land developed. Would like to see more employment uses in the Central area but should not be of a quality that compromises the City Centre. Need more housing, employment and better quality retailing in South Sunderland and the Coalfields and better quality housing and more employment in North Sunderland.</p>	<p>Your comments have been given due consideration and will be used with others to inform the spatial strategy in the next draft of the Core Strategy.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
John Hope		Supports the high growth option and does not agree with the approach set out on the 2013 Core Strategy document. Need to look at retailing trend and adapt the offer on the High Street to match demand which is not necessarily retail. If we are to retain population then the housing offer needs to be more attractive. Need to provide bigger, higher quality residential to be able to compete with other areas of the north east and the south east.	Your comments have been given due consideration and will be used along with others to inform the spatial strategy in the next draft of the Core Strategy.
Mr Richard Bradley		Supporter of the low growth option and believes that bringing vacant buildings back into use will alleviate pressure to build on the Greenbelt. Does not agree with the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy document and would like to see more residential development in the City Centre and less multinational retailers and less residential development in South Sunderland.	Vacant properties are being brought back into use in the City; unfortunately there is insufficient supply to meet the City's housing needs. Your comments regarding the location of development have been given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the spatial strategy in the next draft of the Core Strategy

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Mr John Bell		Supports the medium growth option and believes that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy document is still appropriate. Would like to see more housing in Sunderland South and the Coalfields and more employment uses in the Coalfields and Sunderland North.	Your comments will be given due consideration and will be used along with others to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
Mr Michael Watson		Supports the medium growth option and believes the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still relevant. Would like to see more housing and employment uses in all areas except the Coalfield where it is considered to be about right and there is a need for more affordable housing.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
		Supports high growth option and believes that the approach set out in the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy document is still appropriate. Would like to see more executive housing provided to ensure a wealthier population base	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with other will inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
		<p>Supports the low growth option and believes that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy document is no longer appropriate. Would like to see all new housing development on brownfield land and more housing and employment uses in Central Sunderland. New retailing in the City Centre should be aimed at areas that need revitalisation and housing should be aimed at students. Would like to see less housing in South Sunderland as new developments would cause congestion and more employment uses in Washington and the Coalfields as well as more housing in Washington</p>	<p>Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.</p>
<p>Mr Gary Cassidy</p>		<p>Supports the high growth option and believes that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy documents is no longer appropriate. Should consider merging with Seaham and South Tyneside. Would like to see more housing in Central, North and South Sunderland and more employment in Central and North Sunderland. Stopping the decline of the City Centre retailing should be a priority.</p>	<p>Your comments will be given due consideration and will be used along with other to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.</p>



Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Mr Peter Beal		Supports the medium growth option and believes that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy document is still appropriate. Would like to see as much development as possible on brownfield land.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will inform the next draft of the Core Strategy
Anna Hargrave		Supports the higher growth option but does not believe the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy document is still appropriate. Believes that there are numerous brownfield and derelict sites that should be used before greenfield and Greenbelt. The City Centre has a lot of potential and needs more higher end retailers. Would like to see more employment uses in North Sunderland, Washington and the Coalfields and more residential and better links to the Galleries in Washington.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy
Ms Pauline Hopper		Supports the medium growth option and considers the approaches set out in the 2013 Core Strategy document to still be appropriate.	Your comments will be given due consideration and will be used along with others to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
Mr Brian Cree		Agrees that the City should grow but should do so in a responsible manner. Does not want to see Greenbelt land built on	Your comments will be given due consideration and will be used along with other to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Miss Joanne Walker		Agrees that the City should grow but should do so in a responsible manner. Does not want to see Greenbelt land built on	Your comments will be given due consideration and will be used along with other to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy
Mrs Catherine Jowett		Supports the high growth option and believes the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy document is appropriate	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will inform the next draft of the Core Strategy
Mr Craig Bittlestone		Supports the high growth option and does not believe the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate. Would like to see more housing, employment uses and taller buildings in Central Sunderland and new retail development concentrates in the City Centre. Would like to see more housing and employment uses in South Sunderland and brownfield sites developed before greenfield and greenbelt. Any new retail development in North Sunderland should be centred around the new Seaburn development and Seaburn Camp should not be built on. Washington and the Coalfields should not be expanded but links by road and public transport should be improved to the City Centre,	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will inform the next draft of the Core Strategy

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Mr Stephen Goldsmith		Supports the high growth option but does not believe that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate. Would like to see the City Centre extend with more residential development and facilities to support them as well as the North Bridge Street area in North Sunderland	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
Mrs Liz Reid	adviser springwell vill res ass	Supports the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy and believes that the land being released from the Greenbelt to facilitate the development of IAMP is sufficient. Brownfield sites should be developed before greenfield and Greenbelt and development should be focused in Central Sunderland	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
McCarthy and Stone Ziyad Thomas	Senior Planning Associate The Planning Bureau Ltd.	Supports high growth option although markets will affect the delivery. Believes that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy document is still appropriate. Would like to see more residential development in the north of the City.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
Miss Natalie Hodgson	Senior Business Analyst Gentoo Group	Supports the high growth option and believes the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy document is still appropriate	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will inform the next draft of the Core Strategy

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Mr Gary Bunt		Support low growth option and does not believe that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy document is still appropriate. Does not support the release of Green Belt land for development. Would like to see more employment uses in Central, South and North Sunderland and Washington. Would like to see more residential in North and Central Sunderland and the Coalfields and improves in retail everywhere. better retailing everywhere	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
Mr Martin Terry		Supports the medium growth option and believes that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate. Would like to see more housing in Central Sunderland and the Coalfields	
Mr James Reid	Strategic Land Buyer Barratt David Wilson Homes	Supports the high growth option but does not believe that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate. Would like to see more residential and employment uses in Central and North Sunderland, Washington and the Coalfields	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Mrs Liz Reid		Supports the medium growth option and believes that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy document is still appropriate. Would like to see more housing and employment uses in Central Sunderland and the Coalfields.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
Mrs Valerie MILNES		Supports the medium growth option and believes that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate. Does not use the City Centre due to poor accessibility and would like to see more residential and employment uses in the Coalfields as well as a better retail offer.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy
Mrs Janine Edworthy		Supports the low growth option and believes that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate. Would like to see most development focussed within the inner areas and believes that any further loss of the Greenbelt other than that which is proposed for IAMP would have detrimental impact on the City inner areas imp sufficient	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Dr Ian Edworthy		Supports low growth option and believes that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy document is no longer appropriate. Believes that there should be more housing development in South and North Sunderland and more employment uses in South, North and Central Sunderland. The land that is being released in the Green Belt for the development of IAMP is sufficient and any more would have a detrimental impact on the City.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
Mr Nick Sandford	Government Affairs Officer Woodland Trust	Believes that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate and would like to see growth that does not impact on the City's woodland areas	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will inform the next draft of the Core Strategy
Mr James Cokill	Director Durham Wildlife Trust	Supports low growth option and does not believe that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy document is still appropriate. Questions how the results of the EU referendum will impact on the growth of the City	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will inform the next draft of the Core Strategy. With regards to the results of the EU referendum the Local Plan will be based on the most up to date evidence available at the time of writing.
Pippa Cheetham	O&H Properties	Supports the high growth option and believes that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will inform the next draft of the Core Strategy

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Mrs Janet Wilkinson		Support for the low growth option and believes that the approach put forward in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate. Thinks that new development needs to be of the right type to retain young people, provide them with good quality housing and skilled jobs. Also new development needs to provide facilities.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
Mr John Carruth		Supports the high growth option and believes that the IAMP needs to be balanced with high quality housing development	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
Mr Richard Luke		Supports the high growth option and believes that the IAMP needs to be balanced with high quality housing development. Also feels that the green belt boundary is drawn so tightly around Springwell that it is a development constraint.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
Mrs Karen Luke		Supports the higher growth option and believes that Washington is an attractive location with more detached houses and lower vacancy rates.	Your comments will be given due consideration and will be used along with others to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Mr Richard Luke		Supports the high growth option and believes the City needs a firm policy approach to reversing population decline.	Your comments will be given due consideration and will be used along with others to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy
Miss Karen Simpson		Supports the high growth option and believes that the employment development needs to be balanced with an appropriate residential offer.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
Mr R Luke		Supports high growth option and would like to see more residential and employment uses in Washington. Also believes that a firm policy is required in order to reverse population decline.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
Mrs Lydia James		Supports the high growth option and believes that the approach published as part of the 2013 Core Strategy document is still appropriate. Also considers the Greenbelt boundary is drawn too tightly around Springwell and believes it is a constraint to development.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy
Mrs Laura bailey		Supports the high growth option and would like to see more residential and employment uses in Washington to support workers at Nissan	Your comments will be given due consideration and will be used alongside others to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy



Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Mrs Janet James		Supports the high growth option and believes it is the only option to deliver and balance market with greater choice of type and tenure	Your comments will be given due consideration and will be used along with others to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
Mr Raymond Luke		Supports the higher growth option and would like to see more high quality housing in Washington to support developments at Nissan	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
Mr Grant Owen		Believes that the high growth option is the only realistic option to improve the choice of housing types and tenures in Sunderland.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
Mr Keith Culmer		Supports the high growth option and would like to see more residential development in Washington as it is considered a key industrial location within Sunderland and that housing provision needs to be balanced with the employment offer.	Your comments will be given due consideration and will be used along with others to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
Mrs Heidi Mallinson		Supports the high growth option an believes that the Greenbelt boundary is drawn so tightly around Springwell that it is a constraint to development that needs to be addressed	Your comments will be given due consideration and will be used with others to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Mrs Lillian Luke		Supports high growth option and believes that there is little scope for identification of medium and large housing allocations outside Green Belt/Strategic Breaks in Washington.	Your comments will be given due consideration and will be used alongside others to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
Mrs Pauline Carruth		Supports the high growth option and believes it is the only realistic option if there is to be an improvement in the choice of housing types and tenures in Sunderland. Would like to see more residential development in Washington	Your comments will be given due consideration and will be used along with other to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
Mr Rick Evershed		Supports the high growth option and would like to see more residential development in Washington as it is considered an attractive location to potential movers	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy
Mrs Wendy Culmer		Supports the higher growth option and would like to see more residential development in Washington as it is believed to be an attractive area for potential movers with more detached houses and lower vacancy rates.	Your comments will be given due consideration and will be used with other to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
miss carlin evershed		Supports the high growth option and would like to see more residential development in Washington. Believes that the Greenbelt boundary around Springwell is drawn too tightly and is a development constraint which needs to be addressed.	Your comments will be given due consideration and will be used along with others to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
Mrs Hannah Saltmarsh		Supports the high growth option and would like to see more residential development in Washington. Believes that the Greenbelt boundary is drawn too tightly around Springwell which is a development constraint which needs to be addressed.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
Mr David Storey		Supports the high growth option and believes that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate. Would like to see more residential developments and employment uses in North Sunderland and Washington. Suggests additional housing in Springwell and believes that the site at the bottom of Peareth Hall Road would be appropriate and would be a good site to increase good housing options within a short distance of new development at Nissan.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Mr Laurie Luke		Supports the high growth option and would like to see more residential development in Washington. Believes that Washington is a key industrial location and that housing provision needs to be balanced with the employment offer.	Your comments will be given due consideration and will be used along with others to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy
Mrs Isabel Saltmarsh		Supports the high growth option and would like to see the more residential development in Washington. Believes that the Greenbelt boundary around Springwell is drawn too tightly and is a key development constraint which needs to be addressed. so the core strategy presents an opportunity to take a more balanced approach towards economic development and housing choice, including the provision of aspirational housing.	Your comments will be given due consideration and will be used along with others to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Mrs Catherine Cowie		Supports the high growth option and would like to see more residential development in Washington. Also believes that the Green Belt boundary is drawn too tightly around Springwell and is a key development constraint which needs to be addressed. Also the core strategy presents an opportunity to take a more balanced approach towards economic development and housing choice, including the provision of aspirational housing.	Your comments will be given due consideration and will be used with others to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
Mr Stephen Carruth		Supports the high growth option and would like to see more residential development in Washington but believes there is little scope for medium and large housing allocations outside Green Belt/Strategic Breaks.	Your comments will be given due consideration and will be used along with others to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
Mrs Andrea Carruth		Supports the high growth option and would like to see more residential in Washington. The core strategy presents an opportunity to take a more balanced approach towards economic development and housing choice, including the provision of aspirational housing'	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Mr Jeremy Culmer		Supports the high growth option and believes that Washington is an attractive location with more detached houses and lower vacancy rates.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy
MR Lewis Culmer		Supports the high growth option and would like to see more residential development in Washington. Also believes that the Greenbelt boundary around Springwell is drawn too tightly and is a key development constraint which needs to be addressed.	Your comments will be given due consideration and will be used along with others to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
Mrs Rosy Evershed		Supports the high growth option and would like to see more residential development in Washington. Believes that the high growth option is the only realistic option if to a great choice in type and tenure.	Your comments will be given due consideration and will be used along with others to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy
Mr David Carruth		Supports the high growth option and would like to see more residential development in Washington. Believes that the core strategy represents an opportunity to enhance and extend local facilities.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with other will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Miss Bonnie Carruth		Supports the high growth option and would like to see more residential development in Washington. Believes that Washington is a key industrial location and housing provision needs to be balanced.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy
Saskia Storey		Supports the high growth option and would like to see more residential development in Washington. Believes that there is little scope for medium and large housing allocations outside Green Belt and Settlement Breaks. Also that Washington is a key industrial location within Sunderland and it needs to be balanced with housing provision.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
Johnston		Supports the high growth option and would like to see more residential development in Washington. Believes that Nissan and IAMP sites will deliver further economic growth which needs to be balanced with good quality housing provision and that Washington is an attractive location as it has more detached houses and lower vacancy rates.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Mr Terry Carruth		Supports the high growth option and would like to see more residential development in Washington. Believes that Washington is a key industrial location and that the housing provision needs to be balanced with the employment offer.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy
Mrs Rachel Weightman		Supports the high growth option and would like to see more residential development in Washington. Believes that the Greenbelt boundary around Springwell is drawn too tightly and is a key development constraint which needs to be addressed.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
Mrs Roz Hazell		Supports the high growth option and would like to see more residential development in Washington. Believes that the greenbelt boundary is drawn too tightly around Springwell which is a key development constraint which needs to be addressed in the Green Belt review.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with other will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
Mr Tony Johnston		Supports the high growth option and would like to see more residential development in Washington. Development at Nissan and IAMP needs to be balanced with good quality housing provision.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.



Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Carruth		Supports the high growth option and would like to see more residential development in Washington. Believes that there is little scope for medium and large housing allocations outside Green Belt and Strategic Breaks in Washington	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy
Miss Elaine Saltmarsh		Supports the high growth option and does not believe that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate. Would like to see more residential in Central Sunderland. Believes that the high growth option is the only realistic option to enable uplift in new homes and a greater choice of housing types and tenures.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with other will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
Miss Sarah Carruth		Supports the high growth option and would like to see more residential development in Washington. Believes that there is little scope for medium and large housing allocations outside Green Belt and Strategic Breaks in Washington	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
MR CLIVE SALTMARSH		Supports the high growth option and would like to see more residential development in Central and South Sunderland and Washington	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Mrs Juliette Goodenough		Supports the high growth option and would like to see more residential development in Washington. Believes that Washington is a key industrial location within Sunderland and that housing provision needs to be balanced with the employment offer.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
Mrs Lydia Badams		Supports the high growth option and would like to see more residential development and employment uses in Sunderland North and more residential development in Washington. Believes that there is sufficient retail provision in North Sunderland and that Washington is a key industrial location therefore the housing available needs to be related to the employment opportunities.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
Carruth		Supports the high growth option and would like to see more residential development in North Sunderland and Washington. The emerging core strategy presents an opportunity to take a more balanced approach towards economic development and housing choice, including aspirational housing.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Mr Kevin Saltmarsh		Supports the high growth option and would like to see more residential development in Washington. Believes that the high growth option is the only realistic option if there is to be an uplift in new homes and greater choice of housing types and tenures in Sunderland.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy
Carruth		Supports the high growth option and would like to see more residential development in Washington. Believes that Nissan and IAMP sites will deliver further economic growth, which needs to be balanced with good quality housing provision.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
Mr Neil Saltmarsh		Supports the high growth option and would like to see more residential developments in all of the sub areas, as well as more employment uses in South and North Sunderland and Washington. Washington is believed to be an attractive location with more detached houses and lower vacancy rates.	Your comments will be given due consideration and will be used along with others to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Mr Angus Walker		Supports the high growth option and would like to see more residential development and employment uses in Washington. Believes Washington is a good location and attractive to potential movers and suggests sites in Washington Springwell for development.	Your comments will be given due consideration and will be used along with others to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
Mrs Patsy Soulsby		Supports the high growth option and would like to see more residential development in Washington. Believes that the Greenbelt boundary around Springwell is a development constraint which needs to be addressed.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
Carruth		Supports the high growth option and would like to see more residential development in Washington. Believes that the Greenbelt boundary around Springwell is a key development constraint which needs to be addressed.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy
Mrs Esther Owen		Supports the high growth option and would like to see more residential development in Washington. Believes that the Greenbelt boundary around Springwell is drawn too tightly and is a development constraint which needs to be addressed.	Your comments will be given due consideration and will be used along with others to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Richard Culmer		Support for the high growth option and would like to see more residential development in Washington. The emerging core strategy presents an opportunity to take a more balanced approach towards economic development and housing choice, including aspirational housing.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy
Mr Gerry Carruth		Supports the high growth option and does not believe that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate and that the high growth option is the only realistic option if there is to be an uplift in new homes and improvement in the choice of housing types and tenures. Would like to see more residential development and employment uses in Washington as it believed to be an attractive location for potential movers with more detached houses and lower vacancy rates. The core strategy is also seen as an opportunity to enhance and extend the provision of community facilities.	Your comments will be given due consideration and will be used along with others to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Miss Carrie Culmer		Supports the high growth option and would like to see more residential development in Washington. The core strategy also represents an opportunity to enhance and extend the provision of community facilities.	Your comments will be given due consideration and will be used along with others to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
Ms Anneliese Hutchinson	Service Director Development and Public Protection Gateshead Council	Concerned that a significant change in migration patterns between Sunderland and Gateshead could affect the implementation of the objectives in their Local Plan not just for housing but for retailing and services as well.	Your comments have been noted and given due consideration. Sunderland City Council will continue to work with Gateshead Council under the duty-to-cooperate to fully understand the cross boundary issues of the Core Strategy.
Ms Anneliese Hutchinson	Service Director Development and Public Protection Gateshead Council	IAMP: Desire to work with Sunderland and South Tyneside on a greater understanding of the implications of the IAMP and if neighbouring areas are to benefit and support the delivery of the project, land use and economic development policies will need to appropriately take account of its potential impacts. At this point they encourage a review of the IAMP's impact on housing needs that appropriately considers the full demographic and labour force implications of the additional jobs growth that will be delivered by the project.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration. The IAMP Topic papers are being updated; including the housing needs impact paper.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Ms Anneliese Hutchinson	Service Director Development and Public Protection Gateshead Council	Green Belt & 2013 Spatial Development emphasis- if growth levels were broadly acceptable across authorities, the 2013 emphasis for residential development in South Sunderland with only limited development in Washington would be supported. Noted concern that the 'majority' of areas around Nissan, Usworth and Springwell are not seen to be fundamental to Green Belt purpose at Stage 1, unlike in other parts of the city.	Noted. The majority of Green Belt land around Springwell Village is shown to be fundamental to the purpose of Green Belt. However, the key point here is that areas of Green Belt that clearly have an element of 'urban fringe' tend to have less of a fundamental impact than areas of isolated open countryside that is physically separated to urban areas. Sites taken forward to Stage 2 of the Green Belt Review will be further analysed but this should not be seen as an indication that the land would be suitable for Green Belt deletion.
Ms Anneliese Hutchinson	Service Director Development and Public Protection Gateshead Council	Green Belt Review: Locations considered appropriate for further consideration within Sunderland Green Belt Review include a number of areas which we consider, should they come forward for development, would compromise the gaps between major urban areas: particularly between Tyneside, and Sunderland and Washington. We request that those sites are discounted from Sunderland Green Belt Review.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Ms Anneliese Hutchinson	Service Director Development and Public Protection Gateshead Council	Green Belt (IAMP): The impact of the IAMP on Green Belt purposes will depend on its detailed location, design and layout. Gateshead anticipates that Sunderland and South Tyneside Councils would have due regard to the importance of continuing to fulfil Green Belt purposes as far as practicable and avoid bridging strategic Green Belt gaps, in particular between Gateshead (at Follingsby) and Sunderland, or severing strategic green infrastructure corridors.	Comments noted. The entire area has been put forward for further consideration primarily due to its inclusion as an NSIP. However, we note the concern regarding impact to Green Belt purpose and these have been already flagged-up as having "major overall adverse impact" in the Green Belt Review. The key impacts to Green Belt gaps and to preserving green infrastructure corridors will be considered carefully and in consultation with Gateshead MBC.
Councillor Colin Wakefield	Sunderland City Council	Would like to see the Coalfields referred to as Houghton Le Spring.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration.
Councillor Colin Wakefield	Sunderland City Council	Employment: Options focus on housing, the only employment opportunities referred to are at the IAMP with no detail provided on employment and retail opportunities within the area referred to as the Coalfield.	Your comments have been noted. The Core Strategy will also include policies and land for supporting economic growth, over and above that envisaged at the IAMP. This will include employment sites within the Coalfield. The Council's Employment Land Review and Retail Needs Assessment's will be used to inform these policies within the emerging plan.



Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Councillor Colin Wakefield	Sunderland City Council	Housing: The options do not take into consideration the housing growth that has taken place in the coalfields since the last consultation.	Your comments have been noted, housing growth in the area will be taken into account in preparing Spatial Option for the Area. Ref IDP.
Councillor Colin Wakefield	Sunderland City Council	Retailing: More retail development is needed in Houghton Town Centre. Concerned that out of centre retail development has been granted at Philadelphia and may come forward at Rain ton Bridge. There are sites in Houghton which would be better suited to new development such as the former colliery site and the old gas works to the south of the colliery.	Comments noted. The Council has prepared an updated Retail Needs Assessment and this will be used to inform the retail policies within the Core Strategy.
Councillor Colin Wakefield	Sunderland City Council	No clear proposals for retail or employment uses other than the IAMP. Coalfields need more/new retail provision. Need to take better account of residents' views.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration. The ELR has been used in informing Development Management decisions and it will be taken forward as evidence to inform the Publication Plan. There is also a Retail Needs Assessment that will be used to inform the Publication Plan.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Councillor Colin Wakefield	Sunderland City Council	Residents' views are not listened to and Consultation was not published very well - responses will not be representative of area.	Your comments have been noted. This document has outlined how the Council has consulted on the Growth Options. As this is a non-statutory consultation the level of consultation has been considered appropriate.
Mr Adrian Miller	Esh Developments	Proposals to extend SHLAA site 330 to accommodate 170 dwellings in the Green Belt.	Your comments have been noted and given due consideration. The Council has updated the 2016 SHLAA and Green Belt Review. SHLAA site formerly known as 330 is now identified as 330A and the extension (phase 6) as 330B. SHLAA site assessments for 330A & 330B can be found in the 2016 SHLAA update report and the Green Belt site assessment is available in the Green Belt Review report.
Mr Adrian Miller	Esh Developments	High growth supported. Low and medium growth would be planning for decline, and would not correspond to NPPF Para 154 that Local Plans be aspirational but realistic.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration.
Mr Adrian Miller	Esh Developments	Considers that the approach for the 5 ARFs is still applicable- including Coalfield.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Mr Adrian Miller	Esh Developments	<p>Philadelphia (330) - The yield for the site is 500 dwellings, which reflects the quantum granted within the outline permission and these are projected to be built out at a rate of 30 dwellings per annum, with the final 80 dwellings being delivered after the plan period (post 15 years). It is our view that a site of this size and in this location could be developed at a quicker rate than 30 dwellings per annum. Due to the scale of the development it is likely that there will be multiple sales outlets within the site, increasing sales rates and providing different types of product across the site. The size of the site provides opportunities for multiple products to be sold simultaneously in addition to the phased release of affordable housing. As a result delivery is likely to exceed 30 dwellings per annum over the plan period and thus the 80 shown as Post 15 in the SHLAA assessment will be delivered inside the plan period. Dependent upon the outcome of the Green Belt Review and subsequent adoption of the Local Plan it is considered logical that a large part of</p>	<p>Your comments have been noted and given due consideration. The Council has updated the 2016 SHLAA. SHLAA site formerly known as 330 is now identified as 330A and the extension (phase 6) as 330B. SHLAA site assessments for 330A &amp; 330B can be found in the 2016 SHLAA update report.</p>

<b>Full Name</b>	<b>Organisation Details</b>	<b>Summary of Response</b>	<b>Council response</b>
		the phase 6 area, providing c.170 dwellings, will also be delivered within the 15 year period.	

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Mr David Anderson	Hall Construction	Low Growth would not meet OAN and therefore be contrary to national policy. The Council has had persistent under-delivery against previous (now revoked) RSS targets. The modelling should be refreshed to take account of the latest population projections. Concerned that the modelling uses a 'baseline' jobs forecast and does not take account of jobs growth as a result of policy interventions such as IAMP and the Northern Powerhouse. Medium Growth would not significantly boost the supply of housing as required by the NPPF. High growth is preferred.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration. The Council is updating its demographic projections to take account of the recently published 2014 based sub-national population projections and the DCLG published household projections derived from these. The impacts of IAMP have been taken into consideration for all of the Growth Options.
Mr Ian Radley	Highways England	No preferred growth option. Particularly interested in the quantum and spatial distribution of development and the resulting implications.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration
Jennifer Morrison	Tyne and Wear Archaeology Officer	No specific comments on the Growth Options but would prefer a low growth option to protect the greenfield around historic settlements and villages.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration. Check how comment is worded.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Mr Ryan Molloy	Thompsons Of Prudhoe	Thompson's wish to extend their licence beyond current permission to 2022 and believe that other types of development on the land would be inappropriate and only the recycling activities should be allowed on the site in future.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration.
Mr Ryan Molloy	Thompsons Of Prudhoe	Formal objection to fields SP6, 12 and 13 being included in Stage 2 of the Green Belt Review- contrary to Paragraph 123 of NPPF. The land immediately to the south of the site, included in field SP6, as well as field SP12 and the northern part of SP13 includes land that is immediately adjacent to the operational areas within the quarry. The operator has concerns that the development of residential properties in close proximity to the quarry, such as these fields, will have an adverse impact on their ability to continue operations at this site. This is essentially because the residential properties will be too close to the operational areas and they may struggle to meet any conditions placed on them by the Environment Agency or the LPA.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration. The Green Belt Review and SHLAA will address these issues.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
	The Coal Authority	The Coal Authority has no particular preference in respect of the growth options proposed for the plan area as this should be a matter for local consideration. The site allocation methodology will need to include criterion that refer to and consider the issues of land stability and mineral sterilisation in line with NPPF guidance.	Your comments have been noted and given due consideration.
Mr Steven Willcocks	Taylor Wimpey	Supports the High Growth and the 5 ARF approach. Puts forward information supporting the Burdon Lane site.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration
Mr Steven Willcocks	Taylor Wimpey	Supports the High Growth option and the 5 ARF approach. Provides further information for sites at Chester Road and Sea ham Road	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration
Mr Steven Willcocks	Taylor Wimpey	Support High Growth option but claim that Washington has a greater role to play in providing much needed housing development.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Barbara King		Preferred low growth with the flexibility of moving to medium growth if there is sufficient demand. Plan should be reflect the needs of the city and not be led by unrealistic government targets. Should be flexible to meet actual demand in the city and not focus as much on sub areas.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration. The Council will follow the latest guidance set out within the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) when identifying its preferred strategy, which will include taking into consideration local market indicators. Consideration will also be given to inclusion of a phasing strategy.
Mr Tim Harrison	National Grid/Capita	No comments but is happy to provide advice and guidance in the future.	The Council welcomes this response and will continue to work with National Grid on the preparation of the Local Plan.
Miss Katie Rumble	Development Surveyor Hellens Group	Supports the Higher Growth option. This is the only strategy that will meet the Council's aspirations for economic growth.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration



Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Miss Katie Rumble	Development Surveyor Hellens Group	Support for more housing development in Washington. NPPF is clear that Local Plans must be effective in that they should be deliverable, the 2013 Core Strategy was heavily reliant upon regeneration sites and new housing in South Sunderland and this approach is considered to be unsound as the strategy is not deliverable. Such an approach is likely to result in an under provision of housing land and therefore a failure to meet the objectively assessed needs of the housing market area.	Your comments have been noted and given due consideration. The Council has updated its SHMA, 2016 SHLAA, Demographic Analysis and Forecasts, Economic Viability Assessment and Green Belt Review which have subsequently informed the spatial distribution of housing in the Core Strategy and Development Management Plan. The Council will continue to work closely with the house building industry and the SHLAA panel to ensure that future annual updates of SHLAA continue to reflect the true deliverability of sites.
Miss Katie Rumble	Development Surveyor Hellens Group	Hellens disagree with SHLAA assessment for sites 407 & 408. Hellens propose that the only constraint to development is the location of the sites within the Green Belt. If the council is minded to release land from the Green Belt, development of sites 407 and 408 could commence within the 5 year period, which would assist the Council in provide for a 5 year housing land supply.	Your comments have been noted and given due consideration. The Council has updated its 2016 SHLAA, five year land supply position and Green Belt Review. Site specific comments for sites 407 and 408 can be found within the respective documents.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Miss Katie Rumble	Development Surveyor Hellens Group	SLR and Green belt comments on SLR site 407 and 408. Disagree with the landscape, townscape and historic environment elements of the SLR that development of this land will have a high and significant impact and that development provides opportunity to enhance biodiversity and wildlife corridor connections. Believes that site 407 (GB site SP13) should have a lower scoring in relation to its impact on urban sprawl and site 408 should have a lower scoring in relation to countryside encroachment and settlement merging.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration. The SHLAA, SLR and the Green Belt Reviews will be updated to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy and your comments will be used to inform them. A separate report will also consider all sites submitted for potential development in the Green Belt against the 5 purposes.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Miss Katie Rumble	Development Surveyor Hellens Group	<p>BGVA Springwell Village Housing Needs Assessment submitted. Scenario one shows that without a Green Belt release, the level of housing delivered in Springwell Village will lead to a significant fall in the overall population and demonstrative ageing of that population. Scenario one projects falls in all age groups under 60. This will have a particular impact on the local school, nursery, community centre and shops. Scenario two assesses the impact that a Green Belt release and the development of 250 dwellings would have on the population of Springwell Village. Scenario two clearly shows that new housing could have a beneficial impact on the population and vitality of the Village. Scenario two would lead to increases in all sections of the population, including infants, primary school age children, young working age persons and older working age persons. Whilst this would entail an increase in the population of 21% over the 30 year projection period, this would support the existing services in the Village including the pubs, school, nursery,</p>	<p>The BGVA Springwell Village Housing Needs Assessment has been noted. The Council has updated its SHMA, SHLAA, Demographic Analysis and Forecasts and Green Belt Review Assessment which has subsequently informed the spatial distribution of housing in the Core Strategy and Development Management Plan.</p>

<b>Full Name</b>	<b>Organisation Details</b>	<b>Summary of Response</b>	<b>Council response</b>
		community centre, local shops, park and the church.	

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Miss Katie Rumble	Development Surveyor Hellens Group	Report providing an overview of the potential suitability of land for development on the outskirts of Springwell Village. Hellens have undertaken a substantial number of assessments to establish the suitability of development of the site for housing, a range of assessments have been undertaken to establish if and how the site could be developed. The technical appraisals have concluded that the site is largely free of development constraints with regards to potential ecological, highways, heritage, landscape, flooding, and noise impacts. The only constraint to development is the location of the sites within the Green Belt	Your comments have been noted and given due consideration. The Council has updated the 2016 SHLAA and Green Belt Assessment. SHLAA site assessments for Hellens' land interests can be found in the 2016 SHLAA update report and Green Belt Assessment.
Miss Katie Rumble	Development Surveyor Hellens Group	Report presenting the results of an archaeological desk-based assessment and heritage statement, conducted in advance of a proposed development at Springwell.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration
Adam McVickers	Planner Persimmon Homes	Support High Growth option but claim that Washington has a greater role to play in providing much needed housing development.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration

<b>Full Name</b>	<b>Organisation Details</b>	<b>Summary of Response</b>	<b>Council response</b>
Adam McVickers	Planner Persimmon Homes	Supports the High Growth and the 5 ARF approach. Puts forward information supporting the Burdon Lane site.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration
Mrs Suzanne Todd	Property Management Surveyor University of Sunderland	The University would like Sunderland Council to pro-actively plan to meet development needs in area. Low option would fail to meet OAN target and therefore the University do not consider it to be a sound approach.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Mrs Suzanne Todd	Property Management Surveyor University of Sunderland	<p>Medium option May 2016 pop figures would suggest that Sunderland OAN needs uplifting. The University recommends these figures are taken into account. In conclusion the University is concerned that the medium growth option is not sustainable as it has not been prepared in line with the NPPF and it would not significantly boost the supply of house building. Seek clarification on whether student housing is included as part of the OAN. There is also concern that the jobs number used is a 'baseline' position and does not reflect positive interventions such as IAMP or the Northern Powerhouse. The University therefore prefers high growth option but recommends that baseline data is updated.</p>	<p>Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration. The Council is updating its demographic projections to take account of the recently published 2014 based sub-national population projections and the DCLG published household projections derived from these. Student accommodation was not taken into consideration as part of this and will be dealt with separately. All growth options include an uplift to support the delivery of IAMP.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Mrs Suzanne Todd	Property Management Surveyor University of Sunderland	The University believe that it is key that growth is promoted within locations where there are realistic delivery prospects. In addition, the University consider that the sub-area boundaries should be influenced by the analysis of data and modelling of scenarios for those sub-areas. This will ensure that the correct policy interventions are made and that development is appropriately located. The University requests clarification as to the relationship between the sub-areas identified on the Growth Options Map and the housing areas identified within the SHLAA as, at present, these do not correspond and further clarity would be beneficial in this respect.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration. If the areas don't match should we be explaining why?
Mrs Suzanne Todd	Property Management Surveyor University of Sunderland	The Central sub-area should be expanded to support the vision set out in SEM and 369 Vision- increased scale and distinctiveness	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration.
Mr Nick Mclellan	Story Homes	Supports the High Growth and the 5 ARF approach. Puts forward information supporting the Burdon Lane site.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration



Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Mr Nick Mclellan	Story Homes	Support High Growth option but claim that Washington has a greater role to play in providing much needed housing development.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration
Mr James Reid	Strategic Land Buyer Barratt David Wilson Homes	Growth Options because of past under-delivery and to meet SEP regional growth, the Council needs to substantially increase housing delivery. Typically, new housing sites are delivered at 35 housing pa per site.	Your comments have been noted. 35 build-outs for BDW sites are noted. The Council has revised the SHLAA Methodology which allows for developer specific build out rates to be forecast for their sites, where evidence of previous delivery at such rates can be demonstrated.
Mr James Reid	Strategic Land Buyer Barratt David Wilson Homes	Vote for High Growth at least. Low growth is contrary to NPPF. Population projections need to reflect 2014 and not 2012, which shows 6000 more people in Sunderland by 2035. Also that the IAMP jobs/housing addition of 10 requires unrealistic change in commuting and unemployment levels.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration. The population projections are being updated. The IAMP Impact papers are also being updated.
Mr James Reid	Strategic Land Buyer Barratt David Wilson Homes	Barratt David Wilson Homes considers that it is also important and best practice to include an element of flexibility within the emerging Plan to allow for non-delivery, which is typically in the order of 10%.	Your comments have been noted and given due consideration. The Council will ensure that there is typically around 10% additional housing land supply that is deliverable or developable, to allow for flexibility in the market over the lifetime of the plan.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Mr James Reid	Strategic Land Buyer Barratt David Wilson Homes	Barratt David Wilson Homes therefore considers that the Washington Sub-Area should accommodate further housing growth to complement IAMP and capture the economic growth potential of this proposal. Land east of Sulgrave in particular. Greenfield land and sustainable locations are needed, and need to properly reflect the knock-on requirements from IAMP.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration.
Mr James Reid	Strategic Land Buyer Barratt David Wilson Homes	Specific proposal for land east of Sulgrave for residential development. It is proposed that the development would support the IAMP and provide housing that workers aspire to.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration. Various reports will be updated to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy as well as a separate report to consider all sites submitted for potential development in the Greenbelt against the 5 purposes.
Mr James Reid	Strategic Land Buyer Barratt David Wilson Homes	Should be seeking High Growth Option as a minimum	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Mr James Reid	Strategic Land Buyer Barratt David Wilson Homes	BDW is aware there has been significant under delivery and unmet need in Sunderland historically that should be taken into account. This coupled with the ambitious IAMP proposals and progrowth objectives of SCC must drive the emerging strategy. Question city's past under delivery.	Your comments have been noted and given due consideration. The Council has updated the SHLAA and five year land supply position. Within this report the Council has applied a 20% buffer to reflect a record of persistent under delivery of housing. The application of the buffer assists to bring forward housing from later in the plan period and to increase choice in the market for housing.
Mr James Reid	Strategic Land Buyer Barratt David Wilson Homes	Supports the recognition that there is a need for additional housing and employment land within the Washington sub area	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration
Mr James Reid	Strategic Land Buyer Barratt David Wilson Homes	BDW fully supports SCC's decision to carry US1 through to stage 2 but requests that site boundary of US1 be altered to reflect the SLR's outline.	Your comments have been noted. To inform the next draft of the Core Strategy a separate report will consider all sites submitted for potential development in the Greenbelt against the 5 purposes.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Mr James Reid	Strategic Land Buyer Barratt David Wilson Homes	Support for SHLAA site 567 at Stone Cellar Road, Washington. It would provide a logical extension to Washington urban area and already has a number of boundaries with urban area. Does not represent countryside encroachment and does not impact on merging of settlements. Would like to see the site split from rest of Green Belt parcel US1.	In addition to the Green Belt review, a separate report will consider all submitted development sites (in Green Belt) in relation to the Green belt's 5 purposes. At this stage it is acknowledged that the impact of Site 567 is much less than wider parcel of US1.
Mr Colin Ford		High growth favoured. Out-migration is as a result of a lack of housing supply and choice. The only way to halt and reverse out-migration is through a high growth strategy. This would be more sustainable as it would reduce the amount of long-distance commuting. More development should also be focussed in the Coalfield area.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration.
Mr Colin Ford		North of Hetton Bogs SLR sheet 181 disagree wildlife and flooding assessments, with the appropriate mitigation the development would have no impact. A detailed plan of the site would prove that this is possible.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration
Mr Clive Milner		Supports the findings of the Green Belt Review.	Your comments have been noted.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Mr Clive Milner		The SLR assessment needs an update and needs to acknowledge the scheme to improve Washington Road and the ecology work that has been carried out. Object to the assessment on flooding and the existing pylons and overall suitability. The land owner has now commissioned further assessment of the site to identify if there are no substantive reasons to prevent future development.	Comments will be given due consideration and will be used along with other to inform the update of the SHLAA and SLR.
Mr Clive Milner		Supports medium to high growth. Low growth would fail to meet the Council's OAN and would not be consistent with the NPPF.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration.
Mr Clive Milner		Don't feel that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy for Washington is still appropriate. The development of the proposals for the IAMP which will see significant growth in jobs should be reflected in housing growth as well and these homes should be situated so that they don't encourage people to travel great distances.	Your comments have been noted. The Core Strategy will take coherent approach to planning of this area taking into account housing and employment opportunities.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Ms Anneliese Hutchinson	Service Director Development and Public Protection Gateshead Council	Gateshead does not believe that the Green Belt Review for land at Usworth has reached a defensible conclusion.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration. This is an important green infrastructure and wildlife corridor along the River Don and Sunderland CC has noted that South Follingsby allocation has narrowed this corridor significantly. The remaining areas to be considered further at Stage 2 will duly reflect the significance of the potential impacts that any scale of development would have in the area.
Ms Anneliese Hutchinson	Service Director Development and Public Protection Gateshead Council	Development at Springwell on any significant scale of sites to the north and/or west would risk joining the built up areas of Washington/Springwell with Gateshead, or narrowing the Green Belt in this vicinity to the extent of endangering its integrity.	Comments noted, particularly the concern regarding impact to the gap between Springwell Village and Eighton Banks/Wrekenton, which effectively maintains a green corridor from the west of this area to the coast. The remaining areas to be considered further at Stage 2 will duly reflect the significance of the potential impacts would have in the area.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Ms Anneliese Hutchinson	Service Director Development and Public Protection Gateshead Council	A number of the SLR sites are within important inter district wildlife corridors. Any development related to IAMP needs to give due consideration to Landscape and ecological mitigation zone• .	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration. Further work will be undertaken (and in consultation with Gateshead MBC) to ensure that sensitive areas are safeguarded from development (where appropriate levels of mitigation is impractical and unviable). Agreed that Gateshead MBC and Sunderland CC (and South Tyneside MBC) need to work closely together regarding appropriate mitigation, should any development come forward (and especially in relation to IAMP).
Ms Anneliese Hutchinson	Service Director Development and Public Protection Gateshead Council	Keen to work with the Council to gain a better understanding of how the potential adverse impacts of development on the transport network can be avoided or mitigated. Given the potential scale of development that could take place nearby, Gateshead Council would support a proposal to re-open the Leamside line for freight or passenger access. We are keen to work with neighbouring local authorities to explore the potential for this.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration. Agreed that Gateshead MBC and Sunderland CC need to work closely together regarding any mitigation that may be required.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Cllr Geoffrey Walker	Councillor	Consultation has not been far reaching. What are the plans for future consultation both with the public and internally.	Your comments have been noted. This document has outlined how the Council has consulted on the Growth Options. As this is a non-statutory consultation the level of consultation has been considered appropriate. At the next stage of consultation members will be informed of the methods and material to be used in advance. Refer to the Statement of Community Involvement
Cllr Geoffrey Walker	Councillor	How will the impact of growth on neighbourhoods, highways and infrastructure be assessed?	Your comments have been noted. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will outline the infrastructure that is required to deliver the level of development that is proposed.
Mark Gabriele	Bellway Homes Ltd	Low growth negative, Medium growth not sufficiently ambitious. High growth preferred. Suggests that the SA broadly supports high growth option, in terms of supporting sustainable economic growth, supporting a demographically missed population and reducing the present out-migration of younger people. The environmental risks to high growth can be mitigated through the choice of appropriate sites and the formulation of suitable policies to help manage	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration.



Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
		delivery.	
Mark Gabriele	Bellay Homes Ltd	5 area approach is correct- South Sunderland has potential, while Washington and some other parts are constrained by GB. Points out that SHMA states that 32% of migrants moved to Southern Suburbs, but 22% to Washington and 22% to Coalfield.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Gillan Gibson	Secretary CPRE Durham	Pleased to note most of the sites assessed as red, not suitable for development in the SLR but unhappy to see some sites assessed as requiring further assessment in the Green Belt Review Stage 2 and would prefer that they remain protected Green Belt without further consideration. Do have a major caveat in that they do accept that a case can be made for the deallocation of the sites in the IAMP to permit the use of Green Belt land for specialised employment use. No doubt about the benefits that Nissan and other specialised advanced engineering companies and their supporting businesses bring to the area.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration.
Gillan Gibson	Secretary CPRE Durham	Prefer the medium growth option. It is hoped that the release of sites will be controlled so that settlement breaks and Green Belt would be the last to be released and if development is slower than predicted then they may not be required at all.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration. Consideration will also be given to inclusion of a phasing strategy.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Gillan Gibson	Secretary CPRE Durham	No objection to conclusions regarding Herrington Workingmen's Club, and local residents inform them that development would enhance the area.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration
Gillan Gibson	Secretary CPRE Durham	Green Belt - sites coloured Amber. CPRE accepts that Houghton Quarry is a previously developed site. IAMP - Concern about site and inconsistency between this and SLR 805 consideration. However, general acceptance of wider need for jobs, prefers IAMP Option 3 and requests that all remaining non-IAMP land be retained as Green belt in future	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration. With regards to IAMP and site 805 the SLR sheets broadly assessed all areas of open countryside and we accept that the separate treatment of this area as an Area Action Plan makes the approach to consider Green Belt and Strategic Land confusing.
Gillan Gibson	Secretary CPRE Durham	Green belt - sites coloured Red. CPRE is pleased to see this site assessed as red, not suitable for development, and trusts it will remain listed as not suitable for development in the Local Plan. CPRE would say they have a definite preference for development to take place on brownfield sites (other than those which have become important for wildlife conservation) rather than Green Belt.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration. The preferred Growth Option chosen will have a key influence on whether additional sites need to be found for future development, including on Green Belt land. Stage 2 of the Green Belt Review will be prepared and inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Gillan Gibson	Secretary CPRE Durham	Settlement Break - sites coloured Green. CPRE is unhappy to see this site assessed as green• , suitable for development, and objects to this designation. CPRE considers this site should remain as a Settlement Break in the Local Plan and be assessed as red• , not suitable for development. The site is a valuable part of maintaining separation between settlements. CPRE would say we have a definite preference for development to take place on brownfield sites (other than those which have become important for wildlife conservation) rather than Settlement.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration. The Council has identified as many brownfield sites as possible. The Settlement Break Review has identified the value and purpose of each Settlement Break area, and considered these as suitable for development.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Gillan Gibson	Secretary CPRE Durham	Settlement Break - sites coloured Amber. CPRE is unhappy to see this site assessed as amber• , potentially suitable for development, and objects to this designation. CPRE considers this site should remain as a Settlement Break in the Local Plan and be assessed as red• , not suitable for development. The site is a valuable part of maintaining separation between settlements. CPRE would say we have a definite preference for development to take place on brownfield sites (other than those which have become important for wildlife conservation) rather than Settlement Breaks.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration. The settlement break sites identified as amber have been done so on the ground that their development would have minimal impact on the Settlement Break and where there is any it could be mitigated against.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Gillan Gibson	Secretary CPRE Durham	Settlement Break - sites coloured Red. CPRE is pleased to see this site assessed as red• , not suitable for development, and trusts it will remain listed as not suitable for development in the Local Plan. CPRE would say we have a definite preference for development to take place on brownfield sites (other than those which have become important for wildlife conservation) rather than Settlement Breaks.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration. The Settlement Break Review will be reviewed and will inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
Larry Hetherington		Transport infrastructure is poor and would not be able to support the higher growth option	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will set out the infrastructure that is required to deliver the Plan and how it will be funded.
Brian ODoherty		Need a better explanation in the Plan of S106 and CIL are, what monies might be involved and how this might be distributed throughout the city.	Comments noted. The Council will seek to make clear in the Core Strategy the different types of planning contributions available. With regard to the potential for CIL, the Council will be investigating the viability of introducing a CIL through its Whole Plan Viability Assessment. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will set out the infrastructure that is required to deliver the Plan and how it will be funded.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Brian ODoherty		Believes that building in the green belt to the north should be avoided so as not to merge with Gateshead and South Tyneside	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration
Brian ODoherty		Disappointed that a local business was not given the task of preparing the sustainability appraisal.	When procuring services the City Council has a policy of using local firms where possible through the "Sunderland First"; on this occasion no local firms had the appropriate expertise.
Brian ODoherty		Prefer the medium growth option.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration
Brian ODoherty		Building socially rented properties could prove to be problematic	Your comments have been noted and given due consideration
Lucy Mo	Wear Catchment Coordinator Wear Catchment Partnerships	No Growth Option is preferred- it is accepted that there is a need for growth, though this should not be at the expense of the environment. It is vital that consideration is given to the social, economic, environmental and health benefits of existing green belt, settlement breaks / green space.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration during the preparation of the Local Plan and the Sustainability Appraisal.
Lucy Mo	Wear Catchment Coordinator Wear Catchment Partnerships	Should be seeking to protect and enhance green and blue infrastructure, in line with WFD and RBMP which seek to improve water quality levels.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Lucy Mo	Wear Catchment Coordinator Wear Catchment Partnerships	The finding of the UK Topsoil project should feed into environmental policies, especially its findings in relation to surface and groundwater and its impact in Coalfield area	The findings of this project will be considered once they are known.
Lucy Mo	Wear Catchment Coordinator Wear Catchment Partnerships	Proposed development must have sufficient headroom and sewer capacity to avoid spills into watercourses	Your comments have been noted and work is on going with Northumbrian Water
Lucy Mo	Wear Catchment Coordinator Wear Catchment Partnerships	Council should adopt a catchment management approach to flood risk to ensure knock-on effects do not happen elsewhere	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration
Lucy Mo	Wear Catchment Coordinator Wear Catchment Partnerships	The SA should state that the hydrogeological link between managing surface water and groundwater should be made explicit and recognised as a priority risk- especially relevant in SPZ areas. Should reflect climate change events that will increase frequency of flash run-off from agricultural areas which will impact on water quality negatively. It should specifically mention water quality and water pollution. Further specific references to SA, including need to avoid infiltrated SUDS being allowed above	Your comments have been noted and will be considered in revisions to SA.



Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
		SPZ areas.	
Richard Percy	Partner Abbott Associates	High growth option preferred, as a minimum, if Sunderland is to develop as a Sustainable City. Clear market signals for development in Washington, plus need to reverse population decline, increase working age population, and increase detached properties. There is a clear need for the Plan to seek a balance between housing and employment growth.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Richard Percy	Partner Abbott Associates	It is believed that the Greenbelt is too tightly defined around Springwell Village and that the environmental protection afforded by the historic Green Belt has clearly had adverse social and economic impacts (e.g. leading to significant in-commuting and a mis-match between economic growth and housing choice). The emerging Core Strategy presents an opportunity to take a more balanced approach to these aspects as required by the NPPF.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration. The Council will assess the Greenbelt boundary through its Greenbelt Assessment.
Richard Percy	Partner Abbott Associates	The Local Plan must ensure that appropriate infrastructure provision is made.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will set out the infrastructure that is required to deliver the Plan and how it will be funded
Nigel Harrison	Tyne and Wear Joint Local Access Forum	The forum is concerned that public rights of way are not obstructed as part of future developments and would like to see any amended routes upgraded to bridleways to enable wider use of routes.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration.
Nigel Harrison	Tyne and Wear Joint Local Access Forum	Request confirmation of this letter being received and what action will be or has been taken to include the forum on any list of future consultees.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
	The Trustees of Lord Durham's 1989	Support high growth option. It is the only option which will allow the city to achieve its ambitions and deliver a sustainable future for the city. Low growth would be planning for decline and not meet the OAN. Medium growth is unsustainable as it is only seeking to deliver similar housing numbers to those being delivered now, which is at a time of declining population. The medium option is not sustainable as it increases commuting and does not provide enough working age population. A positive strategy should be pursued which supports economic growth, deliver a level of housing aligned to this level of growth, and creates neighbourhoods which can attract and retain households in the city. The evidence should be updated to reflect the 2014 sub-national population projections and Sunderland retaining more jobs created by IAMP than is suggested.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration. The Council is updating its demographic projections to take account of the recently published 2014 based sub-national population projections and the DCLG published household projections derived from these. Updates to the IAMP topic papers have been undertaken.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
	The Trustees of Lord Durham's 1989	<p>Housing market performance differs by area, driven by local variations across a variety of factors. In a post recession environment, the spatial alignment of housing demand (including locational preference) and supply is critical to maximise prospects of future delivery. Quite simply, if housing land is allocated in locations where buyers won't buy and builders won't build, it will not be taken up and homes will not be provided. Therefore the location of housing allocations is just as critical as the quantity.</p>	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration
	The Trustees of Lord Durham's 1989	<p>Supports the 2013 ARF approach- if the Coalfields area is to make a meaningful contribution to the delivery the High Growth scenario a higher number and broader range of sites across the area will be required to ensure new housing can be made available throughout the plan period</p>	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
	The Trustees of Lord Durham's 1989	Puts forward major Green belt site to south of St Aidans Terrace, New Herrington. It is claimed that the site is suitable, there are no constraints hence deliverable, available in the short term and a sustainable site, within easy access of facilities.	Some of the information that is presented is contrary to information presented on SLR sheets and will need to be considered further.
	The Trustees of Lord Durham's 1989	Puts forward major Green belt site at Biddick Woods. It is claimed that there are no constraints and it is a sustainable site, within easy access of facilities.	Contrary to SLR sheet which demonstrates significant GB issues; Critical Drainage Area, impact on buffer zone to LWS, distance to facilities, potential use as part of Leamside Line
		Supports the high growth option and does not believe that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate. Would like to see more residential development in Central and South Sunderland but no more retail. In Washington, North Sunderland and the Coalfields would like to see less residential development, employment uses and retail.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with other will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy
		Support for medium growth option and believes that more infrastructure is required in South Sunderland.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.

<b>Full Name</b>	<b>Organisation Details</b>	<b>Summary of Response</b>	<b>Council response</b>
Mr David Anderson	Hall Construction	More development in Washington needed	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration
Mr David Anderson	Hall Construction	Supports the Greenbelt report recommending that areas SP1, SP2 and SP3 are considered further at Stage 2 but SP4, SP5, SP7, SP8 and SP9 are not considered. Sunderland could potentially release land north of Usworth (applicant owns Follingsby South).	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration
Mr Ian Radley	Highways England	Have provided an assessment of sites included in the evidence base.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration
Andrea King	South Tyneside Spatial Planning	Growth options are not clear where additional growth is going to come from and how this fits with neighbouring authorities' projections and emerging local plan growth assumptions. Therefore welcome further detailed discussions to consider to what extent these higher projections are assumed to affect South Tyneside's projected population growth. South Tyneside are currently considering their alternative growth options and the potential spatial capacity for development and growth.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Andrea King	South Tyneside Spatial Planning	Provide more detailed comments on the Green Belt Review and the SLR. Concern about impact to GI corridor and Green Belt gap that runs between Sunderland and Boldon/Cleadon, plus the impact to areas of High Landscape Value and to Local Wildlife Sites.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration.
Mr David Bridge	Sunderland Civic Society	Suggestion that SHLAA points towards where GB deletion may occur. Believes that the Settlement Break Review opens up more land than is needed. Concerned about the scale of development proposed in the South Sunderland Growth Area and should be reduced. Believes that ONA is unrealistic and more detail is needed to assess the SHLAA sites but concerned that releasing sites from the Greenbelt that are not required would have a detrimental impact on the countryside and the regeneration of inner areas. Also the ELR is based on old take up rates and would appear that site locations do not meet demands.	The SHLAA sites that have been assessed as part of the Green Belt Review are submitted by external landowners or prospective developers, have been assessed against the same criteria and many have been discounted. Land to the north of IAMP has been considered at Green Belt Review Stage 2 because this entire area fell within the original NSIP boundary. It has been determined that settlement break land north of Burdon Lane (within SSGA) provides limited settlement break purpose and was earmarked in the UDP as having potential for development. SSGA is seen as strategically significant area for development to deliver future housing need in the city.
Mr David Bridge	Sunderland Civic Society	Prefer a Low to Medium Growth option.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Mr David Bridge	Sunderland Civic Society	Distribution of growth should include retail and office uses concentrated in the City Centre, Washington should only take a pro rata share of development due to pressure on green belt sites. Sunderland North should see development in order to halt decline and regenerate areas. In Sunderland South the preference is to encourage development within the existing urban area, especially the inner areas with development of greenfield sites kept to a minimum. Coalfields should see development in the north whilst improving the environment in the south	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration
Mr Andrew Moss	Wardhadaway	Clarifies details of a site to be included in the SHLAA	Your comments have been noted and your site(s) will be considered as part of the SHLAA.
Mr Andrew Moss	Wardhadaway	One of the Offerton sites has been omitted from SHLAA and needs reinstating	Your comments have been noted and given due consideration. The Council has updated the 2016 SHLAA. SHLAA site formerly known as 464 is now identified as 464A and the extension as 464B. SHLAA site assessments for 464A & 464B can be found in the 2016 SHLAA update report.



<b>Full Name</b>	<b>Organisation Details</b>	<b>Summary of Response</b>	<b>Council response</b>
Mr Andrew Moss	Wardhadaway	Need to plan for higher levels of growth	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration.
Mr Andrew Moss	Wardhadaway	IAMP should be encouraged	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration during the preparation of the Core Strategy and IAMP AAP.
Mr Andrew Moss	Wardhadaway	Local plan should provide a commensurate amount of housing development	Your comments have been noted and given due consideration.
Mr Andrew Moss	Wardhadaway	Should be a range and choice in the housing offer which should include executive housing.	Your comments have been noted and given due consideration.
Mr Andrew Moss	Wardhadaway	Site put forward in the SHLAA (464A & 464B) will help to provide executive housing which has an important role to play in achieving wider population and economic growth objectives for the region.	Your comments have been noted and given due consideration. The Council has updated the 2016 SHLAA. SHLAA site formerly known as 464 is now identified as 464A and the extension as 464B. SHLAA site assessments for 464A & 464B can be found in the 2016 SHLAA update report.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Mr Andrew Moss	Wardhadaway	It is believed that areas CO15 and CO31 assessed as part of the review are too large and parts of the areas could be released without causing material harm. It is not agreed that they are fundamental to the purposes of the Green Belt and should be retained in full. SHLAA sites 464A and 464B should be considered further at stage 2 as possible locations for a Green Belt Review.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration.
Mrs Pippa Cheetham	Planning Manager O&H Properties Ltd	Support the High Growth option.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration.
Mrs Pippa Cheetham	Planning Manager O&H Properties Ltd	Support the 2013 CS sub area split for development.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration.
Mrs Pippa Cheetham	Planning Manager O&H Properties Ltd	Intend to submit an outline application for up to 700 dwellings on the Groves site. Land in Newbottle also presents an opportunity to improve housing choice.	Your comments have been noted and given due consideration. Your comments have been noted and given due consideration. The capacity of SHLAA site 085 has been amended to 700 units to reflect the intent for the site.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Mrs Pippa Cheetham	Planning Manager O&H Properties Ltd	Support for the findings of the Green Belt Review and the assessment of HO22 and HO26 and would welcome a further assessments of HO19, HO22, HO23 and HO26. These sites could be combined to provide a substantial site.	Your comments have been noted. The Greenbelt report does not indicate that any of the areas (at this stage) are not essential to Greenbelt purpose, just that some are fundamental and have no need to be reviewed any further.
Mr Steve Hopkirk		Does not believe that the growth option choices provided are the correct path and should be more flexible. There should be scope to adjust between the options based on market conditions and actual demand. The target could be started low and increased if demand for housing picks up in a statistically significant way. This would allow the city to respond actual growth than projections or arbitrary targets. Concern that we will over allocate and identify greenfield sites for development, which could be avoided if a more flexible approach is adopted.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration. The Council will follow the latest guidance set out within the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) when identifying its preferred strategy, which will include taking into consideration local market indicators. Consideration will also be given to inclusion of a phasing strategy.
Mr Steve Hopkirk		Brexit makes the economic future of the City uncertain.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Mr Matthew Good	Planning Manager	High Growth option preferred but recommends the options are updated to take account of the recent population projections. Low option would condemn city to decline and would not meet the OAN. Concern over some of the assumptions used in the modelling work, including adjustments to economic activity rate, reductions in unemployment rate and commuting patterns. Concerns of under-delivery in past against the RSS target. The modelling uses a 'baseline' jobs figure and does not account for an uplift that could be generated by IAMP and Northern Powerhouse. Consideration should be given for an uplift in housing numbers to help meet affordable housing need.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration. The Council is updating its demographic projections to take account of the recently published 2014 based sub-national population projections and the DCLG published household projections derived from these. The impacts of IAMP have been taken into consideration for all of the Growth Options.
Mr Matthew Good	Planning Manager	Do not want to comment on the exact distribution of development but that the strategy provides a sufficient range of sites, more sites than are required and that they are viable.	Your comments have been noted and given due consideration.
Gillian Gibson	Public Health	A full health impact assessment should be commissioned once the growth option has been determined.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration. A Health Impact Assessment of the Core Strategy will be undertaken.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Gillian Gibson	Public Health	Generally work is good for physical and mental health, but the quality of work also matters. The low growth option, which indicates that economic growth could be harmed, could potentially damage the health of local people and may be contrary to the duty of the council to improve the health of the people of Sunderland.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration
Mr John Cooper		The amount of green belt land lost to IAMP should be sufficient for the City as a whole. Further loss will reduce attractiveness of City as place to live and do business.	Your comments have been noted. The Council has given further consideration as to whether Green Belt development is required to deliver the housing and employment strategy in the Core Strategy, through update of the SHLAA, Employment Land Review and Green Belt Assessment.
Mr John Cooper		Supports growth in economy but should not be through the loss of green belt. Secure development by using brownfield land.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration. The Council will give further consideration as to whether Green Belt development is required to deliver the strategy as the Core Strategy develops.. The plan will seek to prioritise development of brownfield sites

<b>Full Name</b>	<b>Organisation Details</b>	<b>Summary of Response</b>	<b>Council response</b>
Mr John Cooper		Caution is needed in relation to the number of new houses to be built. New houses do not mean that jobs will be created and new jobs do not necessarily require new houses local patterns of work show people often do not live and work in the same borough. Recognising recent falls in population, the number of houses to be built should reflect realistic population estimates	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration. Consideration to commuting patterns has been given as part of the demographic modelling work and will be used to inform the preferred strategy.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Miss Katie Rumble	Development Surveyor Hellens Group	Support for the 5 ARF approach and believes that additional sites needed in West. In line with high growth scenario, site 648 should be considered and that there are special circumstances exist to justify its release from the Greenbelt. These include the need to reduce out migration, alleviate pent up demand for housing, and meet the demand to build in strong market area and the need in the area for affordable and larger family housing. There are no known constraints on the site and it does not fit the 5 purposes of the Greenbelt. The potential S106 contribution from the development of the site could deliver much needed greenspace/sports pitches in the area.	Your comments have been noted. The information submitted is contrary to the Green Belt Stage 1 review and needs to be considered further.
Adam McVickers	Planner Persimmon Homes	Low Growth would not meet OAN and therefore be contrary to national policy.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Adam McVickers	Planner Persimmon Homes	Medium option stands below the revoked RSS level- does that therefore merit a significant boost to housing that the NPPF requires? Updated pop projections need to be used etc that show higher growth. Policy approach to jobs growth does not reflect IAMP or Northern Powerhouse- growth and housing need will be higher.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration. The Council is updating its demographic projections to take account of the recently published 2014 based sub-national population projections and the DCLG published household projections derived from these. The impacts of IAMP have been taken into consideration for all of the Growth Options.
Adam McVickers	Planner Persimmon Homes	High growth is more sustainable and reduces reliance on in-commuters	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration.
Adam McVickers	Planner Persimmon Homes	More housing focus should occur in Washington. High Growth leads to 2069 additional houses needed in plan period. Non-Green Belt sites currently discounted should remain so as they will be unreliable to come forward. Green Belt release of 2000 homes is required.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration.



Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Adam McVickers	Planner Persimmon Homes	The existing spread of sites in SHLAA exhausts South Sunderland and Coalfield, and this pushes need for deletion into Washington in particular. Washington is a strong market area, and it is a strong sustainable argument to locate these next to emerging jobs- particularly in light of IAMP.	Your comments have been noted. The Council has updated the 2016 SHLAA which has assisted to inform the spatial distribution of housing in the Core Strategy and Development Management Plan.
Lynn Hartridge		The Council needs to consider what comes first houses or jobs. Need to create some wealth in the way of jobs before the developers are allowed to build on Green Belt. Fear is that if jobs growth doesn't materialise then development will still take place on Green Belt.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration
Rachel Cooper		The amount of green belt land lost to IAMP should be sufficient for the City as a whole. Further loss will reduce attractiveness of City as place to live and do business.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration. The Council will give further consideration as to whether Green Belt development is required to deliver the strategy as the Core Strategy develops.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Rachel Cooper		Supports growth in economy but should not be through the loss of green belt. Secure development by using brownfield land.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration. The Council will give further consideration as to whether Green Belt development is required to deliver the strategy as the Core Strategy develops.. The plan will seek to prioritise development of brownfield sites
Rachel Cooper		Caution is needed in relation to the number of new houses to be built. New houses do not mean that jobs will be created and new jobs do not necessarily require new houses local patterns of work show people often do not live and work in the same borough. Recognising recent falls in population, the number of houses to be built should reflect realistic population estimates	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration. Consideration to commuting patterns has been given as part of the demographic modelling work and will be used to inform the preferred strategy.
Mr Nick Mclellan	Story Homes	Site extension to SHLAA reference 463, identified through concept plan with suggested mitigation.	Site promotion and suggested mitigation given due consideration. The Council has updated the 2016 SHLAA. SHLAA site formerly known as 463 is now identified as 463A and the extension as 463B. SHLAA site assessments for 463A & 463B can be found in the 2016 SHLAA update report.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Mr Nick Mclellan	Story Homes	High growth. Washington needs more housing growth than the 5 ARF split shows. There are a large number of housing sites in less popular areas of Sunderland that are undeliverable in the short term, by contrast these sites are in a popular location, are deliverable and in the short term and will help to address housing needs in the early part of the plan period.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration
Mr Nick Mclellan	Story Homes	Proposes Site 463 for development and supports Greenbelt assumption that the site should be considered for Greenbelt deletion. Puts forward that the River Don (and its floodplain) is a sufficient barrier between Washington and Follingsby and that it is highly accessible being only a 20min walk to Concord centre. Development of the site should not considered to constitute urban sprawl and Follingsby is not part of the town of Gateshead, so doesn't apply in terms of settlement merging also the site is too urban to be classed as countryside.	The information presented in contrary to information held by the Council on the site and would require further consideration.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Unknown	Church Commissioners For England	<p>The medium growth scenario should be used as a minimum for the housing target. It is recommended that the period covered by the SHLAA is amended so that it covers the full plan period. The SHLAA identifies site 426 as being able to deliver 450 dwellings, however this was based on previous a previous scheme and following pre-application discussions with Officers a scheme of up to 500 dwelling is now proposed. The SHLAA should be amended to reflect this.</p>	<p>Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration</p>
Unknown	Church Commissioners For England	<p>Support the inclusion of site BU12 for inclusion within Stage 2 of the Green Belt Study and that it would be a suitable location for growth</p>	<p>Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration. Subsequent review of Green Belt Stage 1 has recommended that the parcel be removed from any further consideration, constituting urban sprawl (having no boundary with urban area and no potential for rounding-off), and supporting the openness of the countryside. The area in question is considered as part of SLR site 426, and this raises significant issues relating to biodiversity and infrastructure concerns too.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Unknown	Church Commissioners For England	Still fully support the strategy set out in the 2013 Core Strategy	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration
Unknown	Church Commissioners For England	Fully support the approach towards focusing housing growth within South Sunderland.	Your comments and support have been noted.
Mr Steve Gawthorpe	Area Director Homes and Communities Agency	Sulgrave: Higher growth options preferred in order to meet economic aspirations, and to support City Centre and other centre regeneration. Uncertainty over timing of some sites in South Sunderland Growth Area means there is need for flexibility elsewhere across City. Washington is ideal location for strategic land release.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration
Mr Steve Gawthorpe	Area Director Homes and Communities Agency	Sulgrave: Additional land will be required to meet higher growth option GB land necessary and land east of Sulgrave is in sustainable position beside IAMP.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Mr Steve Gawthorpe	Area Director Homes and Communities Agency	Cherry Knowle: Site BU4 - Welcome fact that small Greenbelt allocation has been separately reviewed in SLR, and put forward that it serves little Greenbelt purpose and could become part of a larger development of Cherry Knowle. Recommends that the scoring for Green Belt 'purpose' for this area should be downgraded. Land immediately to the north of BU4 (site 824 in SLR) should be considered alongside this site as part of wider proposals.	Your comments have been noted and it is acknowledged that the scoring for Greenbelt 'purpose' would be different if site BU4 was surrounded by SSGA development/road on 3 sides.
Mr Steve Gawthorpe	Area Director Homes and Communities Agency	Cherry Knowle: Question the assumptions in HRA report on greenspace requirements for mitigation measures. The assumption that 250 homes would equal a population of 1000 population and the subsequent greenspace requirement would badly affect future housing delivery in the area	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration
Kath Lawless	Head of Planning Newcastle City Council	Concerned that a significant change in migration patterns between Sunderland and Newcastle could affect the implementation of the objectives in their Local Plan	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration. The Council will work closely with Newcastle City Council on these cross boundary issues through the duty-to-cooperate.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Kath Lawless	Head of Planning Newcastle City Council	Newcastle would also like to explore the implications of the growth scenarios on growth in jobs within the City and employment sector forecasts. Job growth of the scale associated with the medium or higher growth scenarios is likely to include growth in job sectors and companies operating across the city market areas and given the inclusion of Newcastle within the Sunderland travel to work area further consideration of the implications of the Experian led growth options would be appropriate. Additionally, Newcastle would request that the transport assessments of the identified growth scenarios, and the implications for the existing transport network and assumed modal split, be shared with Newcastle so that any implications to Newcastle and the City's planned improvements to the transport network can be understood.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration. The Council will work closely with Newcastle City Council on these cross boundary issues through the duty-to-cooperate.
James Hudson	Senior Planning Advisor Environment Agency	Cannot answer the questions as set out in the consultation letter but have provided an overview of the environmental issues that should be taken into consideration.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
James Hudson	Senior Planning Advisor Environment Agency	The Local Plan should have regard to the objectives of the WFD and the Northumbrian River Basin Management Plan. It seeks to ensure that all water bodies achieve good status by 2021 & 2027 and to prevent the deterioration in the status of the water bodies. This should be reflected in the SA, including a WFD indicator	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration
James Hudson	Senior Planning Advisor Environment Agency	SA Objective 9 should include reference to both surface water and ground water quality. This should also be reflected within the key issue section on page 14.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration
James Hudson	Senior Planning Advisor Environment Agency	The results of the Wear Rivers Trust Topsoil Project should feed directly into the Local Plan.	The findings of this project will be considered once they are known.
James Hudson	Senior Planning Advisor Environment Agency	Environment Agency outlines the potential to build SUDS into the design of new developments which will have the benefit of reducing risk of flooding and act to trap and to some extent mitigate the effect of pollutants, including settling out sediments which can impact on invertebrate by having a smothering effect on river beds.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration



Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Richard Newsome	Story Homes	High growth supported. The majority of new residential development in the next plan period should occur in the South Sunderland Growth Area and Washington Sub Area but Coalfield area needs a good proportion of homes to sustain housing choice and delivery and prevent economic stagnation over the next plan period.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration
Richard Newsome	Story Homes	Low growth option would have negative knock-on effects to public services and facilities, schools and general retail vitality; it would also result in limited choices of new housing being delivered throughout the City. It would be planning for decline and not meet the OAN.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Richard Newsome	Story Homes	Medium Growth Scenario is wholly unsustainable as it also fails to deliver the much needed level of new homes required in Sunderland when taking into account its legacy of under delivery and stalled housing sites in unviable locations. Although this option would deliver similar levels of residential development to those recently achieved in Sunderland the Council must recognise that under these levels of growth Sunderland has faced still faced economic decline and increasing levels of out-commuting resulting in significant social, economic and environmental underperformance throughout the City. This trend will only continue unless a High Growth Option is planned for.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration
Richard Newsome	Story Homes	Puts forward Site 128 and suggests suitable mitigation	Site promotion and suggested mitigation given due consideration. The Council has updated the 2016 SHLAA. Site 128 has been assessed as a developable site, capable of delivering 140 units within the 6-10 year period.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Clare Rawcliffe	Countryside Officer South Tyneside Council	Concern about Seaburn Camp housing proposals as it would result in the loss of open space which is used as an alternative by dog walkers instead of the coast.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration as part of Stage 2 Green Belt review, SHLAA review and SLR updates.
Clare Rawcliffe	Countryside Officer South Tyneside Council	Concern regarding 714, 401 and 642 none of these should be developed. Form a strategic wildlife corridor, linking to Bramston Pond LNR, key species including water voles present on these sites.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration as part of Stage 2 Green Belt review, SHLAA review and SLR updates. Comments being forwarded to Sunderland Countryside Officers.
Clare Rawcliffe	Countryside Officer South Tyneside Council	SLR info on Site 175 Fulwell Quarries strong objection direct impact to LNR (statutory designation) and adjacent to SSSI	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration
Carol Naylor	George F White	High Growth option favoured, distribution should not be dealt with as a percentage split. Implications of Brexit need to be considered, but note that 2014 based SNPP already presume net international migration will fall significantly by 2021. Agree with the 2013 Area distribution.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Carol Naylor	George F White	Puts forward further details on site 638 of the SHLAA to prove the site is available, achievable and economically viable	Further information regarding site availability, achievability and economic viability considered. The Council has updated the 2016 SHLAA. A SHLAA site assessment for 638 can be found in the 2016 SHLAA update report.
Carol Naylor	George F White	High Growth option favoured, distribution should not be dealt with as a percentage split. Brexit need to be considered, but note that 2014 based SNPP already presume net international migration will fall significantly by 2021.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration
Carol Naylor	George F White	Puts forward further details on site 641 of the SHLAA to prove the site is available, achievable and economically viable	Further information regarding sites availability, achievability and economic viability considered. The Council has updated the 2016 SHLAA. A SHLAA site assessment for 641 can be found in the 2016 SHLAA update report.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Andy Downer	Northumbria Water Ltd.	Fulwell Reservoir site 254. Accept site as 6-10 but consider SLR as overly cautious.	Further to the Growth Options SLR, the Council has considered site 254 (Fulwell Reservoir) further in the SHLAA. Since the Growth Options Consultation in 2016, the Council has updated the SHLAA Methodology to accord with Planning Practice Guidance: Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessments. This updated methodology was applied to SHLAA sites as part of the 2016 SHLAA update to ensure consistency and robustness of the assessment. A SHLAA site assessment for 254 can be found in the 2016 SHLAA update report.
Andy Downer	Northumbria Water Ltd.	Site 407 at Springwell Village is the best location for a new drinking water reservoir to serve the area. The southern part of the site is proposed for reservoir	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration.
Andy Downer	Northumbria Water Ltd.	Will be able to provide further comments regarding infrastructure once more detail is available. Look forward for future opportunities to comment.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) will set out the infrastructure that is required to deliver the Plan and how it will be funded. The Council will work closely with NWL on the preparation of the IDP.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Andrew Walker	Business Development Officer Nexus	Where large areas have been identified for development, including the 3000-dwelling development area in Sunderland South and the areas of up to 1500 dwellings in the Millfield and Pallion areas on the southern banks of the River Wear, Nexus considers that these should be designed to include maximum public transport accessibility from the outset, therefore it is suggested that Masterplans are produced for each of these development areas to assess potential demand and propose potential new routes, or extensions to existing services	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Andrew Walker	Business Development Officer Nexus	<p>The Combined Authority aims to extend the existing Metro network to improve transport accessibility, as set out in the draft NECA Metro and Local Rail Strategy. Nexus requests that due consideration be given to the potential for new Metro corridors, that the City Council protects the spatial envelope of former railway alignments including space for access and potential stations identified within the Metro and Local Rail Strategy to preserve this potential. These currently include: South Hylton Metro Station to Victoria Viaduct; Follingsby to Fencehouses and City centre to Doxford via Thornhill and Farringdon</p>	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Andrew Walker	Business Development Officer Nexus	Whilst Nexus does not object to the consideration of any of the sites included in this consultation for future development in this Growth Options consultation, the contents of the Nexus Planning Liaison Policy and the requirement for accessible public transport are emphasised including ensuring all new developments are within 400m of a current or new bus service or within 800m of a Metro station, and also that appropriate developer contributions will be requested at all such sites to accompany the granting of planning permissions	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will set out the infrastructure that is required to deliver the Plan and how it will be funded
	New Herrington WMC and Institute	Supports the high growth option as it is believed that the medium and low growth would be planning for decline. It is also believed that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate. The high growth option would necessitate Greenbelt release and the WMC site is considered a logical, low-impact release.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration. The submission considers that the yield and housing density could be higher. This has previously been set low due to previous designs put forward focused residential development on non Greenbelt area, to create new community centre with car parking, to retain TPO's trees and safeguard the bowling green.



Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
	New Herrington WMC and Institute	The site yield is too low. Whole site is 1.5ha, 41 dwellings appropriate rather than 14	The Council has updated the 2016 SHLAA The capacity of SHLAA site 113, has been amended to 41 units.
	North East Building and Development Ltd.	High growth supported. The majority of new residential development in the next plan period should occur in the South Sunderland Growth Area and Washington Sub Area but Coalfield area needs a good proportion of homes to sustain housing choice and delivery and prevent economic stagnation over the next plan period.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration
	North East Building and Development Ltd.	Puts forward Site 128 and suggests suitable mitigation	Site promotion and suggested mitigation given due consideration. The Council has updated the 2016 SHLAA. Site 128 has been assessed as a developable site, capable of delivering 140 units within the 6-10 year period.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
	North East Building and Development Ltd.	Medium Growth Scenario is wholly unsustainable as it also fails to deliver the much needed level of new homes required in Sunderland when taking into account its legacy of under delivery and stalled housing sites in unviable locations. Although this option would deliver similar levels of residential development to those recently achieved in Sunderland the Council must recognise that under these levels of growth Sunderland has faced still faced economic decline and increasing levels of out-commuting resulting in significant social, economic and environmental underperformance throughout the City. This trend will only continue unless a High Growth Option is planned for.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration
	North East Building and Development Ltd.	Low growth option would have negative knock-on effects to public services and facilities, schools and general retail vitality; it would also result in limited choices of new housing being delivered throughout the City. It would be planning for decline and not meet the OAN.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Ellen Bekker	Planning Adviser Natural England	A preferred growth option has not been stated although the higher the growth in the City the more likely development will have effect designated site. Feel that the relationship between the growth options and the SLR is unclear at this stage. Should the location of development become more certain, Natural England could provide more detailed advice on how development might affect the natural environment and we would therefore welcome early discussion on this.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration
Ellen Bekker	Planning Adviser Natural England	HRA Screening: NE concurs with conclusions of the Screening Report. Need early discussion when site locations are being considered. Detailed comments on elements identified in HRA	Your comments have been noted. Sunderland City Council will continue to consult with Natural England regarding HRA and site identification matters.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Ellen Bekker	Planning Adviser Natural England	<p>SA Concur with the conclusions of this report and welcome the SA of the Growth Options and considered it a good framework for assessment of the Growth Options. Welcome the inclusion of green infrastructure corridors in the review. There 18 SSSIs in Sunderland, rather than 17 noted in the SA. It would help to include a map of these. Would like to see the baseline and issues/opportunities regarding the National Character Areas to be updated. Advise that the impact of water quantity and quality and air quality on biodiversity interests including designated sites are considered. Update to consider the vulnerability of habitats to climate change. Potential to consider the proportion of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land which could be developed. Advise that an assessment of the effects of water quality and quantity and air quality on biodiversity, including designated sites, is added. The potential impact upon the Durham Heritage Coast could include in the assessment for Landscape and Townscape.</p>	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration during the preparation of the SA.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Ellen Bekker	Planning Adviser Natural England	SLR: Suggest include maps showing assessment of suitability of sites for development. Also should refer to SSSI Impact Risk Zones. Should also refer to Priority Habitats and Species.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration
Ellen Bekker	Planning Adviser Natural England	Green Belt Review: Welcome the inclusion of Green Infrastructure corridors in the review.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration
Lord Durham Estates	Lord Durham Estates	Puts forward major Green belt site to north of Penshaw. It is claimed that there are no constraints and that the site is sustainable as it is within easy access of facilities and does not conflict with any of the purposes of Green Belt.	Comments have been duly noted. However the information presented is contrary to information that the Council holds and the revised Greenbelt Review has now recommended that the parcel is not considered beyond Stage 1, due to fundamental impact to openness and encroachment of countryside.
Linda Mary Wood		Consultation has not been very well publicised and Coalfields do not need anymore new housing. Further consultation is needed.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration
Barbara Hooper	Principal, Historic Places Team Historic England	Have considered the three options but feel there is sufficient information to assess the impact on heritage assets. Suggest using heritage assessment element in SLR to further inform SA.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Helen		Population in decline, figures are overestimated due to lower birth rate.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration. The Council has used Government published figures to inform the preparation of the Plan drawn from the Census and ONS.
Helen		Believes that Greenbelt should not be used for housing as there is plenty of brownfield land available, and Coalfields could be used.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration. Brownfield land in the city has diminished in recent years, and even the low growth option could not be delivered purely by re-using brownfield land.
Greg Skeoch		The amount of green belt land lost to IAMP should be sufficient for the City as a whole. Further loss will reduce attractiveness of City as place to live and do business.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration. The Council will give further consideration as to whether Green Belt development is required to deliver the strategy as the Core Strategy develops.
Greg Skeoch		Supports growth in economy but should not be through the loss of green belt. Secure development by using brownfield land.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration. The Council will give further consideration as to whether Green Belt development is required to deliver the strategy as the Core Strategy develops.

<b>Full Name</b>	<b>Organisation Details</b>	<b>Summary of Response</b>	<b>Council response</b>
Greg Skeoch		Caution is needed in relation to the number of new houses to be built. New houses do not mean that jobs will be created and new jobs do not necessarily require new houses local patterns of work show people often do not live and work in the same borough. Recognising recent falls in population, the number of houses to be built should reflect realistic population estimates	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration. Consideration to commuting patterns has been given as part of the demographic modelling work and will be used to inform the preferred strategy.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
		<p>Supports the medium growth option and does not believe that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate. The Core Strategy should now focus on land previously used for housing or current unsatisfactory housing where there is already infrastructure in place. Would like to see more development in Central Sunderland and South Sunderland. Believes that housing appropriate to city centre living creates a vibrant city centre and regenerates the whole city. Also there are development opportunities along River due to new bridge. Would also like to see more development in Washington but not on the Greenbelt and less development in the Coalfields due to lack of school places and flood risks.</p>	<p>Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.</p>



Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Mrs Claire Harrison-Coe		<p>Supports a low to medium growth option and does not believe that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate.</p> <p>Concerned that there will not be the resources/infrastructure to support high growth. Would like to see less residential development and more employment uses and retail in Central Sunderland. Believes that development should be distributed and relevant to need in the area and brownfield availability.</p>	<p>Your comments will be given due consideration and will be used along with others to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Gillian Gibson	Sunderland City Council	<p>When considering the negative impacts of the medium and higher growth options there are two hazards that could have a very direct impact on health. These are road traffic accidents and air quality. Should the higher growth option be pursued it is imperative that increase traffic movement across the city does not put the lives of our children and young people at further risk of accidents and that steps are taken to mitigate the impact on air quality through the implementation of evidence based interventions including increased 20mph zones, greater support for active travel and appropriate tree planting.</p>	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration
Gillian Gibson	Sunderland City Council	<p>The City has a high dependency ratio which has a significant impact on demands on a range of public services, particularly health and social care. The low growth option, which has been identified as leading to the continued decrease in working age population would further exacerbate this issue at a time of increased financial pressures for public services, including the local NHS.</p>	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Gillian Gibson	Sunderland City Council	The planned housing construction identified in the growth options could be used to tackle some of the health issues for Sunderland. The design of such housing developments should, however, ensure that in addition to addressing housing need they also take account of wider issues such as social cohesion and access to physical activity.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration
Gillian Gibson	Sunderland City Council	There is increasing evidence that environment plays a critical part in encouraging people to be physically active. The higher growth option identifies that significant land would need to be released from Green Belt. If this is green space that is accessed by local people then its loss could be to the detriment of their health.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration
Gillian Gibson	Sunderland City Council	The Five Ways to Wellbeing are a set of evidence based actions, identified by the New Economics Foundation, which promote people's wellbeing. They are Connect, Be Active, Take Notice, Keep Learning and Give. Each of these elements may be influenced by the growth option selected and the way in which it is then implemented.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Gillian Gibson	Sunderland City Council	The Five Ways to Wellbeing are a set of evidence based actions, identified by the New Economics Foundation, which promote people's wellbeing. They are Connect, Be Active, Take Notice, Keep Learning and Give. Each of these elements may be influenced by the growth option selected and the way in which it is then implemented.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration
Durham County Council Durham County Council	Spatial Policy Team Durham County Council	DCC are supportive of the IAMP and its potential contribution to economic growth in the NECA area.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Durham County Council Durham County Council	Spatial Policy Team Durham County Council	It is important to ensure that the assumptions made in developing scenarios for our Local Plans are compatible. There are two areas in which assumptions made in the Growth Options appear to be at variance to those used in the emerging Durham Plan, these being adjustments to the commuting rates under the medium growth scenario and the adjustments to net migration rates under both the medium and high growth scenarios. It is unclear from the Growth Options document what employment opportunities or strategy would be delivered to enact the reduction in the commuting ratio. The transport implications of such as change are also unclear. DCC would welcome the opportunity to discuss these issues as part of the duty to cooperate.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration. We will continue to work with Durham Council under the duty-to-cooperate to fully understand the cross boundary issues of the Core Strategy.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Mr George Martin		<p>Support for medium growth option and does not believe that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate. Would like to see brownfield and derelict sites developed first and Washington will already contribute a larger chunk of greenbelt for IAMP. Would like to see more residential and retail developments and employment uses in Central Sunderland and Coalfields and to support the City Centre no further development of retail parks. Believes that the Coalfields has more scope to absorb extra housing it is the least densely populated Would like to see more residential development and employment uses in South Sunderland but less retail development. Believes that there should be less residential development and retailing in North Sunderland and Washington but more employment uses.</p>	<p>Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Ms Maureen Lambton		Supports the low growth option and is of the view that the amount of Greenbelt which will be needed for the IAMP any further land needed for employment and housing should be taken from brownfield and previously developed areas.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with other will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy
Mrs Susanne Miller		Supports the low growth option and does not believe that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate. Would like to see retail uses developed within all existing areas. Considers the priorities for housing should attracting key workers to the City, using brownfield land and housing that is affordable.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy
James Daly		Supports medium growth option and does not believe that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate. Would like to see reduced housing focus on the Coalfields and encourage economic growth. Agrees with housing growth in Sunderland South. Greenbelt housing in Washington should be encouraged.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Mrs Lisa Harris		Does not believe that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate. Believes that growth should be supported and encouraged but not at the expense of the Greenbelt.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy
Mr Ian Harris		Does not believe that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate. Believes that growth should be supported and encouraged but not at the expense of the Greenbelt.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy
Ms Donna Bishop		Supports the low growth option and does not believe that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate. Believes that the coalfield area should be given major consideration in any future development.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy
Mr Christopher Bishop		Supports the low growth option and does not believe that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate. Believes that there must be sufficient brownfield sites that could be developed before Greenbelt is considered. Believes that all housing should be developed in the Coalfields as it is the least densely populated.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.



Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Mr Dennis Lambton		Does not believe that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate. Supports growth but not at the expense of the Greenbelt and that existing proposals for job creation are enough to support growth. The priority should be brownfield over greenfield. Also the number of houses to be built should not be based on the number of jobs that might be created.	Your comments will be given due consideration and will be used along with others to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy
Joan Pearson		Supports the medium growth option and believes that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate. Would like to see maximised use of brownfield sites in all areas for development and Greenbelt safeguarded while taking into consideration the higher volume of traffic since 2013.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy
J P Pearson		Supports the medium growth option and believes that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate. Would like to see maximum utilisation of brownfield sites in all areas	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Angela Templeman		Supports the low growth option and does not believe that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate. Does not want to see development on the Greenbelt, greenfield sites or Settlement Breaks	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
Dan Banning		Supports the low growth option and does not believe that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate. Does not want to see development on Greenbelt, greenfield sites or Settlement Breaks	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy
Mitchell Templeman		Supports the low growth option and does not want to see development in the Greenbelt, greenfield sites or Settlement Breaks.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy
Matt Banning		Supports the low growth option and does not believe that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate. Does not want to see development in Greenbelt, greenfield sites or Settlement Breaks.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
S C Templeman		Supports low growth option and believes that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate. Does not want to see development on the Greenbelt, greenfield sites or the Settlement Breaks.	Your comment will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
P Nelson		Does not believe that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate. Supports growth but not at the expense of the Greenbelt. Proposals already in existence to delete Greenbelt land for job creation are sufficient to support growth and building houses on this basis of extra jobs is not acceptable.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy
I Nelson		Does not believe that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate. Believes that growth is good but not at the expensive of Greenbelt and that proposals already in place are adequate for growth support.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
Audrey Thompson		Need better infrastructure i.e. roads and parking to attract and retain home owners.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Ann Huntley		Supports the medium growth option and believes that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy documents is still appropriate. Would like to see more retail provision in coalfields as well as schools, leisure facilities and libraries. Also need housing for the elderly, especially bungalows and sheltered housing and affordable rental properties.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
Helen Thompson		Supports the medium growth option and believes that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used inform the next draft of the Core Strategy
Alice Curtis		Supports the medium growth option and believes that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate. Also believes that the infrastructure that is available at the moment cannot cope. Would like to see the Bridges expanded to include the High Street and less housing in South Sunderland and the Coalfields	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Brian Thompson		Support high growth option and believes that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate. Would like to see derelict and partially derelict industrial land brought back into use for housing.	Your comments have been given consideration and will be used along with other to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
John Thew		Supports the high growth option and believes that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate	Your comments will be given due consideration and will be used along with other to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy
G J Thompson		Supports the high growth option and believes that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
A Greenwood		Supports the medium growth option and does not believe the approach set out in the 2013 Growth Options is still appropriate. Would like to see more residential development in Central Sunderland and in Washington as there is more land available in Washington. However would like to see less residential development in the Coalfields.	Your comments will be given due consideration and will be used along with others to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
C Buddle		Supports the high growth option and believes that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Christopher Bell		Supports the high growth option	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy
Jeremy Wicking		Supports the high growth option and believes that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy
Peter Thompson		Supports the high growth option and believes that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy
E McEvoy		Supports the high growth option and does not believe that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate. Should be more employment uses and retail in Central Sunderland and a better mix of housing to suit young professionals. Should be more residential development and employment use in South Sunderland and the Washington. Would like to see more residential development in the Coalfields and North Sunderland as long as natural assets of the coast are protected.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Ken Smithson		<p>Supports medium growth option. Would like to see more residential development and offices in Central Sunderland to boost retail and more employment uses on brownfield sites in South Sunderland. Would like to see more employment in North Sunderland and Washington but no housing on greenfield sites. In the Coalfields would like to see more residential development and employment uses on brownfield land, also an improvement to transport links.</p>	<p>Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy</p>
Annabel Lawson		<p>Supports the medium growth option and believes that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate. Would like to see more residential development in Central Sunderland which would make the area feel safer and the retail area needs updating. Believes that South Sunderland should be linked to the Coalfields and that retail provision in the Coalfields needs to be improved although maybe too late as Dalton Park is expanding further.</p>	<p>Your comments will be given due consideration and will be used along with other to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy. A Retail Needs Assessment has been prepared as part of the revised evidence base.</p>

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Michael Harding		My concern is for any new housing to be used on the Green Belt at Springwell Village. There are many reasons, traffic increasing, emerging routes congested, environmental issues, which are only a few to mention. There are many brownfield areas in Washington which could be redeveloped and are half empty units, factories etc but have been overloaded. To me it's ridiculous to use Green Belt land and destroy a community and the environmental land that we should preserve.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration
Mary Peel		Considering the recent referendum results and the total uncertainty I think a pause is necessary or further investigation. Less housing and more employment. Do we really need it! Don't build for the sake of building	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration
Miss Eve Lambton		Supports the low growth option and does not believe that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate. Growth should be supported but not on the Greenbelt	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.



Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Mr David Lambton		Supports the low growth option and does not believe that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate. Growth should be considered but not on the Greenbelt	Your comments will be given due consideration and will be used along with others to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
Mr Chris Lambton		Supports the low growth option and does not believe that the approach set out in the 2013 is still appropriate. We should be able to grow but not to the detriment of our green belts	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy
Miss Angela Lambton		Supports to low growth option and does not believe that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate. Does not want development to take place on the Greenbelt	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
Ms Philippa Abbott		Supports the medium growth option and believes that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy.
Mr Kevin Bond		Supports the high growth option and believes that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the net draft of the Core Strategy

Full Name	Organisation Details	Summary of Response	Council response
Miss Charlotte Nelson		Does not believe that the approach set out in the 2013 Core Strategy is still appropriate. Growth is supported but not at the expense of the greenbelt and that job creation is not enough to support growth.	Your comments will be given due consideration and along with others will be used to inform the next draft of the Core Strategy
Christina Taylor	RSPB Northern England Office	Sustainability Appraisal Comments: proposed alteration to 2.2.2; to objective 8; In Biodiversity section - SSSIs also need to be taken into account	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration
Christina Taylor	RSPB Northern England Office	HRA Screening comments: the International sites are properly screened out of the HRA process; impact on non-indigenous plants; proof required that demonstrates that SANGS will work in diverting people from coastal areas; SAMM mitigation measures contradiction, i.e. that cliff top walking will be encouraged but at same time is not expected to provide a realistic alternative to beaches and other areas for dog walking; further analysis/monitoring is required; the emerging Durham County Local Plan should be included in an in-combination assessment.	Your comments have been noted and will be given due consideration.

## **Appendix G – Comments Recorded After Drop In Events**

## **Growth Options Consultation Events**

### **Friday 20<sup>th</sup> May – Wear Catchment Partnership, Rainton Meadows**

Issues raised:

- Location of potential housing development and economic development, impact to waterways and drainage, ecology, landscape.

### **Saturday 21<sup>st</sup> May – City Library**

Issues raised:

- Interest in Washington ELR sites
- Query over demographic modelling
- Concerns over impact on natural environment

### **Monday 23<sup>rd</sup> May – Houghton Library**

Issues raised:

- Improvements needed to appearance of Houghton centre, signposts for car park locations etc.
- Query over whether new supermarket is still proposed on Houghton colliery site.
- Central route – whether this is still being progressed and timescales.
- Houghton and the Coalfield not seen as a Council priority and all investment is focused on Sunderland City.

### **Monday 23<sup>rd</sup> May – Bunnyhill Centre**

Issues raised:

- Need jobs growth
- SSTC and new Bridge in wrong location- need additional bridge over River Wear
- Lack of local facilities in Town End Farm

### **Tuesday 24<sup>th</sup> May – Kayll Road**

Issues raised:

- SSTC

### **Tuesday 24<sup>th</sup> May – Ryhope**

Issues raised:

- Need to protect the environment
- Safeguard our greenspaces
- Improve the City Centre
- Create jobs

### **Wednesday 25<sup>th</sup> May – Washington Galleries**

Issues raised:

- Land east of Sulgrave / north of Nissan – suitability for development
- Protection of Green Belt across city
- Protection of Green Belt specifically around Springwell Village- road capacity, impact on landscape, school and village already vibrant

### **Thursday 26<sup>th</sup> May – Sandhill Centre**

Issues raised:

- Retailing in Sunderland – too many restrictions on traders
- More tourist attractions along the coast
- Sunderland needs a lot of investment to be able to compete with neighbouring cities.

### **Friday 27<sup>th</sup> May – Hetton Library**

Issues raised:

- Concern about “white land” to the east of Hetton, and whether that would be safeguarded from residential development or quarrying. Questions about the level of protection afforded to this open countryside

### **Friday 27<sup>th</sup> May – Washington Millennium Centre**

Issues raised:

- Previous uses on sites that are now being developed for housing

### **Monday 6<sup>th</sup> June – Washington Millennium Centre**

Issues raised:

- General interest in housing development in South Sunderland and Washington
- General support for new housing development
- Acceptance that IAMP is strategically necessary, even if it means loss of a few properties and some of the Green Belt to the north of Nissan

### **Tuesday 7<sup>th</sup> June – Ryhope Library**

Issues raised:

- Concern about volume of housing proposed around Ryhope, and concern that it may develop independently to Ryhope and not improve the existing village infrastructure or quality of shops/village centre

### **Thursday 9<sup>th</sup> June – Doxford Park**

Issues raised:

- Better understanding of the justification for development of the SSGA area, and of the constraints that will be impacted upon / need to be addressed – especially groundwater/surface water flooding at Thristley Wood, for example
- A lot of concern that significant levels of development across Doxford Park and Silksworth in particular will have on the road network congestion, on pedestrian safety/road safety and the environment as a whole
- Questioning why Sunderland needed to arrest the population decline, and why higher levels of housing growth were required in the first place
- Questioned whether younger professionals are actually leaving Sunderland, and why this would be
- Generally appreciative of the extra efforts to inform local residents in the area, and with Keep Burdon Green
- A resident was keen for higher growth across the city, and keen for economic development to occur across the city

### **Friday 10<sup>th</sup> June – Kayll Road Library**

Issues raised:

- Concern that city strategically has given-up employment land, and that now there is a shortfall in places, particularly in Washington
- It made sense for the riverside areas of Pallion and Deptford to be retained for employment, to make up for the shortfall elsewhere, and considering that the new road will improve access.

### **Friday 10<sup>th</sup> June – Fulwell Library**

Issues raised:

- Need to ensure that we maximise / take opportunity to develop on a number of existing brownfield and greenfield sites that are suitable for development
- General interest on potential development sites in Fulwell / Seaburn area

### **Saturday 11<sup>th</sup> June – Houghton Library**

Issues raised:

- Area should no longer be referred to as the coalfield, should we now be calling it Houghton and Hetton
- Local transport scheme in the area and how consultation has been poor
- Discussion around previous use of sites and questioning whether some land should be built on for health reasons
- Local retailing centres are in decline, one of the main costs is business rates
- Area has seen a lot of housing building recently and questioning whether this should continue in the future
- New housing is putting pressure on local schools and services

### **Saturday 11<sup>th</sup> June – Washington Galleries**

Issues raised:

- Cost of local transport
- Comments on information provided in the SLR sheets
- Recognition that this was not a ward issue, it is a city wide issue

### **Wednesday 29<sup>th</sup> June – Youth Parliament (Sunderland)**

Issues raised:

- Concern about the environment, loss of habitat that needs protecting
- More young people saw their future away from Sunderland (regional shift) than in Sunderland – more a reflection of keeping variety of options open.