

An AI(artificial intelligence) \* analysis of the transcript created at the session:  
Matter 5 Issue 7 (GA1Hebburn Campus) and Issue 7 (SP14 Wardley Colliery) – 11 July 2025

## 1. Meeting details

- **Event:** South Tyneside Local Plan Examination – Day 4
- **Date:** Friday 11 July 2025
- **Time:** Session opened at 09:30; adjournment at 11:00; SP14 resumed at ~11:15 and closed shortly after 15:00
- **Chair:** David Spencer, Planning Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State
- **Format:** Public hearing, recorded and live-streamed; contributions limited to those at the table

## 2. Attendees (by role)

- **Inspector:**
  - David Spencer – independent examining Inspector
- **Council (South Tyneside Council):**
  - Deborah Lee – Operations Manager, Spatial Planning Team
  - Andrew Inch – Senior Manager, Planning Service
  - Rachel Cooper – Senior Planning Policy Officer
  - Trevor Male – Strategic Transport Lead
  - Claire Rockliffe – Natural Environment Manager
- **Statutory / technical bodies:**
  - James Finch – National Highways
  - David Maguire – Sport England
- **Representors / site promoters:**
  - Robin Wood – RMK Planning, for Thomas Armstrong Holdings (Wardley Colliery – SP14)
  - Chris Martin – Pegasus Group, for Bellway Homes Ltd (GA1 Hebburn Campus)

## 3. Site GA1 – Hebburn Campus (Policy SP7 / GA1)

### 3.1 Context and purpose

- GA1 is a proposed housing allocation (indicative capacity 115 dwellings) on former South Tyneside College Hebburn campus land, currently in the Green Belt and formerly used as playing fields.
- The site's release requires justification of exceptional circumstances and resolution of Green Belt, playing field, and delivery issues.

### 3.2 Key statements – Green Belt and boundary

#### 1. Council's Green Belt assessment

- GA1 corresponds to Green Belt parcel H1 in the Green Belt Study.
- The parcel scores low/no impact against Green Belt purposes 1, 3 and 4, and moderate impact against purpose 2 (separation between neighbouring towns).
- Council concludes the site does not pose a significant degree of overall Green Belt harm and that compensatory improvements are available as set out in Appendix C of the study and the Green & Blue Infrastructure Strategy.

#### 2. Use of Site Frameworks document (HO2)

- HO2 identifies site constraints, opportunities and indicative capacity; some principles are reflected in SP7 key considerations and wider Local Plan policies.
- Council's current intention is to keep HO2 as supporting evidence, not to embed concept frameworks directly in policy.

#### 3. Inspector's concern on southern Green Belt boundary

- Existing allocation boundary cuts across open land and does not follow a physical, permanent feature, contrary to NPPF paragraph 143(f) which prefers boundaries along recognisable features.
- Inspector floated a possible main modification: redraw the Green Belt boundary to follow Wardley Lane in the south, combined with stronger policy wording to secure the southern land as open space / mitigation / BNG and to avoid "grey belt" risk.

\* AI Usage Disclosure: This document was created with assistance from AI tools. Whilst the content has its origins from the recorded transcript it has been reviewed and edited by a human to correct spelling. Non the less, there may be error so please verify any critical information.

An AI (artificial intelligence) \* analysis of the transcript created at the session:  
Matter 5 Issue 7 (GA1 Hebburn Campus) and Issue 7 (SP14 Wardley Colliery) – 11 July 2025

#### 4. Council's response

- Current south-of-allocation land is intended as a Green Belt buffer between Hebburn and Gateshead, retaining separation and allowing Green Belt-compatible mitigation uses (playing field, BNG etc.).
- Council considers the submitted plan sound but accepts that if the Inspector prefers a Wardley Lane boundary, policy would need to be strengthened to secure the role and long-term stewardship of that land as open, mitigatory space.
- Option of using conditions and/or Section 106 obligations to secure long-term management was flagged.

#### 5. Bellway's (Pegasus) position on boundary

- Bellway accepts the Green Belt Study's methodology and conclusions and agrees that GA1 has relatively low Green Belt impact and is a logical extension to Hebburn.
- Main disagreement is over the southern boundary: Bellway wants the allocation extended further south to encompass land intended for mitigation (replacement playing pitch etc.).
- Rationale is practical: experience elsewhere showed that leaving mitigation land as Green Belt can trigger separate Green Belt "openness" assessments for necessary ancillary structures (SUDS, allotment sheds, storage, small car parks).
- Bellway is content with the Inspector's suggestion to re-draw boundary along Wardley Lane if policy clearly defines permitted uses in the southern area and avoids a need for a separate Green Belt assessment for mitigation infrastructure.

#### 6. Sport England's related concern

- Sport England emphasised that whatever boundary solution is chosen must still allow a functional, sustainable playing field with appropriate access and supporting infrastructure; they expressed concern that strict openness tests could constrain that.

### 3.3 Key statements – formerly used playing fields and paragraph 99 NPPF

#### 1. Status of GA1 as playing field

- The land's last lawful use was as playing fields serving the former Hebburn campus; the housing now to the north was approved after campus closure (college closed ~2011; housing application ~2014).
- The whole 5.7 ha GA1 allocation meets Sport England's definition of "playing field" (the whole of a site which includes at least one 0.2 ha marked pitch), regardless of how many pitches were lined out.
- Although horses currently graze the land and no ancillary facilities remain, Sport England stresses that this does not change its status as playing field.

#### 2. Council's acceptance of shortfall and need for mitigation

- Council accepts there is no surplus of playing field provision in Hebburn/Jarrow and that there is a shortfall, notably in junior football and rugby union capacity, which is expected to grow over the plan period.
- Council accepts that any development of GA1 must provide mitigation or replacement in line with NPPF paragraph 99 and Local Plan Policy 37.

#### 3. Sport England – findings of the Playing Pitch Strategy (PPS)

- PPS and Assessment Report (NAT17) were prepared to Sport England methodology and signed off by a steering group including Sport England and National Governing Bodies.
- Key findings for the Hebburn/Jarrow sub-area:
  - Small surplus of adult football pitches.
  - Shortfalls in junior and small-sided football pitches, with deficits growing over time.
  - Rugby union at Jarrow Vikings (Gerovians): currently at balance but with strong growth aspirations and existing difficulty accommodating new teams; suggestion to reassign some football land at their site to rugby union, with knock-on effects on football.

\* AI Usage Disclosure: This document was created with assistance from AI tools. Whilst the content has its origins from the recorded transcript it has been reviewed and edited by a human to correct spelling. Non the less, there may be error so please verify any critical information.

**4. Sport England’s interpretation of NPPF 99(b)**

- Maple Durham case law requires that the quantitative and qualitative elements of paragraph 99(b) be assessed “in the round”; absence of quantitative replacement is not automatically fatal, but proposed package must demonstrably offset the loss.
- Sport England emphasises:
  - No current proposal includes quantitative replacement of GA1 playing field area; all proposed mitigation sites are themselves existing playing fields (albeit disused), so they do not add new hectares of playing field.
  - They need to be convinced that the qualitative improvements proposed (Clock Field, Hebburn Riverside, retained pitch) together outweigh the quantitative loss. At present, they are not.

**5. Council’s mitigation package**

Council proposes a multi-site package:

- **(a) Retained playing field adjacent to GA1**
  - Retain land immediately south of GA1 (outside the allocation, within Green Belt) as playing field / open space.
  - Use it as mitigation and to address over-playing at adjacent St Joseph’s Academy pitches, where demand is high and community use heavy.
  - Council believes a physical link can be provided between St Joseph’s and the retained pitch via a new path through the northern strip of GA1, minimising the need to walk through the housing estate.
- **(b) Financial contributions to bring disused pitches back into use**
  - Secure developer contributions from GA1 through S106 towards:
    - ♣ **The Clock field** (council-owned): good-quality turf and drainage but disused, with no changing rooms or parking.
    - ♣ **Hebburn Riverside / King George V fields** (council-owned): isolated, currently affected by antisocial behaviour, dog fouling and unauthorised vehicle use; subject to a wider Hebburn Riverside masterplan that considers reactivation of pitches and management measures (access control, drainage works, facilities).
  - Contributions would target the causes of disuse (drainage, basic facilities, managing antisocial behaviour).

**6. Sport England’s critique of the mitigation package**

- **Retained GA1 pitch**
  - Unsure how the retained pitch would be practically linked to St Joseph’s, given the deep landscape belt and location at the southernmost part of the site; they believe a northern connection would be more straightforward.
  - Concern that requirements for biodiversity net gain, landscaping and Green Belt openness could conflict with creating a high-quality, intensively used playing surface and necessary support facilities.
- **Clock Field**
  - Field in good agronomic condition with patterns indicative of existing drainage, but lacking access, parking and changing; no clear, costed scheme exists to make it attractive to users.
  - Concern that once changing is provided, highways may require new parking, increasing complexity and cost.
- **Hebburn Riverside / King George V**
  - Sites are isolated, subject to antisocial behaviour, litter and dog fouling; again, no robust, costed plan to convert them into attractive, multi-pitch hubs.
  - Trend in junior football is towards large, multi-pitch “hub” clubs (e.g., Hebburn Town Juniors) rather than fragmented single-pitch sites; the mitigation fragments supply further, against this trend.

\* AI Usage Disclosure: This document was created with assistance from AI tools. Whilst the content has its origins from the recorded transcript it has been reviewed and edited by a human to correct spelling. Non the less, there may be error so please verify any critical information.

An AI(artificial intelligence) \* analysis of the transcript created at the session:  
Matter 5 Issue 7 (GA1Hebburn Campus) and Issue 7 (SP14 Wardley Colliery) – 11 July 2025

- **Overall**
  - Sport England views the proposals as insufficiently developed and “half-baked” to demonstrate that NPPF 99(b) will be met.
  - They warn against leaving too much to be resolved at application stage; if issues later prove intractable, there would be a net policy failure without recourse to revisit the allocation.

**7. Bellway’s position on playing fields**

- Accepts the land’s last use as playing fields and that policy requires mitigation, but emphasises that pitches have been unused for ~14 years; Sport England would no longer be a statutory consultee on a simple change-of-use because the 5-year statutory period has expired.
- Argues that, in reality, the playing fields have little prospect of being revived absent development, so development plus mitigation could produce a better public sporting outcome than leaving the land fallow.
- Notes that disused pitches (Clock and the GA1 site) are not included in current PPS baseline quantitative calculations, so bringing them back into use would increase active supply.

**8. Inspector’s interim directions / points for further work**

- Requests from the Council:
  - Quantified area (hectares) of the retained southern land proposed as playing field and clarity on whether it can accommodate full-size or junior pitches and ancillary facilities.
  - Clarification of how a safe, direct link between St Joseph’s and retained pitch could be secured through policy and masterplanning.
  - Further information on timescales and funding for the Hebburn Riverside masterplan and reactivation of Clock and Riverside sites.
- Signals he will consider whether:
  - Policy GA1/SP7 should be modified to:
    - ♣ Adjust the Green Belt boundary to Wardley Lane.
    - ♣ Include stronger and more specific requirements on replacement / mitigation pitches (location, type, link to St Joseph’s) and contributions to specific sites.
  - The Infrastructure Delivery Plan and later Stage 2 hearings should explicitly track how playing pitch deficits and mitigation are planned and funded.

**3.4 Suitability, capacity and delivery**

**1. Capacity**

- Council’s standard density assumptions would yield ~90 dwellings; given high accessibility (adjacent bus stops, school, existing residential character), it considers 115 dwellings realistic.
- Site Frameworks document and Bellway’s illustrative layouts both support delivery of around 115 dwellings, plus SUDS and mitigation, on the developable area north of the retained open space.

**2. Bellway’s delivery intentions**

- Bellway has submitted a pre-application enquiry and sees the scheme as a logical second phase to the existing development to the north; there are no ransom strips and access can be punched through.
- Typical build-out period for a similar-sized scheme (north of site) was ~3 years. Bellway anticipates a similar 3-year build period once permission is granted; they are “chomping at the bit” to proceed.

\* AI Usage Disclosure: This document was created with assistance from AI tools. Whilst the content has its origins from the recorded transcript it has been reviewed and edited by a human to correct spelling. Non the less, there may be error so please verify any critical information.

### 3. Biodiversity net gain (BNG)

- Bellway asserts BNG is manageable on GA1: baseline habitat is mainly grassland; southern open land can deliver habitat creation while remaining usable for pitches; any residual requirement can be met via off-site habitat banks/statutory credits.
- Sport England cautions that BNG design may compete with the need for high-quality sports surfaces and that squeezing both on the same land may reduce pitch usability.
- Inspector notes he will expect future material from the Council to address whether the southern land can realistically serve both BNG and playing field mitigation.

### 4. Viability

- Bellway confirms GA1 has been costed and is viable, including BNG obligations; the company has in-house BNG expertise.
- A more general Bellway viability letter is submitted separately and will be examined at Stage 2.

### 3.5 Conflicts / disagreements for GA1

- **Green Belt boundary / treatment of southern land**
  - Council: prefers submitted boundary; accepts possible modification but anxious not to weaken Green Belt protection.
  - Bellway: prefers larger allocation boundary extending south, or Inspector's Wardley Lane proposal with clear policy on permitted uses and no extra Green Belt test.
- **Adequacy of playing field mitigation under NPPF 99(b)**
  - Council/Bellway: consider mitigation through retained pitch plus investment at Clock and Riverside sufficient and appropriate in constrained urban context.
  - Sport England: currently unconvinced; sees no quantitative replacement, under-developed qualitative schemes, and practical challenges linking and managing the sites.
- **Strength of policy wording ("mitigate" vs "replace")**
  - Council prefers "mitigate" as more accurate to the actual package; Sport England wants stronger wording and clearer tie-in to specific mitigation outcomes.

### 3.6 Agreed / requested actions – GA1

- **Council to:**
  - a. Provide area (ha) and technical capacity of the retained southern land for playing pitch use (type/size of pitches).
  - b. Confirm how a pedestrian link between St Joseph's Academy and the retained pitch could be secured (alignment and policy hook).
  - c. Clarify treatment of Clock and Hebburn Riverside pitches in the PPS baseline (included/excluded) and any scenario testing of bringing them back into use.
  - d. Provide more detail and indicative timescales on the Hebburn Riverside masterplan and works proposed to address antisocial behaviour, access, drainage and facilities.
  - e. Consider potential main modifications to:
    - GA1/SP7 policy wording on playing field replacement/mitigation (including use of "replace"),
    - explicit references to specific mitigation sites and contributions,
    - explicit requirement for a link to St Joseph's, and
    - (if Inspector so directs) revision of the Green Belt boundary to follow Wardley Lane.
- **Inspector to:**
  - a. Reflect on competing boundary options and mitigation packages and, via post-hearing correspondence, indicate whether main modifications are necessary for soundness.

#### **4. Site SP14 – Wardley Colliery (Policy SP14 – Strategic Employment Allocation)**

##### **4.1 Context and purpose**

- SP14 is a proposed strategic employment allocation (B2/B8 focused) on former Wardley Colliery land (former coal disposal point) in the Green Belt, near the A194(M) and potential future Metro “Washington Loop” extension. Total footprint ~12.7 ha, including existing uses and safeguarded land.
- The site is adjacent to the Wardley Colliery Local Wildlife Site (LWS), largely open mosaic habitat on previously developed land.

##### **4.2 Key statements – Green Belt and exceptional circumstances**

###### **1. Council’s Green Belt assessment**

- The allocated SP14 area corresponds broadly to Green Belt parcel FO1 in the Green Belt Study.
- FO1 was assessed as:
  - Moderate harm for Green Belt purposes 1–3; low harm for purpose 4; overall highest harm rating: moderate.
- In contrast, the wider area including the LWS scored higher overall harm, and the Council has deliberately confined the allocation to the lower-harm land.
- Policy SP14 already requires compensatory improvements to remaining Green Belt, drawing on Appendix C of the Green Belt Study.

###### **2. Exceptional circumstances – employment need and location**

- The Plan adopts the highest employment land demand scenario (linked to International Advanced Manufacturing Park) and needs additional land in the south-west of the borough, where opportunities are limited.
- SP14 is one of few sites that is:
  - Previously developed land in the Green Belt.
  - Adjacent to the strategic road network.
  - Potentially well-served by future Metro (Washington Loop) and existing bus routes.
- Council and RMK (for landowner) both argue these factors cumulatively demonstrate exceptional circumstances for Green Belt alteration at this location.

###### **3. Extent of allocation and available land**

- Policy SP14 allocation covers the full “footprint” area (~12.7 ha), including:
  - Western and eastern parcels (P4A, P4B in Employment Land Technical Paper).
  - Existing anaerobic digestion (AD) plant in the south.
  - Land safeguarded for a future Metro station.
- Net developable employment land currently available is ~6.71 ha, with a further ~2–3 ha within the plan period as a container storage lease expires at the north end of the site.

###### **4. RMK / landowner’s position on Green Belt**

- RMK supports allocation and accepts FO1 assessment as robust.
- They challenge the Green Belt assessment of adjacent FO2 parcel (to the north) and argue that part of FO2 – a distinct, lower-lying area enclosed by higher ground to south and east and a watercourse to the north – was incorrectly lumped with the higher spoil heap.
- They submit that this northern sliver has a lower contribution to Green Belt purposes and is more akin to FO1; they see a “missed opportunity” for additional allocation land (circa 3.7 ha) at a highly sustainable rail-adjacent location.
- Inspector notes the Council’s position that current Plan provides sufficient employment land and a buffer; he queries whether exceptional circumstances extend to releasing additional FO2 land.

**5. Local Wildlife Site (LWS) and Green Belt interaction**

- Part of the SP14 allocation overlaps the mapped Wardley Colliery LWS, which is open mosaic habitat on previously developed land (a priority habitat).
- Council and LWS Partnership have recently surveyed the area and propose revising the LWS boundary to better reflect current ecological value; the revised boundary would reduce the amount of allocation falling within the LWS.
- A formal decision by the LWS Partnership on the revised boundary is expected within ~12 months, but no date is set; ecologists are under pressure from new statutory duties under the Environment Act 2021 (especially BNG).
- Inspector confirms any boundary change would not increase the 12.7 ha allocation area; it would simply reduce the overlap with the LWS.

**6. Management and “open mosaic” dynamics**

- RMK highlights that open mosaic habitats are successional and transitory; without management, they will naturally shift to scrub and woodland, potentially losing their current ecological value.
- They note the site has seen recent colonisation by pioneer tree species (e.g. silver birch) and informal, unauthorised uses (scramble bikes, informal camp), illustrating both change and management challenges.
- Council’s ecologist agrees that active management is needed and that part of the area could be used as a biodiversity net gain “delivery site” for open mosaic habitat, serving multiple developments.

**4.3 Key statements – Transport and strategic road network**

**1. Access and relationship to strategic network**

- Vehicular access is expected from Follingsby Lane; from there, traffic would route to the A194(M) via the Follingsby junction (junction naming varied locally).
- The site does not directly access the White Mare Pool junction; impacts on the strategic road network are concentrated at White Mare Pool and the A19 southbound.

**2. National Highways’ position**

- National Highways assessed cumulative impacts of all plan allocations, not SP14 in isolation, using robust trip generation assumptions.
- Two “big-ticket” mitigation items identified and agreed with the Council:
  - Improvements at White Mare Pool junction, potentially phased.
  - Lane-gain / lane-drop scheme on A19 southbound.
- Further minor localised tweaks may be required at application stage, to be identified via detailed transport assessments.
- National Highways confirms it considers the evidence sufficient at this stage and supports the Local Plan provided these improvements are secured.

**3. Policy response and main modification**

- Council and National Highways agree a main modification to SP14 adding explicit wording that development must avoid unacceptable impact on highway safety and provide mitigation for cumulative impacts, including at White Mare Pool.
- RMK does not object in principle, noting specific occupiers and trip profiles are unknown but accepting that any scheme would be subject to detailed transport assessment.
- Inspector notes DfT Circular 01/2022 and December 2023 NPPF revisions, observing that initial transport work was based on a robust, arguably worst-case scenario and that more vision-led approaches now emerging could reduce impacts.

#### 4. Public transport and Washington Loop (Metro)

- **Washington Loop project**
  - Northeast Mayoral Combined Authority has secured £1.85bn City Region Sustainable Transport funding for 2027–2032.
  - The Mayor has ring-fenced £900m of this to deliver the Washington Loop, utilising parts of the Leamside line corridor and linking to the South Hylton Metro line.
  - Proposed stations include Follingsby (adjacent to SP14), Washington South, Washington North, and connection back to the existing system.
  - Construction is aimed for the 2027–2032 funding window; the project is being managed and appraised by the Combined Authority.
- **Safeguarding and current accessibility**
  - South Tyneside Local Plan includes a safeguarding policy for future Metro stations, and SP14 lies within that safeguarded area.
  - Existing bus stops are within 400 m of the northern part of SP14, and further stops exist near the Amazon facility on Follingsby Lane.
  - Council expects active travel to be enhanced by recent national highways investments and intends to promote walking and cycling access to the site.

#### 4.4 Ecology and Local Wildlife Site (LWS)

##### 1. LWS extent and revision

- The Wardley Colliery LWS currently covers both high spoil heaps and lower-lying areas, including part of the SP14 allocation.
- 2010 and 2020 ecological surveys by Haycock & Jay Associates underpin the LWS designation; the 2020 survey will form the basis for revising the boundary.
- Council expects the revised boundary to reduce the proportion of allocation within LWS, thereby limiting direct conflict, but overall LWS designation remains.

##### 2. Mitigation hierarchy and policy SP14

- SP14 requires adverse ecological impacts to be addressed in line with the mitigation hierarchy (avoid, mitigate, compensate) and to include compensatory improvements to remaining Green Belt land within the LWS.
- Council is open to further modifications to SP14 to reflect specific mitigation measures from the Green Belt Study if the Inspector considers this necessary.

##### 3. RMK's view on management and BNG

- RMK argues that formal management linked to development could improve the condition of open mosaic habitat while controlling unauthorised use; they see potential for a dedicated BNG delivery site to lock in long-term management.
- Council's ecologist supports the principle that active management is required and that open mosaic is a suitable BNG receptor habitat, given its priority status.

##### 4. Future survey work

- RMK queried whether the LWS baseline survey (2020) will be refreshed; Council believes the existing evidence will be acceptable to the LWS Partnership for the boundary update.

#### 4.5 Market interest and deliverability

##### 1. Current use

- South: permanent anaerobic digestion (AD) plant occupies part of the allocation.
- North: container storage operation with a lease expiring within the plan period, after which land becomes available.
- Central parts: largely disused previously developed land.

##### 2. Market interest

- Landowner originally purchased site for a block-production plant but has put this on hold due to market change and local plan timing.
- Formal marketing has not commenced due to Green Belt status, but estate agents report informal approaches and strong interest from:
  - Speculative occupiers attracted by location.
  - Existing South Tyneside companies seeking expansion land but currently being pushed to Gateshead/Sunderland due to limited local options.
- Council emphasises that SP14 provides rare, flexible space for general B2/B8 uses, not constrained by nearby residential receptors.

##### 3. Site access and inspection

- Site is private, with signage indicating occasional use by Northumbria Police firearms unit; Inspector requires advance coordination via Programme Officer to visit safely, though RMK considers no inherent safety issues.

#### 4.6 Conflicts / disagreements for SP14

##### • Additional land (part of FO2) for allocation

- RMK: argues a 3.7 ha northern extension is more like FO1 in character and offers unique, sustainable, rail-adjacent land; believes it was unfairly assessed and that exceptional circumstances exist to include it.
- Council: currently relies on existing Green Belt Study parcel-based assessment and considers moderate-harm FO1 release sufficient; sees SP14 as providing necessary “headroom” and is not promoting further Green Belt loss.

##### • Local Wildlife Site boundary and management

- Council: supports LWS revision to reflect up-to-date ecology and expects SP14 plus management to enhance remaining LWS; open to policy strengthening.
- RMK: supports revision and emphasises need to manage open mosaic succession and unauthorised uses; sees BNG delivery as an opportunity.

##### • Detail of compensatory measures

- Council: believes SP14 plus Green Belt Study Appendix C provide a sufficient framework; detail can be refined through development management.
- RMK and Inspector: open to considering more explicit policy wording if it improves clarity and soundness.

#### 4.7 Agreed / requested actions – SP14

- **Council to:**
  - a. Continue working with National Highways to refine cumulative transport assessment for the White Mare Pool and A19 southbound mitigation, including any impacts of revised trip generation under a more vision-led approach.
  - b. Progress LWS Partnership decision on revised Wardley Colliery LWS boundary (targeting decision within ~12 months).
  - c. Consider and, if necessary, draft changes to SP14 to:
    - Embed explicit reference to highway capacity and safety mitigation (as already agreed in SoCG).
    - Clarify ecological mitigation and compensatory improvements for the LWS and remaining Green Belt, in line with the Green Belt Study.
- **RMK / landowner to:**
  - a. Provide any additional mapping and justification already referenced in the Statement of Common Ground for the 3.7 ha FO2 sub-parcel (topography, boundaries, visibility).
- **Inspector to:**
  - a. Visit SP14 (with prior notice to landowner) and subsequently indicate whether:
    - Additional FO2 land is necessary for soundness.
    - More detailed compensatory Green Belt / ecology provisions are needed in SP14.

#### 5. Consolidated list – Key actions and responsibilities

##### GA1 – Hebburn Campus

1. **Quantify and test retained playing field area**
  - **Action:** Provide area (ha), potential pitch layout and ancillary requirements for the southern retained land.
  - **Responsible:** South Tyneside Council (Planning & Leisure/Environment).
2. **Clarify link to St Joseph’s Academy**
  - **Action:** Demonstrate feasible pedestrian route and consider policy wording requiring delivery of a link through GA1.
  - **Responsible:** South Tyneside Council; Bellway/Pegasus to contribute through ongoing pre-application dialogue.
3. **Develop robust mitigation proposals for Clock and Hebburn Riverside**
  - **Action:** Clarify PPS treatment of disused pitches, outline indicative scope (access, drainage, facilities, antisocial behaviour management), approximate costs and funding route (including GA1 contributions).
  - **Responsible:** South Tyneside Council, with input from Sport England.
4. **Review GA1/SP7 policy wording (mitigate/replace; boundary; links)**
  - **Action:** Draft possible main modifications to:
    - Wording on playing field “replacement” vs “mitigation”.
    - References to specific mitigation sites.
    - Green Belt boundary alignment with Wardley Lane if required.
  - **Responsible:** South Tyneside Council; Inspector to indicate whether modifications are necessary.
5. **Stage 2 – Infrastructure Delivery Plan scrutiny**
  - **Action:** Track playing pitch deficits and mitigation schemes through IDP and housing trajectory work at Stage 2.
  - **Responsible:** Inspector and Council.

### SP14 – Wardley Colliery

#### 1. Transport mitigation wording in SP14

- **Action:** Insert agreed main modification requiring that development does not have unacceptable impacts on highway safety, including mitigation at White Mare Pool and A19 southbound.
- **Responsible:** South Tyneside Council (with National Highways support).

#### 2. Refine cumulative transport evidence

- **Action:** Update cumulative modelling and SoCG to reflect revised trip rates and vision-led measures under DfT Circular 01/2022.
- **Responsible:** South Tyneside Council and National Highways.

#### 3. Wardley Colliery LWS boundary revision

- **Action:** Progress LWS Partnership decision on revised boundary, based on 2020 survey; clarify effect on overlap with SP14.
- **Responsible:** South Tyneside Council (Natural Environment Manager) and LWS Partnership.

#### 4. Clarify and, if needed, strengthen SP14 ecological and compensatory provisions

- **Action:** Consider more specific references to open mosaic habitat management, BNG delivery, and compensatory Green Belt improvements.
- **Responsible:** South Tyneside Council; Inspector to advise on necessity.

#### 5. Consideration of additional FO2 land

- **Action:** Inspector to review on-site and documentary evidence for the 3.7 ha FO2 sub-parcel and decide whether further Green Belt release is required.
- **Responsible:** Inspector; RMK to provide supporting material as needed.

### 6. Consolidated list – Risks, concerns and blockers raised

#### GA1 – Hebburn Campus

- **Green Belt soundness risk**
  - Boundary not following a permanent physical feature could be inconsistent with NPPF paragraph 143(f), particularly if southern land is intended to remain undeveloped indefinitely.
- **Risk of “grey belt” outcome**
  - If current boundary remains and southern land remains Green Belt but unmanaged, there is a risk it functions as “grey belt” between Hebburn and Gateshead without clear policy direction.
- **Uncertain compliance with NPPF paragraph 99(b)**
  - Sport England cannot yet conclude that quantitative/qualitative replacement is equivalent or better; risk that allocation proceeds without a clearly workable mitigation package.
- **Practical deliverability of mitigation sites**
  - Clock and Hebburn Riverside require significant investment and management changes (access, drainage, facilities, antisocial behaviour management); no firm scheme or costed programme is in place.
- **Potential conflict between BNG and pitch functionality**
  - Designing BNG on the same land as pitches may compromise playing surface quality or limit usable area, complicating delivery of PPS objectives.
- **Timing/funding uncertainty for Hebburn Riverside masterplan**

An AI (artificial intelligence) \* analysis of the transcript created at the session:  
Matter 5 Issue 7 (GA1Hebburn Campus) and Issue 7 (SP14 Wardley Colliery) – 11 July 2025

- No definitive timescale or funding package is available; risk that mitigation lags behind housing delivery.
- **Policy wording ambiguity (“mitigate” vs “replace”)**
  - Current wording may not give sufficient certainty on level and nature of replacement provision required to satisfy paragraph 99(b) and Sport England.

#### **SP14 – Wardley Colliery**

- **Residual uncertainty about LWS boundary and ecology**
  - Delay in LWS Partnership decision on revised boundary; until then, there is some uncertainty about precise overlap of allocation and LWS and consequent mitigation requirements.
- **Open mosaic succession and unmanaged change**
  - Without formal management, open mosaic habitat will succeed to scrub/woodland, potentially undermining its value and justification for the LWS.
- **Unauthorised and anti-social use**
  - Scramble bikes, informal camps, and unsupervised access present ongoing management and safety issues and may damage habitats.
- **Potential cumulative highway impacts**
  - While National Highways is content in principle, timely delivery and phasing of White Mare Pool and A19 mitigation is necessary to avoid capacity and safety issues on the strategic road network.
- **Uncertainty over Washington Loop delivery**
  - Although politically prioritised and funded in principle, Washington Loop timing, detailed design and station delivery (including Follingsby) are not yet fixed; short-to-medium-term public transport benefits may not materialise as early as desired.
- **Debate over releasing additional FO2 land**
  - If FO2 sub-parcel is not allocated, there is a possible missed opportunity for additional sustainable employment land; if it is allocated without robust Green Belt justification, risk to soundness.

\* AI Usage Disclosure: This document was created with assistance from AI tools. Whilst the content has its origins from the recorded transcript it has been reviewed and edited by a human to correct spelling. Non the less, there may be error so please verify any critical information.