

An AI(artificial intelligence) \* analysis of the transcript created at the session:  
Residual Matters from stage 1 and Matter 7 Issue 2 – sufficient supply of homes Thursday 15th Jan

## 1. Overview

This document is the result of analysing the hearing transcript, as such it did not follow a formal meeting process or a standing agenda or action log, so the “minutes” below are structured under the main themes actually discussed:

- White Mare Pool / highway capacity and funding for SP8 (Felgate)
- Air quality and wider public health impacts
- Delivery, master planning and SPD for SP8 (Felgate)
- Overall housing land supply, trajectory and five-year supply

Where possible, I attribute statements and actions to named participants as they appear in the transcript.

## 2. Key statements and actions (by topic)

### A. White Mare Pool junction, highway capacity and funding (Felgate / SP8)

#### Key statements

- Mr Green referred to historic and recent traffic modelling around White Mare Pool (A194/A184/A185), including National Highways documents indicating that by 2032 significant queuing and by 2037 severe queuing is forecast at the junction, and that infrastructure would be required to address this.
- National Highways (via Mr Finch) confirmed:
  - The current scheme cost has dropped from about £40m to around £10–14m because overbridges have been removed and only incremental junction improvements remain in the plan period.
  - The current guidance is to avoid “severe” impact rather than to hold junctions below a fixed capacity threshold (e.g. 90%).
  - The council’s modelling is considered robust and, with proposed improvements and a variable message sign warning of queues, National Highways does **not** consider the impact of the local plan proposals to be “severe”.
  - National Highways has no intention at this stage to deliver the White Mare Pool scheme itself; delivery could fall to third parties, with National Highways engaged but not leading.
- Council officers and consultants (Mr Finch, Mr Fairfield, others) emphasised that the transport modelling supporting the plan is a robust evidence base; data collected in April 2024 is considered up-to-date enough for plan-making, with further refinement at application stage.
- Mr Quigley (for the council/transport side) clarified that the £40m figure frequently quoted relates to an earlier, larger scheme; the current scheme that “facilitates the local plan” is in the £10–14m range and is intended to be funded by multiple developments via Section 106 and other contributions, not by Felgate/SP8 alone.
- The White Mare Pool junction is referenced in the North East Local Transport Plan as a location where a scheme will be investigated, giving some policy support for external funding bids.
- Ms Egleston (for the Felgate landowner/developer) stressed it has never been proposed that the Felgate (Laverick Hall Farm) allocation would fund the entire White Mare Pool scheme, either at £40m or at the reduced level; the intention is pooled contributions from developments across the borough plus potential external funding.
- Councillor Kilgour expressed strong doubt that real funding will materialise:
  - No clear commitment exists from the Combined Authority, the Mayor, or central government for the reduced scheme.
  - National Highways has written that it has no intention of funding it.
  - The council is not in a position to fund a private developer’s profit-making scheme, and other large sites (e.g. Hebburn College) are not expected to contribute to the highway network.
  - On that basis she and residents consider the SP8 site not deliverable due to lack of funding and infrastructure.
- Councillor Kilgour also argued that removal of overbridges is “ludicrous” given the perceived success of the Testos scheme, and she wants SP8 removed from the plan, or at minimum materially amended.

\* 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:  
Residual Matters from stage 1 and Matter 7 Issue 2 – sufficient supply of homes Thursday 15th Jan

#### Actions / follow-ups

- Council to continue using an incremental, multi-party funding approach for White Mare Pool, with Section 106 contributions from several allocations and potential external funding bids (no specific new task, but reaffirmed as the delivery route). Responsibility: Council transport and planning teams, in liaison with National Highways and developers.
- National Highways to condition necessary junction improvements and queue-warning signing to be in place prior to occupation of development at Felgate (SP8). Responsibility: National Highways via planning conditions and S106 at application stage.

#### Risks / concerns / blockers

- Risk that pooled Section 106 and uncertain external funding will not cover the cost of the scheme, leaving inadequate mitigation and undermining SP8 deliverability.
- Concern from residents and councillors that removal of overbridges will degrade safety and capacity, compared to previous designs and to the Testos example.
- Perception that TomTom and model data under-represent the real duration and severity of queues experienced by residents.
- Concern that National Highways' changed test (from fixed capacity to "no severe impact") allows more congestion than is acceptable locally.

### B. Air quality around Felgate / White Mare Pool

#### Key statements

- The council's air quality officer (Mr Mail) stated:
  - The council operates a "robust" monitoring regime using continuous and diffusion tube monitoring.
  - South Tyneside currently has **no** Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs); previous AQMAs at Boldon/Stanhope Road and Lindisfarne (A19/A194) have been revoked due to improved concentrations and continued compliance with objectives, and this has been accepted by Defra.
  - The borough-wide annual status report shows no NO<sub>2</sub> exceedances, and readings are below the 40 µg/m<sup>3</sup> objective.
  - The council does **not** consider that it has an air quality problem as defined by national objectives, but it remains proactive with monitoring and an air quality strategy.
  - Improvements at Lindisfarne were achieved through a council-led three-lane scheme funded from Local Growth Fund, in partnership with the Combined Authority, which reduced emissions and allowed AQMA revocation.
- On Felgate specifically:
  - Diffusion tubes near Felgate/Headworth that residents assumed were on the estate were actually positioned in cul-de-sacs near the A19 and elsewhere; some were removed in 2013 and 2016 due to continued compliance.
  - Mr Mail confirmed monitoring locations are rotated to optimise use of a limited tube network and to align with receptors and known issues; he offered to review locations and introduce a diffusion tube at Felgate if there is local concern.
  - Any major planning application (Felgate, Brinkburn etc.) will require an air quality assessment, and further monitoring can be required as a condition.
- Mr Green argued that Felgate has not been meaningfully monitored since 2013 and that this has left a knowledge gap; he read correspondence confirming removal of tubes, and highlighted a recent commitment from the council to review the network and "include Felgate".
- Councillor Kilgour stressed: "If we don't have any data, we don't know what we don't know", and cited evidence that traffic on the relevant road is actually increasing.
- Mr Green raised additional health concerns relating to non-exhaust emissions (brake dust, tyre particles), particularly in stop-start traffic on the A194 and local distributor roads, quoting academic work suggesting increased heart and lung disease risk and noting that EVs are heavier and can increase brake dust.

\* 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:  
Residual Matters from stage 1 and Matter 7 Issue 2 – sufficient supply of homes Thursday 15th Jan

- The council noted that:
  - Uptake of electric vehicles and investment in some electric buses are occurring, though not specifically targeted at Felgate.
  - The Mayor has ambitions to take greater control of bus services over 5–10 years, but this is not yet in place.

#### Actions / follow-ups

- Air quality team to review diffusion tube network and add a monitoring location covering Felgate/near Durham Drive as part of the imminent review already flagged in correspondence.  
**Responsibility:** Council environmental health/air quality team.
- For Felgate and other major allocations, require site-specific air quality assessments and, where justified, additional monitoring as part of planning conditions.  
**Responsibility:** Development management and Environmental Health.

#### Risks / concerns / blockers

- Potential under-estimation of current and future exposure at Felgate due to historic lack of on-estate monitoring and reliance on broader network tubes.
- Residents’ concern that stop-start congestion (including additional traffic from 1,200 dwellings) will materially degrade air quality around several schools and residential streets, beyond what is captured by borough-wide averages.
- Non-exhaust particulate emissions (brakes/tyres) are not tightly regulated, and may remain high even with electrification of the fleet.

### C. Wider public health and mental wellbeing

#### Key statements

- Public health officers (Ms Hardy, Ms Fairfield) stated:
  - They do **not** consider there to be significant public health issues that render Felgate undeliverable.
  - Policy 1 requires Health Impact Assessments (HIA) for large sites such as Felgate, and public health will use these to secure mitigation and maximise health benefits.
  - Potential **positive** health impacts of Felgate, if “done right”, include:
    - A much-needed mix of housing (including potential for more suitable, healthier homes).
    - Better access to good quality public transport and active travel routes (walking/cycling).
    - Opportunities for new social/community infrastructure and health care provision.
  - Public health work is data- and evidence-driven, informed by the Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy and the South Tyneside Data Observatory.
- The developer (Mr Morton) confirmed that a Health Impact Assessment has been commissioned for Felgate and will be developed in collaboration with council officers.
- Councillor Kilgour strongly disagreed that the scheme is health-promoting in its current form, arguing that:
  - The housing mix does **not** reflect identified needs (e.g. insufficient bungalows, older persons’ accommodation, extra care and one-bed units).
  - The proposed layout does not create cohesive community connections and places the hub at the edge of the development.
  - Two potential exits onto Durham Drive and the volume of traffic undermine any claimed health benefits.
- Mr Green highlighted mental health and wellbeing issues:
  - Long-standing community use of the existing fields, paths and vistas (including views to the farm and use by a livery stable) contributes to residents’ mindfulness and wellbeing.
  - Residents report anxiety about loss of outlook, overshadowing from new townhouses, and the cumulative impact of repeated development attempts over many years.
  - He noted concerns about the farming family and the livery stable potentially losing their livelihood and assets, with knock-on effects for local young people.

\* 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:  
Residual Matters from stage 1 and Matter 7 Issue 2 – sufficient supply of homes Thursday 15th Jan

- The inspector acknowledged he had read the Laverick Hall Farm statements about public access and mental health issues and would consider them under matter 1 (Green Belt / public access).

#### Actions / follow-ups

- Developer to complete and submit a Health Impact Assessment for Felgate, engaging with public health and using the South Tyneside Data Observatory framework.  
**Responsibility:** Felgate promoter (Laverick Hall Farms/Church Commissioners and their consultants) in liaison with council public health.
- Public health to use HIA and policy framework to negotiate: appropriate housing mix, community facilities, active travel measures and opportunities for new health provision.  
**Responsibility:** Council public health and planning policy/development management.

#### Risks / concerns / blockers

- Risk that health benefits claimed in principle (better housing, active travel, new facilities) are not realised in detailed design or are undermined by traffic, congestion and loss of green space.
- Local perception that mental health and community cohesion harms from losing long-used countryside and paths outweigh any potential benefits of new development.
- Concern that the housing mix and affordable provision do not align with evidence of need, limiting health benefits for older and low-income residents.

#### D. Masterplan vs SPD and delivery of SP8 (Felgate)

##### Key statements

- The council explained that:
  - It began work on a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for Felgate to secure high-quality design for the largest allocation in the plan.
  - Following concerns at Stage 1 about delay and the legal status of SPDs, it now proposes to remove the SPD requirement and instead strengthen Policy SP8 to require:
    - A masterplan, including a phasing and implementation plan, approved by the council.
    - A diagram and supporting text drawing key principles from the Felgate “opportunities paper”.
  - This approach mirrors that used at Town End Farm (SP7A) and in other plans where Kings Counsel has been involved.
  - The masterplan would sit alongside existing plan policies (including Policy 47 on design), and any planning applications would have to comply with it.
- The council’s counsel (Mr Shereavrian) and Ms Cooper stated:
  - Requiring strict compliance with an SPD (as in current SP8(3)) is problematic because SPDs are not part of the statutory development plan; they can be material considerations but cannot bind decisions.
  - A masterplan approved via planning application(s) will provide more detailed, binding control than an SPD, because it will structure reserved matters, design coding, phasing and Section 106 triggers.
  - A diagram in the supporting text will give communities a clear schematic of access points, main routes, community facilities and green infrastructure.
  - The masterplan will be subject to statutory consultation alongside its associated planning application.
- The developer representatives (Mr Morton, Mr Dickinson, Ms Egleston) **support** the shift to a masterplan, arguing that:
  - It removes the risk of delay if an SPD is not prepared or adopted.
  - A masterplan submitted with an outline application provides greater certainty and allows parameter plans, technical documents and S106 to be aligned.
- Councillor Kilgour strongly opposed dropping the SPD:
  - She sees SPD + masterplan as “belt and braces” for a strategic site of 1,200 homes.
  - She fears that relying only on a masterplan leaves too much discretion to officers and too little detailed guidance for the community.

\* 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:  
Residual Matters from stage 1 and Matter 7 Issue 2 – sufficient supply of homes Thursday 15th Jan

- She cited Snipery Park in County Durham, where she said developers sidestepped a council masterplan requirement, and expressed concern that the same could happen at Felgate.
- The inspector indicated:
  - Any change from SPD to masterplan will be treated as a **main modification** subject to public consultation.
  - If he retained the SPD route, he would likely still need to change SP8(3) from “adhere to” the SPD to “have regard to” it.

#### Actions / follow-ups

- Council to draft a main modification to Policy SP8 to:
  - Remove the requirement for development to “adhere to” a Felgate SPD.
  - Insert a requirement for an approved masterplan (with phasing and implementation plan) and cross-reference an illustrative diagram in supporting text.
  - Clarify relationship with any existing SPD guidance as a material guide (not binding policy).  
**Responsibility:** Council planning policy team with legal input; to be consulted on as a main modification.
- Inspector to decide, in his report, whether the SP8 modification (masterplan route) is necessary for soundness, taking account of community concerns and developer support.  
**Responsibility:** Planning Inspector.

#### Risks / concerns / blockers

- Community mistrust that a masterplan prepared by developers and approved through applications will deliver the same level of transparent, up-front detail as an SPD process they were expecting.
- Risk of legal and practical issues if policy continues to require strict conformity with an SPD, given its non-statutory status.
- Concern about timing and phasing: residents fear both SP8 and other sites (e.g. Cleadon Lane, Mayflower Glass) will be built out concurrently, overwhelming infrastructure.

#### E. Overall housing land supply, step trajectory and five-year supply

##### Key statements

- The council’s updated trajectory (using the latest SHLAA/SHLAA 2025 data) indicates:
  - A residual requirement of 3,151 dwellings over the remaining plan period.
  - An identified supply of 3,339 dwellings, giving headroom of about 188 dwellings over that requirement.
  - A 10% lapse rate has been applied to unstarted commitments, based on monitoring and as a cautious allowance.
  - Windfall allowance: 37 dwellings per year from year 6 onwards (27 on larger sites and 10 on small sites), supported by historic evidence and an Efficient Use of Land paper.
- The council acknowledges:
  - Slippage has occurred on a number of sites between SHLAA 2023, 2024 and 2025.
  - There is now a shortfall of 288 dwellings against the “straight” trajectory since the start of the plan period (2023).
  - Without a change in approach, a 5-year deliverable supply at adoption cannot be demonstrated.
- The council proposes a **stepped housing trajectory**:
  - Lower annualised requirement in the early years to recognise delay in bringing forward large green belt sites and pitch-strategy-constrained sites.
  - Higher requirement later in the plan period to ensure the full housing requirement is still met.
  - The step is intended to secure a 5-year supply on adoption and avoid “unnecessary” constraint on development by ensuring the plan has full weight in decision-making.

\* 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:  
Residual Matters from stage 1 and Matter 7 Issue 2 – sufficient supply of homes Thursday 15th Jan

- Developers and HBF representatives (Mr Martin, others) objected strongly:
  - They see the step as a “contrived device” to generate a 5-year supply on paper without addressing underlying under-allocation or deliverability issues.
  - They argue more sites (likely additional green belt) should be allocated instead, particularly smaller sites that can deliver quickly.
  - They consider the margin of 188 dwellings extremely thin, such that minor under-delivery on one or two sites would cause shortfall.
  - If a step is used, they say its magnitude should be moderated (the jump from 180 to 363 dwellings pa is described as “climbing Everest”).
- One developer representative pointed out that other plans have been adopted without a full 5-year supply at adoption, where the inspector explained the reasons and implications; they suggest that may be preferable to an artificial step.
- Local residents and some councillors support the step because:
  - It recognises genuine constraints and avoids a forced acceleration of green belt release and build-out.
  - It allows time for necessary infrastructure and mitigation to be delivered alongside allocations.
- On East Boldon specifically:
  - The neighbourhood plan’s 250-home requirement is acknowledged.
  - The local plan allocation plus sites with permission or resolution (Cleadow Lane, Mayflower Glass) would in practice deliver around 470 homes, roughly a 26% increase in village size.
  - The inspector signalled that Cleadow Lane and Mayflower Glass should be explicitly referenced in SP16 so the true scale is clear.

**Actions / follow-ups**

- Council to prepare and consult on a main modification introducing a stepped housing trajectory in the plan, including updated table 2 and clear annualised requirements and monitoring expectations.  
**Responsibility:** Council planning policy team.
- Inspector to decide whether a stepped trajectory is necessary and sound, having regard to PPG, the 288-dwelling shortfall, and alternative options (e.g. more allocations, explicit acceptance of <5-year supply at adoption).  
**Responsibility:** Planning Inspector.
- Council to update SP16 to reflect the full set of East Boldon sites (allocation plus Cleadow Lane and Mayflower Glass) so the total expected quantum is transparent.  
**Responsibility:** Council planning policy team.

**Risks / concerns / blockers**

- Very limited headroom (188 dwellings) above requirement across the plan period; modest under-delivery on a few sites could cause a plan-period shortfall.
- Persistent scepticism from developers and HBF that the large green belt and pitch-constrained sites will hit the stepped trajectory timings, especially given prior slippage.
- Community concern in East Boldon that combined allocations and brownfield consents represent overdevelopment relative to constrained local infrastructure, regardless of whether the overall borough requirement is met.

\* 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:  
Residual Matters from stage 1 and Matter 7 Issue 2 – sufficient supply of homes Thursday 15th Jan

### 3. Summary list: topics of disagreement or conflict

- **Deliverability of SP8 (Felgate):**
  - Council/developers/National Highways: allocation is deliverable with reduced White Mare Pool scheme, pooled contributions and a robust transport evidence base.
  - Councillor Kilgour, Mr Green and residents: scheme is undeliverable due to lack of secured funding, underestimated network stress, and inadequate infrastructure (especially removal of overbridges).
- **Air quality significance and monitoring at Felgate:**
  - Council: no borough-wide exceedances, former AQMAs revoked, current approach is proportionate; willing to add monitoring if needed.
  - Residents/councillor: Felgate has not been monitored for years; traffic is increasing; health risks from non-exhaust emissions and local congestion are being under-played.
- **Health impacts of Felgate:**
  - Public health officers/developer: with a robust HIA and correct design, Felgate can deliver net positive health outcomes.
  - Councillor/residents: housing mix, traffic, layout, and loss of green space will harm both physical and mental health; benefits are speculative and poorly evidenced.
- **SPD vs masterplan for SP8:**
  - Council/developer: SPD requirement is problematic and potentially delaying; a mandatory masterplan with phasing and implementation is a better, more robust statutory mechanism.
  - Councillor/residents: SPD is needed as a baseline and for transparency; relying solely on a developer-led masterplan weakens community protection and detail.
- **Stepped trajectory and adequacy of housing supply:**
  - Council: step is justified by real constraints and is needed to demonstrate a 5-year supply at adoption while still meeting full need by 2040.
  - Developers/HBF: step is a “device” masking under-allocation and deliverability problems; more sites (especially smaller and non-green-belt where possible) should be allocated instead; if used, the step should be less abrupt.
  - Some local representatives: support the step to avoid accelerating green belt build-out and to allow infrastructure to catch up.

### 4. Consolidated action list (with responsibilities)

1. **White Mare Pool and transport for SP8**
  - Implement incremental junction improvements and variable message signing, funded by multiple developments and external bids where possible.
    - **Responsibility:** Council transport & planning teams, with National Highways oversight.
  - Attach conditions and S106 obligations to Felgate and other relevant applications to ensure highway works are in place before occupation.
    - **Responsibility:** National Highways and council development management.
2. **Air quality monitoring and assessment**
  - Review and adjust diffusion tube network to include a location representing Felgate/Durham Drive as part of the forthcoming network review.
    - **Responsibility:** Council environmental health/air quality team.
  - Require air quality assessments for major local plan sites (including Felgate), adding monitoring or mitigation conditions where needed.
    - **Responsibility:** Development management and Environmental Health.
3. **Health Impact Assessment and public health input**
  - Prepare, submit and iterate a Health Impact Assessment for Felgate with council officers, addressing housing mix, access, active travel and health facilities.
    - **Responsibility:** Felgate developer/promoter and their health consultants, with council public health.

\* 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:  
Residual Matters from stage 1 and Matter 7 Issue 2 – sufficient supply of homes Thursday 15th Jan

#### 4. SP8 masterplan and policy modification

- Draft a main modification to SP8 replacing the SPD requirement with:
  - A requirement for an approved masterplan and phasing/implementation plan.
  - A supporting schematic diagram and cross-reference to any relevant SPD guidance as material.
  - Responsibility: Council planning policy team and legal advisors.
- Consult on the main modification, and then use the approved masterplan to structure subsequent outline and reserved matters applications.
  - **Responsibility:** Council and Planning Inspector (for recommendation); developers for preparation of masterplan.

#### 5. Housing trajectory and SP16 updates

- Update table 2 and related text to:
  - Introduce a stepped housing trajectory with clear annualised requirements.
  - Incorporate the latest SHLAA/trajectory data.
  - Responsibility: Council planning policy team.
- Explicitly reference East Boldon allocations plus Cleadon Lane and Mayflower Glass in SP16 so the total expected growth (approx. 470 homes) is transparent.
  - **Responsibility:** Council planning policy team.

#### 6. Examination steps

- Inspector to consider:
  - Whether SP8 should proceed on a masterplan basis (without an SPD requirement).
  - Whether to endorse the stepped trajectory, or recommend alternative modifications (e.g. further allocations or acceptance of <5-year supply at adoption).
  - **Responsibility:** Planning Inspector in his report, following consultation on main modifications.

#### 5. Consolidated list of risks, concerns and blockers (all topics)

- **Funding and delivery of White Mare Pool scheme:** absence of secured funding; reliance on pooled S106 and speculative external funding; National Highways not intending to deliver the scheme themselves.
- **Traffic growth and congestion:** forecast queuing and perceived under-estimation of real-world congestion; impact of 1,200 homes at Felgate plus other allocations on already stressed junctions and rat-runs.
- **Air quality and non-exhaust emissions:** lack of long-term monitoring at Felgate; stop-start traffic near schools; under-regulation of brake and tyre particulate emissions.
- **Health and wellbeing:** mental health impact of long-running development pressures; loss of well-used paths, vistas and equestrian facilities; concern about housing mix and affordability not matching need.
- **Governance of design and phasing:** fear that replacing SPD with masterplan reduces community leverage; risk that masterplan is developer-driven with insufficient safeguards if policy is not tightly drafted.
- **Housing supply robustness:** thin headroom of around 188 dwellings; evidence of slippage on multiple sites; reliance on a stepped trajectory to construct a 5-year supply rather than on additional allocations or more cautious assumptions.
- **East Boldon cumulative growth:** combined impact of allocation plus brownfield consents (approx. 470 homes) on a village with constrained Victorian infrastructure and services already perceived as at capacity.

\* 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.