

Agenda

Session 9 – 09.30 Wednesday 5 June 2019

Matter 7

The Strategy, Housing Growth Areas and Safeguarded Land for Washington

This matter considers the strategic policies (SP3, SS2 and SS3), the Housing Growth Areas (HGA1-HGA6) and delivery of housing sites and infrastructure in the Washington Sub-Area.

In terms of HGA6, the Council has clarified its approach to Green Belt and the playing pitch use in EX1.008.

Proposed Main Modifications (MMs) 6 to 10 are relevant to this session.

Issues

1. Strategic Policies

1.1 Are Policies SP3 and SS2 justified and effective?

1.2 Are any modifications required to Policies SP3 and SS2 to ensure that they are justified and effective, taking account the need for consistency between policies of the Plan?

1.3 In particular is criterion 3. of Policy SS2 clear ('enhance access to local facilities and services')?

2. Identification of Sites

2.1a Do the Green Belt assessments support the HGAs and areas of Safeguarded Land in Washington and demonstrate exceptional circumstances for the removal of land from the Green Belt?

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

2.1b How have the cumulative effects of the proposed Green Belt deletions around Springwell Village on Green Belt purposes been taken into account?

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

The Council refers to MM9 which summarises the Council's position in terms of impact on Green Belt purposes.

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

The Council notes that limited growth has taken place in Washington as opportunities are restricted by the tightly drawn Green Belt. The Council considers that the scale of growth proposed in the HGAs will not unduly alter the character of the villages/area.

The reasons for not supporting larger Green Belt allocations or other Green Belt sites are set out in the Compliance Statement.

2.4 Is there any justification for the allocation of the safeguarded sites (or in part) at this stage?

The Council refers again to the Compliance Statement in supporting its position.

3. HGA1 – South West Springwell

3.1a Is the Council satisfied that the landscape, heritage, biodiversity, access,

transport, drainage and other constraints are capable of being mitigated so that development of the site would be acceptable?

The Council has clarified that the site promoter owns neighbouring land to facilitate access routes. The Council refers to the Compliance Statement, the site-specific criteria and the SOCGs with various bodies.

3.1b Would the setting of the Bowes Railway be preserved?

3.2a Are all the policy requirements within HGA1 necessary and clear to the decision maker?

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

3.2b In particular are Criteria v. and vi. clear as to their requirements?

3.3 Is the site deliverable or developable?

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

4. HGA2 – East Springwell

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

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

4.1b Would an effective wildlife and green infrastructure corridor be capable of being retained?

4.2 Are all the policy requirements within HGA2 necessary and clear to the decision maker?

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

4.3 Is the site deliverable or developable?

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

5. HGA3 – North of High Usworth

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

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

5.1b Is there scope to improve the accessibility of the site by providing a bus route along Stone Cellar Road?

5.2a Are all the policy requirements within HGA3 necessary and clear to the decision maker?

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

5.2b Do the requirements reflect the characteristics of the site?

5.3 Is the site deliverable or developable?

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

6. HGA4 – North of Usworth Hall

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

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

6.2 Are all the policy requirements within HGA4 necessary and clear to the decision maker?

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

6.3a Is the site deliverable or developable?

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

6.3b Are there any issues relating to landownership of the access to the site which would prevent the delivery anticipated by the SHLAA (commencing in 2026/27)?

7. HGA5 – Fatfield

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

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

6.2 Are all the policy requirements within HGA5 necessary and clear to the decision maker?

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

6.3 Is the site deliverable or developable?

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

8. HGA6 – Rickleton

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

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

8.2 Is the allocation appropriate in view of the need for a Playing Field Assessment?

MM8 is relevant. In view of the new Community Football Hubs and the relocation of 4

football clubs from Washington to the Football Hub in the Northern Area, the Council is confident that the site will be deemed surplus to requirements.

8.3 Are all the policy requirements within HGA6 necessary and clear to the decision maker?

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

8.4a Is the site deliverable or developable?

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

8.4b Have issues of landfill and ground stability (coal outcrops) been taken into account in assessing whether HGA6 is developable?

8.4c How has the need for a Playing Field Assessment been factored into delivery of HGA6?

9. Infrastructure

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

The Council refers to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and the supporting Transport Assessment (SD.51-53) and Education Plan (SD.62). Essential infrastructure is referred to in Policies SS2 and HGA1 to HGA6.

9.2 Have the cumulative impacts on infrastructure, including local roads and schools been assessed and will any adverse impacts be mitigated?

10. Delivery

10.1 Are the assumptions about the rate of delivery of houses from sites in Washington realistic (anticipated delivery is shown in Appendices A, B, F and O of the SHLAA)?

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

Main Evidence Base

SD.22 – SHLAA

SD.29-34 – Green Belt Assessments

SD.35 - Sunderland Development Frameworks

SD.59 – IDP

SD.60 - Whole Plan Viability Assessment

SD.66 - Compliance Statement

EX1.008 & EX1.010 – Council responses to Inspector’s preliminary questions

EX1.011 – Statement of Common Ground – SCC and Sport England (March 2019)

EX1.018 - Schedule of Main Modifications

EX1.020 – SHLAA Update May 2019

Statements

EX10.001 - Sunderland City Council

EX10.002 - Pauline Cooper (ID868362)

EX10.003 - Gillan Gibson - CPRE (ID1175874)

EX10.004 - Springwell Residents' Association (IS868362)

EX10.005 - Tom Baker - Savills (Hellens Land) (ID1169009)

EX10.006(a) - Andrew Rose - Spawforths (Barratt & David Wilson Homes) (ID992525)

EX10.006(b) - Andrew Rose - Spawforths (Barratt & David Wilson Homes) (ID992525)

EX10.007 - Phil Jones - Homes England (ID1175997)

EX10.008(a) - Chris Smith - Lichfields (Story Homes-Norman Elliott) (ID963412)

EX10.008(b) - Chris Smith - Lichfields (Story Homes-Michael Ford) (ID963412)

EX10.009 – R & K Wood Planning - (Mr C S Ford) (ID1170835)

Participants

Sunderland City Council

Name	Company	Representing	ID Number
Chris Smith Neil Westwick Richard Newsome	Lichfields	Story Homes	963412
Chris Smith Neil Westwick Gavin Cordwell-Smith Katie Rumble	Lichfields	Hellens	1169009
Andrew Rose	Spawforths	Barratt & David Wilson Homes	992525
Phil Jones	Homes England		1175997
Liz Reid		Springwell Village Residents' Association	868362
George Martin		Springwell Village Residents' Association	868362
Pauline Cooper		Springwell Village Residents' Association	868362
Tom Baker	Savills	Hellens Land	1169009
Katie Wood	R & K Wood Planning LLP	Clive Milner	1171236
Robin Wood	R & K Wood Planning LLP	Mr C S Ford	1170835
Ian Edworthy	Resident		1000585
Karen Read	K L R Planning	Mr Alan Hutchinson	1176031

Mick Trainer		Washington United FC	1167553
Gillan Gibson		CPRE (NE)	1175874
Anthony Ormond	Resident		1123971
Dominic Armstrong	Armstrong Renewables Ltd		1175639