

# South Tyneside Green Party Response to South Tyneside Regulation 19 Draft Local Plan 2024

## 1. Objection made specifically regarding Policy SP2: Strategy for Sustainable Development

**This policy is not justified by the evidence because it proposes an unsustainable level of growth of housing development; and is not consistent with the NPPF or with other statements of government policy.**

**This policy must be revised to decrease the number of homes being planned for, in order to meet the requirement to be sound on the basis of being positively prepared, so that it meets the area's objectively assessed needs and is consistent with achieving sustainable development.**

In SP2 paragraph 4.9 of the Local Plan it states:

*"4.9 To determine the minimum number of homes needed, a local housing need assessment has been conducted using the standard method detailed in the national planning guidance. The standard method uses a formula to identify the minimum number of homes expected to be planned for in a way which addresses projected household growth and any historic under-supply. Using this approach the local housing needs assessment has concluded that for the plan period (1st April 2023 to 31st March 2040) 309 dwellings are required every year. This produces an overall minimum housing requirement of 5,253 new homes over the Plan period. The household projections that inform the housing baseline are the 2014-based household projections. This figure could change upwards or downwards based on new data. South Tyneside's housing requirement will not be 'locked in' until the Plan is submitted to the independent Planning Inspectorate."*

The Local Plan is based on inaccurate population projections. Census data show a consistently falling population in South Tyneside, from 157,200 in 1991, to 152,785 in 2001, to 148,127 in 2011, to 147,800 in 2021. Yet the Local Plan assumes a population of 151,936 for 2021, an overestimate of 4,136, and that it would continue to increase over the next 20 years.

Using the Office for National Statistics (ONS) 2014 housing projections produces a housing requirement of 309 per year, a total of 5,253 houses by 2040. The Local Plan would require a total of 77,716 dwellings in South Tyneside by 2040 whereas the 2018 ONS projection is for 75,664. Therefore the Local Plan is for 2,052 more houses than are needed.

The ONS household projection is likely to be revised down given the population trends thus increasing the excess housing provision in the Local Plan.

The East Boldon Neighbourhood Forum received the following statement from the Department for Levelling Up, Housing & Communities, written by Alan C Scott, Planning policy adviser on behalf of the Secretary of State:

*“In 2018 the Framework introduced a standard method for calculating local housing need to make the process simple, quick and transparent. “The standard method does not impose a target; it is still up to the local authority to determine its housing requirement, and this includes taking local circumstances and restraints such as Green Belt into account”.*

The NPPF paragraph 5 and 6 states:

*“5. National policy statements form part of the overall framework of national planning policy, and may be a material consideration in preparing plans and making decisions on planning applications.*

*6. Other statements of government policy may be material when preparing plans or deciding applications, such as relevant Written Ministerial Statements and endorsed recommendations of the National Infrastructure Commission.”*

Michael Jenrick, then Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government, made a Written Statement 16<sup>th</sup> December 2020:

*“There were many consultation responses which did not fully recognise that the standard method for assessing Local Housing Need does not present a ‘target’ in plan-making, but instead provides a starting point for determining the level of need for housing in an area. It is only after consideration of this, alongside what constraints areas face, such as the Green Belt, and the land that is actually available for development, that the decision on how many homes should be planned for is made.”*

Michael Gove, Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities and Minister for Intergovernmental Relations, made a Commons Statement on 19<sup>th</sup> December 2023:

*“Today’s update to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)*

*It provides clearer protection for the Green Belt, clarity on how future housing supply should be assessed in plans and on the responsibility of urban authorities to play their full part in protecting the character of precious neighbourhoods.*

*The new NPPF will: facilitate flexibility for local authorities in relation to local housing need; clarify a local lock on any changes to Green Belt boundaries;*

*The new NPPF makes clear that the outcome of the standard method is an advisory starting point in plan making for establishing the housing requirements for an area.”*

The above is supported by guidance in The House of Commons Library published on 27 August 2021 “Calculating housing need in the planning system (England)” which states in 2.4:

*“A starting point, not a target? Land constraints and the standard method. The standard method is intended to be the starting point in determining how many homes an LPA can and should deliver, but is not a target. LPAs must also take account (for example) of land constraints, such as the Green Belt.”*

<https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/research-briefings/cbp-9268/>

This means that South Tyneside Council is able to determine its housing requirement and can take into account the restraint of the Green Belt.

## **2. Objection to development on the Green Belt, made specifically regarding Policies SP3: Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development and SP7: Urban and Village Sustainable Growth Areas**

**These policies are not justified by the evidence and the case for exceptional circumstances to amend the Green Belt boundary has not been made.**

**The Local Plan must be revised to remove the proposed amendment to the Green Belt boundary to allocate additional land for housing and to withdraw all of the sites proposed for removal from the Green Belt: GA1-6 and SP8.**

The Green Belt land allocation in the Local Plan is for 2,308 new homes but there is no justification for building on this precious resource. The Green Belt does not need to be built on and therefore the least harm to this resource is no further development at all on the Green Belt and exceptional circumstances have not been established. The Local Plan must be revised in order to meet the requirement to be sound on the basis of being justified, as an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives and based on proportionate evidence; and on the basis of being consistent with national policy.

In the Local Plan, Policy SP3: Spatial Strategy for Sustainable Development proposes amending the Green Belt boundary to allocate additional land for housing and Policy SP7 Urban and Village Sustainable Growth Areas proposes the removal of sites from the Green Belt and allocation for housing development.

The Local Plan states in Policy SP3: Spatial Strategy for sustainable development:

*“To meet the identified needs in Policy SP2 and to facilitate sustainable growth, the Plan will:*

- 1. Support the sustainability of existing communities by focusing growth within the Main Urban Area including South Shields, Hebburn and Jarrow*
- 2. Secure the sustainability and vitality of the villages of Cleadon, Whitburn and the Boldons by supporting growth which respects the distinctive character of each village*
- 3. Encourage the re-use of suitable and viable brownfield land and, where appropriate, encourage higher development densities.*
- 4. Ensure the delivery of housing in sustainable locations through the allocation of sites in the Main Urban Area and by amending the Green Belt boundary to allocate Urban and Village sustainable growth areas*
- 5. Create a new sustainable, community within the Fellgate Sustainable Growth Area (Policy SP8) by providing homes and community facilities.*
- 6. Prioritise the regeneration of South Shields Riverside, South Shields Town Centre, Fowler Street Improvement Area, and the Foreshore Improvement Area*
- 7. Prioritise economic development in designated Employment Areas, including the Port of Tyne, that are accessible by a range of transport modes and allocate additional land at Wardley Colliery*
- 8. Enhance and strengthen green infrastructure, ecological networks and Green Belt throughout South Tyneside and between neighbouring authorities.*

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states:

*“140. Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified, through the preparation or updating of plans. Strategic policies should establish the need for any changes to Green Belt boundaries, having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so they can endure beyond the plan period”*

As demonstrated in Objection 1 above, there is no evidence that the housing requirement for the Plan period is at a level requiring development on the Green Belt. The strategic need has not been proven, for example there has been no cooperation with neighbouring local authorities which have Local Plans that intend to cumulatively build in excess of 19,000 houses above their respective ONS 2018 housing projections.

Sunderland Local Plan –	10,755 excess houses by 2033
Gateshead Local Plan –	6,337 excess houses by 2030
North Tyneside Local Plan -	2,238 excess houses by 2032

A planning appeal decision has confirmed the protected status of the Green Belt. This decision reiterates and reinforces the protection from inappropriate development given to the Green Belt in national planning policy.

### **Broke Hill golf course**

In the Broke Hill case in Sevenoaks, Kent, the Inspector confirmed that, where planning policies protect areas of particular importance and provide a clear reason for refusing the development, the so-called “tilted balance” presumption in favour of granting planning permission does not apply.

For Broke Hill, the planning policies in this case related to protection of the Green Belt. This is especially important as Sevenoaks does not have the required five-year supply of housing land nor has it met the government’s housing delivery test for 2021. The inspector noted a number of benefits of the proposed development including provision of affordable housing. However, he concluded that notwithstanding the lack of five-year housing supply, the housing delivery test, and the benefits, this did not outweigh the harm that would be caused to the Green Belt, and were not sufficient to override national and local planning policies protecting the Green Belt. “The tilted balance is not invoked, however, because the Framework at Paragraph 11d(i) and footnote 7 protects both areas and assets of particular importance, which include the Green Belt, and provides a clear reason to dismiss the appeal.” Stephen Wilkinson, Inspector Planning Inspectorate decision Broke Hill golf course 31 January 2022

**This case along with ministerial statements demonstrates that the Local Plan fails to be consistent with national planning policy to protect the Green Belt, as specified in paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework.**

**The Local Plan must be revised to remove the proposed amendment to the Green Belt boundary to allocate additional land for housing and to withdraw all of the sites proposed for removal from the Green Belt.**

Furthermore, the Local Plan is not justified because the NPPF states:

*“141. Before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the strategic policy-making authority should be able to demonstrate that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development. This will be assessed through the examination of its strategic policies, which will take into account the preceding paragraph, and whether the strategy:*

*a) makes as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land;*

*b) optimises the density of development in line with the policies in chapter 11 of this Framework, including whether policies promote a significant uplift in minimum*

*density standards in town and city centres and other locations well served by public transport; and*

*c) has been informed by discussions with neighbouring authorities about whether they could accommodate some of the identified need for development, as demonstrated through the statement of common ground.”*

Regarding paragraph “a”, it has not been proven that all brownfield sites have been considered.

There are underutilised sites such as areas in South Shields town centre where previously developed land is used for car parking rather than housing like the area at the Mill Dam in South Shields, the former Staithes House and surrounding land near the town centre has been cleared for development for decades. The large office building at Harton Quay was leased by BT Group until last year but BT Group then closed its office and redeployed its 500 staff to other parts of the North East.

These are areas close to South Shields transport interchange and so would satisfy paragraph “b” the need to promote a significant uplift in minimum density standards in town and city centres and other locations well served by public transport.

The failure to rent out office space also drawn into question the planned 200,000 sq ft of office space in the adjacent Holborn development especially as the Utilitywise office building just down river had to be converted to flats after lying empty for a long period.

Planners overlooked possible brownfield sites across South Tyneside. Questions raised over validity of the reasons for rejection have not been answered. Some examples are the health clinic site near the ambulance station on Boldon Lane, the Pickwick pub in Biddick Hall, the former Methodist church on Bede Burn Road, the former Park Hotel on Lawe Road have not been included in the Local Plan.

Immediately after the Regulation 18 consultation in 2022, planning permission was given for 446 houses on the former Hawthorn Leslie shipyard that had lain redundant for several years. This was not included in the Regulation 18 Draft Plan. A similar situation exists at the former Rohm and Hass brownfield site near Jarrow town centre that would comply with 141 a) and b). This land if designated for industry could be released for housing as the land designated for employment in the Regulation 19 Local Plan is not justified by the evidence.

A further statement which is insufficient is paragraph 4.31, Sustainable Urban and Village Extensions:

*“The Council has undertaken an extensive Green Belt review to identify land which would cause the least harm to the purposes of the Green Belt, that is considered suitable for development, and that could create a new defensible Green Belt boundary. Through this work, the Council has also established the exceptional circumstances to justify amending the Green Belt boundary at each location.*

*Following consultation on the Plan, the Council will undertake a Green Belt boundary review which will review the entire Green Belt boundary to ensure that it has a strong and defensible boundary as required by the NPPF.”*

It has been shown that the Green Belt does not need to be built on and therefore the least harm to this resource is no further development at all on the Green Belt and exceptional circumstances have not been established.

Regarding paragraph “c”, there is no evidence that the aggregated housing assessments of the neighbouring authorities has been compared with the projected population levels of these authorities to show that there will be no overall supply. The simple statement in 4.28 in the Local Plan is insufficient:

*“28. Prior to identifying land in the Green Belt the Council has, as part of Duty to Cooperate, discussed whether neighbouring authorities could accommodate additional housing. As set out in the Duty to Cooperate Statement, neighbouring authorities have confirmed that they would be unable to provide land to meet South Tyneside’s needs.”*

The duty to cooperate has not been evidenced as required by guidance such as PAS – Doing your duty practice update [doing-your-duty-practice--1a3.pdf \(local.gov.uk\)](https://www.local.gov.uk/doing-your-duty-practice--1a3.pdf)

The recommendations in this have not been followed including number 10:

*“10. Plans should reflect joint working and cooperation to address larger than local issues. In many cases, joint studies with other local planning authorities formed part of the evidence used to demonstrate compliance with the duty. Past cooperation put many local planning authorities in a strong position, particularly where this has resulted in the preparation of sub-regional strategies, joint studies or common methodologies on SHMA, Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, economic assessments, Green Infrastructure studies, landscape and renewables assessments, and transport studies.”*

This failure is evident in the vast over provision of housing as previously shown and shared infrastructure for example the health and sewage systems between South Tyneside and Sunderland as well as employment at IAMP. This shows that the Plan is not sound.

### **3. Objection made regarding Sustainability Appraisal Report 2024 – Employment Land and policy SP14: Wardley Colliery**

**The Sustainability Appraisal Report 2024 notes that the Local Plan has increased the amount of land required for employment from the Draft Regulation 18 Local Plan. It notes that the level of employment growth underpinning this is high in the context of past trends.**

**This demonstrates that the Regulation 19 Draft Local Plan is not justified by the evidence base; the amount of land for employment allocated for employment is too high and more of this land needs to be utilised for housing development in existing urban areas. The removal from the Green Belt of the Wardley Colliery site in SP14 is not justified.**

The Sustainability Appraisal Report states:

*“Preferred Options*

*4.41 Within the Draft Local Plan 2019, the Council took forward the following preferred options for employment land: ■ General Employment Land – Option 2: Policy-on Scenario ■ Port and Marine Land – Option 3: Past Completions (net)*

*4.42 These options were selected because the Council considered them to have the most positive effects on SA objective 9 (encourage and support economic growth within South Tyneside) and SA objective 10 (increase opportunities for employment and education and improve living standards). The Council’s reasons for this were set out in the 2019 SA Report.*

*4.43 In the Draft Regulation 18 Local Plan (June 2022) the Council’s preferred scenario for employment land requirements over the Plan period was the Baseline Labour Demand Scenario. The reasons for this were set out in detail in the 2022 Employment Land Technical Paper, which explained that in choosing this scenario the Council was being cognisant of the constraints imposed by the Green Belt and the very high value placed on this resource by local communities.”*

*And*

*“4.45 In the Regulation 19 Draft Publication Plan, the Council’s preferred scenario for employment land requirements over the Plan period is the Policy-on Labour Demand Scenario. As explained in the 2023 Employment Land Technical Paper, the level of employment growth underpinning this scenario, which seeks to capture the impacts of IAMP on the general employment land market, is high in the context of past trends. The 2023 ELR advises that the IAMP proposals are expected to create significant employment opportunities in the wider supply chain. However, the ELR does caution that the ability to fully take advantage of these opportunities will depend on the ‘ability to offer good quality employment sites, with good access to the strategic road network and in close proximity to the IAMP’.”*

The SAR also notes the negative impact of this preferred option for employment land:

*“4.26 However, negative effects were recorded against a number of environmental objectives, reflecting the impact that a high economic growth could have upon the environment due to proximity existing designations, and increased impacts on natural resources, potential impacts on biodiversity and wildlife corridors. This level of growth is also likely to require land from the Green Belt to facilitate the growth aspirations; this objective therefore scored negatively against objective 4 (Green*

*Belt) and objective 5 (green infrastructure) due to the potential impacts on the Green Infrastructure corridor.”*

The Sustainable Appraisal Non-Technical Summary states in the section assessing the Likely Effects of the Local Plan Options:

*“Preferred Options*

*34. In the Draft Regulation 18 Local Plan (June 2022) the Council’s preferred scenario for employment land requirements over the Plan period was the Baseline Labour Demand Scenario. In choosing this scenario the Council had been cognisant of the constraints imposed by the Green Belt and the very high value placed on this resource by local communities. In the Regulation 19 Draft Publication Plan, the Council’s preferred scenario for employment land requirements over the Plan period is the Policy-on Labour Demand Scenario. As explained in the 2023 Employment Land Technical Paper, the level of employment growth underpinning this scenario, which seeks to capture the impacts of IAMP on the general employment land market, is high in the context of past trends. The 2023 ELR advises that the IAMP proposals are expected to create significant employment opportunities in the wider supply chain. However, the ELR does caution that the ability to fully take advantage of these opportunities will depend on the ‘ability to offer good quality employment sites, with good access to the strategic road network and in close proximity to the IAMP’.”*

#### **4. Objection made regarding Density Report 2024 and paragraph 8.24 of the Local Plan**

**The Local Plan is not justified by the evidence as set out in the Density Report 2024 of housing density achieved since the last housing density report in 2018. The Local Plan in paragraph 8.24 sets a lower average housing density than has been achieved which means it is not consistent with the NPPF.**

The Density Report 2024 states:

*“2.3 Paragraph 125 of the NPPF highlights the importance of avoiding homes being built at low densities, where there is an anticipated shortage of land for meeting identified housing needs. Planning policies should avoid homes being built at low densities and ensure optimal use of land by using minimum density standards. These standards aim to uplift the average density of residential development and the use of these standards should be used in other parts of the plan area. Minimum density standards should also be used in a way which ensures that applications which fail to make efficient use of land be refused.”*

It states in the Summary

*“4.1 Following the four assessments several conclusions can be drawn with regards to density patterns throughout South Tyneside. Since the previous Density study in 2018:*

- *The average density of sites assessed was 66 dwellings per hectare based on net site area. This is an increase of 16 dwellings per hectare since the previous study.*
- *The assessments showed that density declined as site area increased and that sites less than 1 hectare had a density significantly higher than those over 1 hectare. Sites less than 1 hectare had an average density of 82 dwellings per hectare. Sites over 1 hectare had a density of 40 dwellings per hectare.*
- *In general sites with a higher yield had typically lower densities. Sites with less than 50 dwellings had an average density of 50 dwellings per hectare whereas sites with more than 250 dwellings had an average density of 28 dwellings per hectare.*
- *Sites in the urban area of South Shields had the highest densities with an average of 72 dwellings per hectare. This is likely due to the nature of the area and the large proportion of smaller sites.*
- *Compared to the standard density buffers in Policy SC3 of the adopted LDF and the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment higher densities were achieved across all three categories. “*

However, the Recommendations for Housing Density which have been utilised by the Regulation 19 Draft Local Plan are lower than the densities which have been achieved. The Density Report states:

*“6.1 Housing yield must ultimately be determined by design. However, for the purposes of estimating housing yield as part of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and Local Plan site selection process the following density calculations are recommended:*

- *Average 60 dwellings per hectare on sites within 400m in the Jarrow and Inner South Shields character areas (higher densities may also be appropriate on a site by site basis e.g. by the riverside on sites such as Holborn and Hawthorn Leslie);*
- *Average 55 dwellings per hectare on sites within 400m in the rest of the borough;*
- *Average 45 dwellings per hectare on sites between 400m – 800m in the rest of the borough; and*
- *Average 35 dwellings per hectare on sites beyond 800m in the rest of the borough.*

*6.2 These densities will be used to estimate site capacities in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment where other information (e.g. planning applications, information from developers etc.) is not available. Should this information be available it will be used.”*

The Density Report 2024 also underestimates the housing densities which have been achieved because two very large urban brownfield sites have been excluded from the assessment:

*“3.2 Whilst permission was given to 26 sites during this period only 24 sites will be used in this study. The sites at Leslie Hawthorn and Holborn have been omitted from this study as due to the nature of those sites they present an anomaly in the*

*densities. These sites have a much higher density as to be viable sites for the developers more dwellings on site were required. These sites have a much higher proportion of flats and apartments than others of this size and location. Therefore, to be able to analyse patterns and trends in the data these 2 sites have been treated as anomalies.”*

If these two sites were included in the assessment, the average density achieved would be higher and the discrepancy between this and the recommendations for average density for the Local Plan would be even greater.

## **5. Objection made specifically regarding Policy 18: Affordable Housing, Policy 19: Housing Mix and Policy 20: Technical Design Standards for New Homes**

**The Local Plan is not justified and is not consistent with the NPPF in terms of meeting the housing needs identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) 2023.**

In the section on Housing Allocations the Local Plan states:

*“5.4 When allocating sites to meet the housing requirement, the Plan has looked to ensure the right homes are delivered in the right places, taking into account need, demand, deliverability, sustainability and improving choice.”*

The SHMA 2023 has identified an annual need for 361 affordable homes each year across the borough which justifies the need for a robust affordable housing policy which will provide mechanisms to help meet this affordable need. Yet the same document states in the Executive Summary:

*“It is recommended that the current target for 75% market and 25% affordable is maintained.”* And in Paragraph 7.10 states: *“The SHMA would suggest that an overall target of 25% affordable housing should continue to be applied. This will be subject to viability testing before a target can be established for affordable housing in the emerging Local Plan.”*

The proposed proportion of affordable homes in Cleadon and East Boldon is 30%, but as median house prices in this area are £225,000 the accepted definition of affordable being 80% of market value means they will still be unaffordable to the very people requiring this provision.

The NPPF states *“62. Within this context, the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies (including, but not limited to, those who require affordable housing, families with children, older people, students, people with disabilities, service families, travellers, people who rent their homes and people wishing to commission or build their own homes).”*

Particular needs identified in the SHMA 2023 are:

- *“Increasing and diversifying the supply of specialist housing for older people. There is a need for 3,060 more units of accommodation for older people by 2040 comprising 1,803 C3 units, 885 C2 Extra Care units and 372 C2 Residential care units*
- *Based on an assessment of additional needs and longer-term demographics, a minimum of 5% of new dwellings should be built to M4(3) wheelchair accessible standard; and all other new dwellings should be built to M4(2) accessible and adaptable standard.”*

However the Local Plan fails to implement these recommendations in full as Policy 20: Technical Design Standards for New Homes states:

*“1. To meet the needs of older people and people with disabilities, a minimum of 5% of new build housing in developments of 50 homes or more shall be built to Building Regulations Requirement M4(3) (wheelchair user dwellings).  
2. All residential dwellings shall be designed to be built to meet Building Regulations Requirement M4(2): (Accessible and adaptable dwellings) except where it can be demonstrated that this is impractical or unviable due to site specific constraints.”*

**Policy 20 introduces a condition that this target for wheelchair user dwellings (ie Building Regulations Requirement M4(3)) will only apply in housing developments of 50 homes or more. This means that the Local Plan is not justified by the evidence of the need for these type of homes.**

## **6. Support for Policy 16: Houses in Multiple Occupation**

**We welcome Policy 16 Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO) as this is justified by the evidence of clustering of HMOs in particular areas of the borough and the need for further measures in paragraph 2 of the policy for the Lawe Top Article 4 Direction area.**

## **7. Objection made specifically regarding Policy 1 Promoting Healthy Communities and Policy 2 Air Quality; and SP5: Former Brinkburn Comprehensive School and SP6: Former Chuter Ede Education Centre**

**The Local Plan is not justified because these policies will not ensure the Strategic Objectives for Promoting Healthy Communities will be achieved; and these policies are not consistent with national policy.**

The Local Plan proposes the development of several vital community open spaces, for example the playing field land at Chuter Ede and Brinkburn School, despite stating in Policy 1:

*“The Council and its partners, including the NHS, will seek to improve the health, wellbeing and quality of life of South Tyneside residents, reduce health inequalities, and to help people live longer and healthier lives. This will be achieved by:*

*1. Supporting new development which: i. Increases opportunities for physical activity and active travel through the provision of good quality sport and recreation facilities and safe and accessible walking, cycling and public transport networks.”*

and

*“iii. Enhances the green and blue infrastructure network and supports climate change mitigation and adaptation.”*

These community open spaces must be protected and removed from the Local Plan as sites for development. The importance of these community open spaces is recognised in NPPF paragraph 98, 20-23, 26 and 92.

Building on playing fields for example at Chuter Ede has the exact opposite effect to the objective, increasing the local population while removing green space playing fields that are used for exercise.

There is little in the Local Plan that would fulfil the Strategic Objectives for Promoting Healthy Communities. In fact, some parts of the plan make the situation worse including the proposed development in areas that will promote car use such as in Cleadon, East Boldon and Whitburn. These developments will typically have two cars per household, adding potentially thousands of car journeys on an already congested road system. This will have a detrimental effect road safety and on the local environment due to noise and exhaust emissions. Some areas have air pollution levels already in excess of the World Health Organisation recommended maximums. These vehicle journeys will only make this more dangerous as there are no safe levels for these pollutants.

The Local Plan states in paragraph 6.14: *“The importance of good air quality is recognised by the World Health Organisation which produced a series of standards that have been adopted by the European Commission and subsequently the UK”.*

A Local Authority recognising this will be aware that the World Health Organisation (WHO) air quality standards were revised in 2021 and the recommended pollutant levels, to be achieved, were revised down by a considerable amount. NOTE: These are not safe levels as scientists do not consider any amount to be safe. It is inconceivable that the UK national standards will not be reduced to reflect these changes.

In the Local Plan, Policy 2: Air Quality states *“2. Where significant air quality impacts are likely to be generated by the development, an appropriate air quality assessment will be required”.* Due to the changes in WHO levels it is reasonable to predict large areas of the Borough will exceed these and the proposed developments in Policy SP7: Urban and Village Sustainable Growth Areas in particular will result in unsafe air pollution.

The council has a duty as far as reasonably practicable to ensure the health and safety of its residents. Given the above, the Local Plan must be revised to take into consideration the results of the proposed developments on air quality and specified measures that would reduce pollution levels to the minimum possible.

*NPPF states in 186: “Opportunities to improve air quality or mitigate impacts should be identified, such as through traffic and travel management, and green infrastructure provision and enhancement. So far as possible these opportunities should be considered at the plan-making stage, to ensure a strategic approach and limit the need for issues to be reconsidered when determining individual applications.”*

**The Local Plan has failed to identify these opportunities adequately and therefore is not consistent with the NPPF and this demonstrates that the Local Plan is not sound.**

*NPPF states: “31. The preparation and review of all policies should be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence. This should be adequate and proportionate, focused tightly on supporting and justifying the policies concerned...”*

**The revised WHO air pollution levels are relevant and up-to-date and should be a material consideration.**

## **8. Objection made specifically regarding Section 7: Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change**

**The Local Plan is not sound because it is not compliant with the Climate Change Act 2008 and Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) duties or consistent with NPPF guidance – carbon accounting and climate mitigation.**

The increased carbon emissions from the development proposed in the Local Plan will add to South Tyneside’s carbon footprint and add to the climate change emergency.

National legislation and guidance strongly stress the central role of the planning system in securing radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and require Local Plans to:

The policies should aim to secure radical carbon reductions in line with a trajectory for the authority area that is consistent with the UK achieving full carbon neutrality by 2050, and in the short term should test the policy options available to achieve the highest level of ambition possible to meet this goal.

As far as possible, all new development should be zero carbon given that the country's net zero target must be met in the next 30 years. A good example from another area is Reading Council: *"The council's 2019 Local Plan requires that all new residential developments of ten or more homes are built to zero carbon standards if possible."* Zero carbon is an achievable standard.

Adoption of this strategy aligns with the councils own stated aims of the Economic Recovery Plan 2020 to *Catalyse green and sustainable growth by maximising the potential of our low-carbon and digital assets and expertise.*

With regards to Policy 15 much is to be welcomed. 15.1 states *Improve the condition of existing homes by enhancing energy efficiency and reducing carbon emissions in existing buildings* And 15.4 *Facilitate improvements to properties that have traditionally suffered from poor management and under-investment*

However, currently demolition is placed far too highly as an option for the current housing stock. Refitting and retrofitting is by far the less carbon intensive approach so demolition must be de-prioritised.

The Local Plan must be revised in order to bring it into compliance with legislative and policy requirements around climate change and the councils stated ambitions.

## **9. Objection made specifically regarding Policy 6: Renewables and Low Carbon Energy Generation**

**The Local Plan is not sound because this policy is not consistent with national policy.**

NPPF 156 states: *"Local planning authorities should support community-led initiatives for renewable and low carbon energy, including developments outside areas identified in local plans or other strategic policies that are being taken forward through neighbourhood planning."*

We welcome Policy 6 paragraph 2 supporting the inclusion of renewable energy into developments, but the text is not strong enough, and once again, will not change business as usual development approaches. A requirement to include and maximise on-site renewable energy generation needs to be folded into an overall green house gas emissions policy, as seen in the London Plan, policy S12<sup>1</sup>.

We welcome Policy 6 paragraph 4, the inclusion of policies requiring development to connect to district heating networks, however this policy needs to be made significantly stronger. The best example of which we are aware is draft policy SI13 of the draft London Plan. As the whole of South Tyneside is located over disused mine-

---

<sup>1</sup> London Plan – policy S12 - [www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/planning/london-plan/new-london-plan/draft-new-london-plan/chapter-9-sustainable-infrastructure/policy-si2-minimising#r-SI2](http://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/planning/london-plan/new-london-plan/draft-new-london-plan/chapter-9-sustainable-infrastructure/policy-si2-minimising#r-SI2)

workings more heating schemes like the “Hebburn Minewater Project” should be invested in for housing schemes.

## **10. Objection made specifically regarding Policy 10 Disposal of Foul Water and Policy 11 Protecting Water Quality**

**The Local Plan is not justified because these policies are not able to ensure the Objectives for Protecting Water Quality will be achieved; and is not consistent with national policy.**

The Local Plan does not refer to the current significant level of sewage pollution in South Tyneside. Population levels have increased considerably in the UK since Victorian times yet we are still using combined sewers that were constructed in the 19th century. If more housing development is permitted, especially on green spaces, more pressure will be exerted on an already failing sewage system. However, in the consultation on the Draft Local Plan, South Tyneside Council confirmed that no extra sewage will be added to the existing infrastructure on the recommendations of Northumbrian Water who have assured them the existing system will cope.

NPPF states “*20. Strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places, and make sufficient provision for: ...  
b) infrastructure for ...wastewater*”

NPPF states: “*185. Planning policies and decisions should also ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development.*”

The Environmental Permitting Regulations 2016 Permits to discharge untreated sewage from Combined Sewer Overflows into watercourses during heavy rainfall are issued to water companies and regulated by the Environment Agency. There is growing evidence to show that these permits are being abused. Sewage is regularly discharged into South Tyneside watercourses in moderate rainfall. This is due to a lack of capacity at the sewage treatment works caused by a lack of investment and contravenes environmental law.

The Environment Agency (EA) has been required to install Event Duration Monitors (EDMs) in all Combined Sewer Overflows (CSOs). These record the number of discharges and the duration of the discharges. The Whitburn system remains in

breach of environmental law as of March 2021, but the EA want to wait 10 years to 'assess' the system.

The data supplied by the authorities needs to be treated with caution. In March 2020 the EA issued an apology after their published sewage discharge records for Whitburn for 2019 were challenged. They were forced to increase the volume of CSO discharges for Whitburn by 10% from 683,676 cubic metres to 760,993.5 cubic metres. In March 2021 Northumbrian Water issued an apology after their published untreated sewage discharge records for Hendon Sewage treatment works for 2019 were challenged. They were forced to increase their published hours of untreated discharges in 2019 from Hendon Sewage Treatment works by 4,000% from 15 hours 52 mins to 646 hours.

Sewage pollution is a contributor to climate change. Seagrasses can absorb more carbon up to 40 times faster than terrestrial forests and these ecosystems become sources of CO2 emissions when they are degraded or destroyed. A major driver of seagrass decline is nutrient pollution from sewage. A study has shown that 90% of the seagrass meadows in the UK have been lost to pollution. Locally, the seagrass meadows in the River Tyne estuary have been devastated by sewage flowing from nearby Combined Sewer Overflows.

Sewage pollution causes harm to public health. Recent epidemiological studies show a close relationship between contact with polluted waters and the incidence of gastro-intestinal, eye, ear, nose and throat infections or irritations and respiratory symptoms. This is a recognised problem for surfers, kite surfers, windsurfers, sailors, kayakers and wild swimmers. Even the dog walkers, joggers and walkers who all enjoy the access to South Tyneside's riverside and beaches throughout the year are at risk from sewage pollution.

Public Health is a material planning consideration. Local authorities have important and wide-ranging public health functions, for example under the Public Health (Control of Disease) Act 1984. This legislation adopts an 'all-hazards' approach and provides South Tyneside Council with the necessary powers to control human health risks arising from infection or contamination of any form including chemicals and radiation. Statutory duties for public health were conferred on local authorities by the Health and Social Care Act 2012. Local authorities (and directors of public health acting on their behalf) now have a critical role in protecting the health of their population, both in terms of helping to prevent threats arising and in ensuring appropriate responses when things do go wrong.

Health considerations are capable of being material planning considerations. This is recognised in the NPPF which includes the following statement at paragraph 92: *"Planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places."*

The health implications of exposure to the levels of sewage pollution regularly discharged into the River Tyne and on to the beaches of South Tyneside must be a material planning consideration with respect to future developments as, without an improvement in sewage treatment capacity, more development will bring about an inevitable increase in sewage pollution.

**Response drafted by South Tyneside Green Party February 2024**