

An AI(artificial intelligence) * analysis of the transcript created at the session:
Matter 8 Economic Development & Vitality of Centres & Matter 9 Issue 4 Design Tuesday 20 Jan 2026

1. Meeting context and attendees

The Inspector, David Spencer, opened the session at 10:00 for Matter 8 (economic development and centres) and at 11:15 for Matter 9 Issue 4 (design).

Key participants included:

- Inspector: David Spencer (Planning Inspector)
- Programme Officer: Annette Fenny (independent programme officer)
- For the Council (Matter 8):
 - Paul Sherrington, King's Counsel for the Council
 - Matt Clifford, Senior Planning Policy Officer
 - Deborah Lamb, Operations Manager, Spatial Planning Team
 - Robin Bullock, Public Health Practitioner
 - Ellie Forrester, Senior Public Health Practitioner
- For the Council (Matter 9 Issue 4 – Design):
 - Paul Sherrington KC
 - Rachel Cooper, Senior Planning Policy Officer
 - Rian Lavick, Planning Policy Officer
 - Andrew (surname not clearly captured), Senior Manager for Planning
- Other participants (design session):
 - Chris Martin, Home Builders Federation (HBF)
 - Mark Murphy, Pegasus Group for Bellway Homes
 - Joe Thompson, East Boldon Neighbourhood Forum
 - Martin Butler, Clean East Boldon Labour Party

Housekeeping was covered (fire exits, toilets, cables, car registration, recording), and it was confirmed that hearings are recorded and uploaded to the Council's website.

2. Key statements and actions (by topic)

2.1 Late evidence and examination process

Key statements:

- The Inspector noted a “flurry” of last-minute requests to attend or submit material and reaffirmed that late or unsolicited material will generally not be accepted, except where there is a clear legal or other compelling reason.
- He stressed fairness to all participants and reminded parties that there had been ample time since Matters, Issues and Questions were published in September to submit statements.
- The Inspector confirmed there will be a six-week consultation on proposed changes (main modifications) after hearings.

Action:

- Council to continue to route any prospective late evidence through existing protocols; Inspector to accept only in exceptional circumstances (e.g. legal matters). Responsibility: Inspector / Council.

Risk/concern:

- Risk of perceived unfairness and procedural imbalance if late material is accepted; Inspector is actively managing this.

* 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 8 Economic Development & Vitality of Centres & Matter 9 Issue 4 Design Tuesday 20 Jan 2026

2.2 Policy SP17 – Strategic employment and Port of Tyne / Tyne Dock Enterprise Park

Key statements:

- Inspector asked whether SP17 should specifically reference Tyne Dock Enterprise Park in response to Port of Tyne representations.
- Council stated it is not necessary to name the Enterprise Park in the policy due to SP17's strategic nature but is "open" to modifying supporting text to:
 - Acknowledge that the Port of Tyne includes Tyne Dock Enterprise Park;
 - Note that it benefits from Enterprise Zone status.
- Council confirmed this change is considered a minor modification (not required for soundness).

Action:

- Draft and include supporting text modification to recognise Tyne Dock Enterprise Park and its Enterprise Zone status. Responsibility: Council policy team.

Risk/concern:

- If not clarified, potential perception by Port of Tyne that Enterprise Park is under-recognised; but Council's view is that the change is not needed for soundness.

2.3 Policy SP18 – Employment sites portfolio

Key statements:

- Council stated SP18's employment site portfolio is justified and consistent with NPPF paragraphs 11, 20, 23, and 81, referring to the employment site selection topic paper.
- Inspector raised whether the detailed land area figures in SP18 should be "sense-checked" before main modifications to ensure they remain accurate.
- Council agreed that a sense-check would be "sensible."

Actions:

- Undertake a pre-modifications sense-check of SP18 employment land figures. Responsibility: Council.
- Inspector to "keep an eye" on whether any updated figures require changes before main modifications. Responsibility: Inspector.

Risks/concerns:

- Risk that outdated employment land figures may undermine soundness or implementation if not checked before adoption.

2.4 Policy SP19 – Port and river-related development (including green technologies and Tyne Dock Enterprise Park mapping)

Key statements:

- Policy SP19 was described as a key strand of the borough's economy, exploiting geographical advantages on the river.
- "Green technologies" wording was added at Port of Tyne's request and is defined at paragraph 9.17 as mainly renewable energy-related activities (e.g. manufacture/transport of turbine components).
- Council confirmed SP19 encompasses Tyne Dock Enterprise Park and that an amendment to the policies map is proposed to clarify this.
- Inspector described the mapped Enterprise Park area as a "finger of land" along the river up to new housing areas; Council agreed.

* 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 8 Economic Development & Vitality of Centres & Matter 9 Issue 4 Design Tuesday 20 Jan 2026

Actions:

- Implement policies map amendment so the SP19 area clearly includes Tyne Dock Enterprise Park. Responsibility: Council mapping/policy team.
- Ensure cross-referencing between SP19 and the updated policies map is clear at main modifications stage. Responsibility: Council; Inspector to review.

Risks/concerns:

- Without mapping clarification, risk of uncertainty about whether Enterprise Park benefits from SP19 policy coverage.

2.5 Additional riverside land for port/river uses and the Roman House (Roman Hight) site

Key statements:

- Inspector asked if further riverside land needs allocation for port/river-related development (MIQ 8.5).
- Council response:
 - No other deliverable riverside land has been identified for employment aside from the former Roman Hight site.
 - Wagonway Road industrial estate has a riverside location but is in established general employment use.
 - Land bounded by Priory Road and Church Bank (ED.5) is safeguarded for marine aggregates and not available for general employment.
 - Roman Hight is allocated for “general economic purposes” but does not preclude specialist port/river uses, thus providing flexibility.
- Council confirmed Roman Hight is ED.6 in SP18.

Action:

- None specific beyond existing allocations; the Inspector noted the explanation.

Risks/concerns:

- Limited additional riverside opportunities for specialist port/river uses; Council considers current allocations sufficient and flexible.

2.6 Site E35 – Heritage impacts within SP19 area

Key statements:

- Historic England raised concerns regarding site E35 and heritage settings.
- Council stated development on E35 could cause “less than substantial harm” to identified heritage assets, but:
 - Existing plan policies on heritage, design and landscaping provide a framework to minimise and mitigate harm.
- A Statement of Common Ground has been agreed with Historic England confirming this approach.

Action:

- None additional; reliance on existing policy framework and agreed Statement of Common Ground. Responsibility: Council / Historic England.

* 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 8 Economic Development & Vitality of Centres & Matter 9 Issue 4 Design Tuesday 20 Jan 2026

Risks/concerns:

- Residual risk of heritage harm from E35 development; Council considers this managed through existing policies and design/landscaping requirements.

2.7 Policy 22 – Protecting employment areas (marketing, viability and agent of change)

2.7.1 Marketing and viability (Criterion 1 and 2)

Key statements:

- Policy 22 requires (1) a 12-month marketing period for sites in allocated employment areas seeking non-employment uses, plus (2) further evidence under part 2.
- Inspector asked what additional evidence beyond marketing is envisaged and whether this aligns with NPPF paragraph 82(d).
- Council explained Part 2 is intended to go beyond factual evidence of unsuccessful marketing to address qualitative/viability factors, e.g.:
 - Deliberate neglect/disrepair by owners.
 - Other viability issues affecting some employment uses but not others.
- Inspector suggested additional supporting text might help users understand how criteria 1 and 2 work together.
- Council agreed that more supporting text would be helpful.

Action:

- Draft supporting text to clarify how marketing evidence and other qualitative/viability factors under criteria 1–2 should be applied. Responsibility: Council.

Risks/concerns:

- Without clarification there is a risk of inconsistent decision-making on loss of employment sites and potential confusion among applicants.

2.7.2 Port of Tyne and additional protection in Policy 22

Key statements:

- Port of Tyne suggested further specific protection in Policy 22.
- Council opposed adding port-specific wording, arguing:
 - Policy 22 is a borough-wide policy and a port-specific carve-out would be incongruous.
 - The Port of Tyne already has a “very high innate degree of protection” as estate owner and can resist alternative uses.

Action:

- No change to Policy 22 proposed specifically for Port of Tyne. Responsibility: Council.

Risks/concerns:

- Port may feel insufficiently singled out for protection; Council’s position is that bespoke text is unnecessary and unbalanced.

* 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.

2.7.3 Agent of change

Key statements:

- Inspector raised whether the agent of change principle is adequately reflected, particularly in relation to existing businesses and potential new sensitive uses.
- Council cited NPPF paragraph 187 and confirmed strong support for the agent of change principle, noting:
 - Policy 22 Part 4 supports changes of use within allocated employment areas only where operations “would not prejudice” neighbouring businesses.
- Council stated this provides an appropriate balance between protecting lawful existing businesses and allowing change.

Action:

- None specifically beyond current drafting; Inspector noted the explanation.

Risks/concerns:

- Risk that new incompatible uses could constrain existing lawful employment operations; mitigated through Policy 22(4) and wider NPPF agent of change principle.

2.8 Leisure and water-based recreation on the River Tyne (MIQ 8.10)

Key statements:

- Policy encourages water-based recreation/leisure on the Tyne; Inspector queried potential conflict with commercial shipping/port operations.
- Council relied on its MIQ 8.10 written response and did not add further points orally, but acknowledged that other bodies (e.g. harbour authorities) can advise in development management.
- Inspector noted bodies such as harbour commissioners or similar would advise on safe river operation.

Action:

- Rely on consultation with relevant navigation/harbour authorities in determination of applications. Responsibility: Council development management.

Risks/concerns:

- Possible navigation and safety conflict between leisure and commercial shipping; addressed via statutory consultees and DM process.

2.9 International Advanced Manufacturing Park (IAMP) Area Action Plan (AAP) and plan review

Key statements:

- Inspector referred to the Council’s October associated matters update (POST-SUB43) regarding the IAMP AAP.
- Council clarified:
 - The joint IAMP AAP review with Sunderland has “paused” and this position remains.
 - There is currently no direct policy “connection” between the IAMP AAP and this local plan beyond the complementary approach discussed at Stage 1.
 - Additional supporting text has been proposed to clarify the relationship but any future AAP changes are for future plan reviews.

An AI(artificial intelligence) * analysis of the transcript created at the session:
Matter 8 Economic Development & Vitality of Centres & Matter 9 Issue 4 Design Tuesday 20 Jan 2026

- Inspector requested the Council to factually update him if the AAP position changes before he issues his report.
- Council agreed to do so.

Actions:

- Council to notify the Inspector of any material change in IAMP AAP progress while the examination remains open. Responsibility: Council.
- Incorporate clarifying supporting text on IAMP–Local Plan relationship as per previous proposals. Responsibility: Council.

Risks/concerns:

- Plan-making “flux” and uncertainty over future AAP review timetable; risk of misalignment if changes occur unreported before the Inspector’s report.

2.10 Retail hierarchy and centres – Policies SP20, 26, 27, 28

2.10.1 Seawinnings Way / Westoe Crown Village status

Key statements:

- Representation sought designation of Seawinnings Way (Westoe Crown Village) as a local centre.
- Council explained the Local Centres and Neighbourhood Centres Assessment classified Seawinnings Way as a “local neighbourhood hub” – a small parade of purely local significance – and not of sufficient significance to be a local centre.
- Council considers this classification justified and evidence-based.

Action:

- No change to its status as a neighbourhood hub is proposed. Responsibility: Council.

Risk/concern:

- Local stakeholders may feel Seawinnings Way merits higher status; Council’s evidence does not support a change.

2.10.2 Overall retail hierarchy and strategy

Key statements:

- The hierarchy of centres in SP20 and the associated framework in Policies 26, 27 and 28 is based on the Stage 1 Town and District and Local Centres Study.
- Council stated the study confirms the three-tier hierarchy and that it remains valid, maintaining the vitality of centres.

Action:

- None beyond existing policies, as Council considers evidence robust.

Risk/concern:

- None specifically identified; Inspector accepted the explanation.

* 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 8 Economic Development & Vitality of Centres & Matter 9 Issue 4 Design Tuesday 20 Jan 2026

2.10.3 Clusters of uses and Policy 26(2)(4)

Key statements:

- Policy 26(2)(4) seeks to manage “clusters of uses”; Inspector asked what types are envisaged.
- Council indicated experience shows clusters of uses such as hot food takeaways and betting-type uses can harm vitality and are the sort of clusters to be managed.
- Inspector suggested further supporting text could help clarify what “clusters” means for plan users, analogous to the earlier discussion on Policy 22.
- Council agreed that such clarification would be helpful.

Action:

- Draft supporting text to explain what is meant by problematic “clusters of uses” under Policy 26(2)(4) (e.g. hot food takeaways, betting shops). Responsibility: Council.

Risks/concerns:

- Without clarification there is a risk of inconsistent interpretation of “clusters” and potential challenge over how the policy is applied.

2.10.4 Impact thresholds – Policy 28

Key statements:

- Policy 28 sets a local retail impact assessment threshold below the NPPF default of 2,500 sq m.
- Council confirmed this lower threshold directly reflects the retail study evidence.
- Inspector noted NPPF paragraph 90 allows local lower thresholds where justified.

Action:

- None; Council maintains the proposed local threshold is evidence-based.

Risk/concern:

- None identified; no soundness objection has been advanced on this point.

2.10.5 Need for additional retail floor space

Key statements:

- Council stated the retail study:
 - Does not identify surplus capacity to support additional convenience or comparison goods floorspace in the short, medium or long term.
 - Sees no anticipated operator demand for large-format leisure uses over the plan period.
 - Identifies a requirement for c. 900 sq m of food and beverage floorspace, expected as small-scale cafés/restaurants/bars within the three principal centres and, to a lesser extent, district centres.
 - Recommends meeting this via reuse/repurposing of vacant floorspace, consistent with Policy 26(1).
- The only “new” centre is the local centre proposed at Felgate in SP8 as part of the 1,200-home allocation.

Action:

- None; Council sees no need for additional retail allocations beyond Felgate local centre and town-centre intensification.

* 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 8 Economic Development & Vitality of Centres & Matter 9 Issue 4 Design Tuesday 20 Jan 2026

Risks/concerns:

- Risk that unplanned retail/leisure demand might arise; Council considers current evidence does not justify dedicated new allocations.

2.11 Hot food takeaways – Policy 32 and public health evidence

2.11.1 Rationale and obesity data

Key statements:

- Childhood obesity, particularly in Year 6 (10–11 year olds), is a key priority in the Council’s Health and Wellbeing Strategy.
- National Child Measurement Programme data show:
 - Year 6 obesity prevalence in South Tyneside is significantly higher than England and regional averages.
 - On 2024/25 data, South Tyneside has the highest Year 6 obesity prevalence in the region.
- Public health officers emphasised the environment influences obesity, and the hot food takeaway policy is one intervention within a broader “whole systems” approach.

Risk/concern:

- Very high and rising childhood obesity rates in South Tyneside; strong concern that any dilution of policy could worsen trends.

2.11.2 400 m school buffers and 10% ward threshold

Key statements:

- Policy 32 uses:
 - A 400 m radius from secondary school entry points (mapped in the Local Plan).
 - A 10% Year 6 obesity ward threshold.
- Current ward-level data (2023/24) show all wards above the 10% threshold; ward-level breakdown for 2024/25 is not yet available but will be provided when received.
- Public health and planning confirmed that, on current evidence, the 10% threshold would mean no further hot food takeaways would be supported in any ward, subject to other policy criteria.
- Existing hot food takeaways are unaffected and can continue to operate.

Key action:

- Public health team to provide updated ward-level NCMP data (2024/25) to planning when available.
Responsibility: Public Health / Planning.

Risk/concern:

- The effective moratorium on new hot food takeaways (given all wards >10%) may be seen as stringent; Council’s justification rests on very poor health indicators and SPD track record.

2.11.3 Justification for 10% figure and SPD track record

Key statements:

- The 10% threshold derives from the 2017 hot food takeaway SPD, itself influenced by Gateshead’s SPD and regional practice; the figure has been rolled into Policy 32.

* 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 8 Economic Development & Vitality of Centres & Matter 9 Issue 4 Design Tuesday 20 Jan 2026

- SPD has been used in decision-making since 2017:
 - 29 takeaway applications
 - 10 refused
 - 11 withdrawn
 - 8 granted (e.g. where existing LDF policies supported A5, where use was ancillary to a restaurant, or where lawful development certificates applied).
- Council indicated this experience shows the approach is operationally workable and has been tested in development management.

Risk/concern:

- Potential challenge that the 10% threshold is too low or inflexible, especially when it translates into borough-wide constraint; Council relies on SPD precedent and health evidence.

2.11.4 Additional Policy 32 criteria

Key statements:

- For proposals that pass early thresholds (e.g. in a future scenario where a ward falls below 10% and outside 400 m of schools), Policy 32 further assesses:
 - Impact on vitality and viability of the centre (criterion 2).
 - Clustering and concentration (criterion 3), drawing from existing Development Management Policy DM3.
 - Residential amenity impacts (criterion 4).
- Council explained that hot food takeaways can form harmful clusters and harm vitality, necessitating the extra layer of scrutiny (beyond standard town centre uses like restaurants/drive-throughs).

Risk/concern:

- Without these criteria, risk of over-concentration and amenity issues even where health thresholds are satisfied.

2.11.5 Potential “watering down” and health risks

Key statements:

- Inspector asked what would be the adverse consequences of “watering down” Policy 32.
- Public health officers stressed:
 - Year 6 obesity rates have been increasing year on year.
 - Weakening the policy risks continuing or accelerating this trend.
 - The policy will not solve obesity alone but is a vital part of a multi-agency whole-systems approach (alongside physical activity measures, sustainable food work, cooking skills classes, etc.).
- Public health confirmed the Council itself, as a public health body, has direct responsibility for implementing wider obesity interventions; the planning policy is one strand.

Risks/concerns:

- Watering down Policy 32 could undermine the wider obesity strategy and exacerbate already severe public health outcomes.

* 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 8 Economic Development & Vitality of Centres & Matter 9 Issue 4 Design Tuesday 20 Jan 2026

2.12 Matter 9 Issue 4 – Design (Policy 47, NDSS and local expectations)

Only the early part of the design discussion is captured in the provided extract.

2.12.1 Policy 47 – internal space and Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS)

Key statements (Council):

- Policy 47 does not require NDSS; it refers to homes having “good quality internal environments with adequate space.”
- Council proposed a modification to supporting text under MIQ 9.21 to clarify that:
 - The plan does not mandate NDSS, but
 - Regard should be had to the nationally described space standards as an indicator, alongside other design policies (e.g. Policy 21) which also affect internal space.
- Council’s review of recently permitted schemes indicates there is no “significant variance” from NDSS in practice.
- Council confirmed that a scheme slightly below NDSS could still satisfy the policy if it provides adequate space overall; the standards would not be applied rigidly.

Key statements (development sector – HBF / Bellway):

- HBF acknowledged that some builders use NDSS-compliant products, others offer non-NDSS products depending on their business model, target market and affordability considerations.
- HBF concerns:
 - Requiring NDSS can raise build costs and prices, potentially forcing families in lower-income areas to trade down from 3–4 bed to 2 bed homes, creating overcrowding – contrary to NDSS aims.
 - Evidence required by PPG to justify NDSS (incl. outcomes, not just whether homes meet NDSS) has not been produced.
 - “Having regard to NDSS” in supporting text could “muddy the waters” and lead to inconsistent DM interpretations; they argue either the plan should require NDSS or not reference it at all.
- Bellway (Pegasus) broadly backed the HBF position, warning that signposting NDSS in supporting text risks using it as “back-door” policy in decision-making.

Key statements (community side – East Boldon):

- East Boldon Neighbourhood Forum and Clean East Boldon Labour Party argued for stronger use of NDSS, referring to Cleadon Lane as a practical example demonstrating the need for mandatory standards (details in their written appendix).

Actions:

- Council has already proposed supporting text referencing NDSS and will consider MIQ responses and representations in any main modifications package. Responsibility: Council.
- Inspector will consider whether the approach (non-mandatory NDSS with signposting) is effective and justified or requires change in the main modifications. Responsibility: Inspector.

* 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 8 Economic Development & Vitality of Centres & Matter 9 Issue 4 Design Tuesday 20 Jan 2026

Risks/concerns (conflict topic):

- Development sector: risk of undermining housing affordability and creating policy ambiguity if NDSS is indirectly enforced without proper evidence.
- Community/Forum: risk of sub-standard internal space where NDSS is not required, as evidenced by local schemes.
- Council: risk of misinterpretation of “adequate space” without some national benchmark; but risk of over-rigidity or affordability impacts if NDSS is mandatory.

3. Topics of disagreement or conflict

1. NDSS and internal space (Policy 47):

- Council: no mandatory NDSS; propose signposting and flexible interpretation.
- HBF/Bellway: oppose NDSS reference without formal adoption; concerned about affordability and policy ambiguity.
- East Boldon groups: argue outcomes on the ground justify stronger NDSS-type control.

2. Status of Seawinnings Way (local centre vs neighbourhood hub):

- Local representor(s) advocated local centre designation.
- Council insists the evidence supports a neighbourhood hub classification only.

3. Strength of hot food takeaway restrictions:

- Some developers/operators (not detailed in extract, but implied by MIQs) see the policy as stringent.
- Council/public health strongly resist “watering down” given extreme obesity statistics; they see policy strictness as essential.

4. Need for explicit Port of Tyne references in Policy 22:

- Port of Tyne has sought greater explicit protection.
- Council rejects port-specific wording as inconsistent with a borough-wide approach and unnecessary given the port’s estate control.

5. Use of NDSS as a “benchmark vs requirement”:

- Council wishes to “have regard to” NDSS.
- HBF/Bellway fear this becomes de facto mandatory despite not going through PPG tests.

* 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 8 Economic Development & Vitality of Centres & Matter 9 Issue 4 Design Tuesday 20 Jan 2026

4. Consolidated action log (with responsibilities)

Action	Description	Responsible	Linked policy/issue
A1	Add supporting text recognising Tyne Dock Enterprise Park and its Enterprise Zone status within SP17 text, as a minor modification.	Council policy team	SP17 / Port of Tyne
A2	Amend policies map so SP19 area clearly encompasses Tyne Dock Enterprise Park; ensure clear cross-reference in the plan.	Council mapping/policy team	SP19 / Policies Map
A3	Sense-check SP18 employment land area figures before main modifications to ensure they remain accurate.	Council	SP18
A4	Draft supporting text explaining how Policy 22 criteria 1 and 2 operate together (marketing evidence plus qualitative/viability factors).	Council	Policy 22
A5	Draft supporting text clarifying what is meant by “clusters of uses” under Policy 26(2)(4) (e.g. hot food takeaways, betting shops) and why they can harm vitality.	Council	Policy 26
A6	Provide updated 2024/25 ward-level NCMP obesity data to planning once available, to inform monitoring of the 10% threshold.	Public Health / Planning	Policy 32
A7	Notify the Inspector if the IAMP AAP position changes (e.g. review resumes) before the examination report is issued.	Council	IAMP AAP / POST-SUB43
A8	Consider the MIQ 9.21 NDSS debate and representations (Council, HBF, Bellway, East Boldon) in framing any main modifications on design/internal space.	Council; Inspector to evaluate soundness	Policy 47

* 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.

5. Consolidated risks, concerns and blockers

- **Procedural fairness risk:** influx of late evidence could compromise fairness; managed by Inspector's strict stance and protocols.
- **Data-accuracy risk (employment land):** outdated SP18 figures could undermine soundness if not checked; Council to sense-check.
- **Mapping clarity risk (SP19/Tyne Dock Enterprise Park):** without map change, ambiguity over coverage of Enterprise Park by SP19.
- **Heritage risk (Site E35):** potential "less than substantial harm" to heritage assets; mitigated via heritage, design and landscaping policies, plus SoCG with Historic England.
- **Economic land loss risk (Policy 22):** unclear interaction of marketing and viability criteria could lead to inconsistent treatment of employment sites; supporting text proposed.
- **Navigation/safety risk (water-based recreation vs port operations):** increased leisure use on the Tyne could conflict with port activity; reliance on harbour authorities and DM process to manage.
- **Childhood obesity risk:** South Tyneside has region-leading Year 6 obesity, rising year-on-year; loosening hot food takeaway policy could exacerbate public health problems.
- **Policy proportionality risk (hot food takeaways):** all wards currently above 10% threshold means no new takeaways under existing evidence, which may be seen as highly restrictive but justified by health evidence and SPD practice.
- **Housing affordability and internal space risk (NDSS):**
 - If NDSS is made effectively mandatory without full evidence, there is a risk of higher prices and under-occupation/overcrowding.
 - If NDSS is not required, local groups fear continued delivery of homes with inadequate internal space.
- **Plan/AAP alignment risk (IAMP):** paused AAP review creates uncertainty; failure to update the Inspector could lead to mismatched references in his report.
- **Interpretation risk (clusters and agent of change):** without clarifying supporting text, "clusters of uses" in Policy 26 and qualitative tests in Policy 22 may be applied inconsistently.

* 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.