

Agenda

Session 13 – 09.30 Wednesday 12 June

Matters 10 and 11

Infrastructure and Delivery/Monitoring and Implementation

This matter considers overall infrastructure provision and its implications for viability and deliverability and monitoring and implementation provisions.

In terms of infrastructure the Council advises that it has had regard to the pooling limitations in considering the delivery of infrastructure alongside the allocations. For clarity Criterion 3i. of Policy NE4 is to be modified to refer to 'greenspace' and not just 'amenity greenspace'.

The Plan is to be modified to include a cross-reference to the Monitoring Framework, include key triggers that could lead to a review of the Plan, and clarify which SPDs and UDP policies are still extant.

Matter 10 – Infrastructure and Delivery

Issues

1. The evidence base underpinning the LP

1.1 Does the Plan and Whole Plan Viability Study make realistic assumptions about land values, sales values, profit and development costs?

The Council refers to the guidance and evidence which underpins the Viability Study.

1.2 Has the effects of brownfield land on viability been taken into account in the policies of the Plan e.g. Policy H2 and the affordable housing target?

1.3 Have the assumptions about affordable housing tenure split been consistent when comparing the Viability Study and the Plan?

1.4 Are the assumptions about build costs within the Whole Plan Viability Study justified (for example a higher build cost is being assumed in South Tyneside)?

2. Transport Network

2.1 Are the transport routes identified in Policy SP10 necessary to support sustainable development coming forward in the Plan period?

The Council notes the modelling of the impact of the Plans policies and proposals through Transport Assessments. The IDP identifies indicative phasing and timescales for the transport schemes.

2.2 Will the routes support the use of sustainable modes of transport?

The Council draws attention to the provisions of Policy SP10 (2-6).

3. Policies ID1 and ID2

3.1 Will Policy ID1 and the allocation policies of the Plan ensure that necessary infrastructure is delivered and in a timely fashion?

The Council refers to the IDP which sets out the priorities for infrastructure in accordance with Part 2 of Policy ID1.

3.2a Is Section 2 of Policy ID1 and the link to the IDP too prescriptive?

The Council considers that the provisions of Policy ID1 are proportionate and will allow the delivery of essential infrastructure to respond to annual monitoring and updates of

the IDP.

3.2b Should the reference to 'timing' within Policy ID1 (Section 2) be deleted?

3.3 Are the policies of the Plan and particularly ID1, ID2 and SP10 consistent with the legal and policy tests for planning obligations?

The Council refers to the tests set out within para 14.11 of the LP.

3.4a Are the policies clear as to the effects of viability on the ability to make infrastructure and other contributions/obligations?

The Council points to Section 3 of Policy ID2 and the supporting text which recognise that viability is a consideration.

3.4b Has the effect of the policies of the Plan as a whole on viability been taken into account?

3.5 Is the requirement within Policy ID2 to seek monitoring fees justified?

The Council refers to the justification within the Compliance Statement (para 16.63).

4. Greenspace

4.1 Will Criteria 2 and 3 of Policy NE4 deliver sufficient greenspace alongside new development so as to create well-designed neighbourhoods which support healthy lifestyles and well-being?

The Council refers to the approach to open space through the UDP and the supply of greenspaces within the City.

4.2 Is the requirement for a minimum of 0.9 ha of greenspace per 1000 bedspaces reasonable?

4.3 Are there circumstances where a major development would not provide or make a contribution to greenspace? If so are such circumstances made clear by the Plan?

4.4 Are the assumptions about bedspaces per dwelling (Para 10.26) justified?

5. Pooling of Contributions

5.1 Are there likely to be any implications arising from the pooling restrictions within the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations for the delivery of infrastructure going forward?

The Council makes particular reference to the approach to school provision.

6. IDP

6.1 Is the IDP clear as to what infrastructure projects are critical to the delivery of the LP, when infrastructure will be delivered, sources of funding and who is responsible for delivery?

The Council considers that the IDP is clear as to which schemes are essential and also identifies funding and any gaps in such funding.

6.2 Is the range of time periods for the delivery of some infrastructure too wide?

Matter 11 - Monitoring and Implementation

Issues

1. Monitoring Framework

1.1a Is the Plan clear in indicating how the Plan's policies and proposals will be monitored?

MM45 is relevant which refers to the Annual Monitoring Report and the Monitoring Framework

1.1b Should the Monitoring Framework be included within the Plan?

1.2 Will the indicators in the Monitoring Framework be effective in monitoring the success of the Plan's policies and proposals?

The Council refers to the data sources included within the Monitoring Framework which are already collected.

1. Review of the Plan

2.1 Is the LP clear as to when a review or partial review of the LP would be triggered due to a failure to meet key targets, for example for those relating to the delivery of housing?

The Council notes that the Monitoring Framework includes a 'Trigger for Action' column a 'Potential Action or Contingency' column which identifies actions which may be needed should the respective triggers be activated. A review of the Plan is identified as a potential action for the majority of CSDP Policies if respective triggers are activated.

2.2 Should the Plan include a policy relating to the need for review including key triggers?

The Council proposes MM45 which refers to key triggers (para 14.19).

2.3 Should the Plan include reference to the need to consider review of the LP every five years (note para 6.5)?

2.4 Should the Plan include reference to the Housing Delivery Test (para 6.9)?

2.5 Should Policy SP8 and/or para 6.9 be amended to refer to the circumstances where additional sites could be brought forward in the absence of sufficient housing supply? (AM32 is relevant)

2. Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)

3.1 Is the Plan clear on the SPD that will be prepared to provide guidance on the implementation of the Plan?

AM1 is relevant.

3.2 Should the reference to the Planning Obligations SPD in para 6.22 be amended to be consistent with Policy ID2?

3. Saved Policies

4.1 Is the Plan clear on which UDP policies are to be saved or superseded?

AM74 and EX1.021 are relevant.

Main Evidence Base

SD.13 - Monitoring Framework (2018)

SD.51-53 – Assessment of Transport Impacts

SD.59 – IDP

SD.60 - Whole Plan Viability Assessment (with CIL scoping) (2017)

SD.62 – Education Planning Report

SD.66 - Compliance Statement

EX1.008 & EX1.010 - Council responses to Inspector's Preliminary questions

EX1.018 - Schedule of Main Modifications

Joint Position Statement – Highways England and Sunderland City Council

Participants

Sunderland City Council

Name	Company	Representing	ID Number
Chris Smith Neil Westwick Richard Newsome	Lichfields	Story Homes	963412
Chris Smith Neil Westwick Steve Willcock	Lichfields	Taylor Wimpey	1120527
Chris Smith Neil Westwick Gavin Cordwell-Smith Katie Rumble	Lichfields	Hellens	1169009
Chris Smith Neil Westwick	Lichfields	Burdon Lane Consortium	1131101
Phil Jones	Homes England		1175997
Stephen Litherland	Hedley Planning	Miller Homes	497082
Andrew Rose	Spawforths	Barratt & David Wilson Homes	992525