

## PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS (WEST) COMMITTEE

### AGENDA

Meeting to be held in the COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL on  
Tuesday 29<sup>th</sup> March 2022 at 5.30 p.m.

#### Membership

Cllrs Blackett, Donaghy, Fagan, Lauchlan, G. Miller (Vice Chair), Peacock, Price, Thornton (Chair), and Warne

ITEM		PAGE
1.	<b>Receipt of Declarations of Interest (if any)</b>	
2.	<b>Apologies for Absence</b>	-
3.	<b>Minutes of the meetings of the Committee held on Tuesday 31<sup>st</sup> August, 2021 and the meeting held on Tuesday 1<sup>st</sup> March, 2022</b>  (copies herewith)	1
4.	<b>Applications made under the Town and Country Planning Acts and Regulations made thereunder</b>  Report of the Executive Director of City Development (copy herewith).	11

Elaine Waugh,  
Assistant Director of Law and Governance,  
City Hall  
SUNDERLAND

18<sup>th</sup> February, 2022

For further information and assistance, please contact Paul Wood at  
[paul.wood@sunderland.gov.uk](mailto:paul.wood@sunderland.gov.uk)



**At a meeting of the PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS (WEST) COMMITTEE held in the Council Chamber, Civic Centre on TUESDAY 31<sup>ST</sup> AUGUST, 2021 at 5.30 p.m.**

**Present:-**

Councillor Thornton in the Chair.

Councillors Blackett, Donaghy, Fagan, Lauchlan, G. Miller, Price, and Warne.

**Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest

**Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted to the meeting on behalf of Councillor Jenkins

**Minutes of the last meeting of the Committee held on Tuesday 6<sup>th</sup> July 2021.**

1. RESOLVED that the minutes of the last meeting of the Committee held on Tuesday 6<sup>th</sup> July, 2021 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

**Applications made under the Town and Country Planning Acts and Regulations made thereunder**

The Executive Director of City Development submitted a report and circulatory report (copies circulated), which related to the West area of the City, copies of which had also been forwarded to each Member of the Council, upon applications made under the Town and Country Planning Acts and Regulations made thereunder.

(for copy reports – see original minutes)

**19/01320/FUL – Erection of a detached double garage and change of use of open space to private garden. (Amended plans received on 19.4.21)  
Neds Cottage, Hetton Le Hill Farm, Elemore Lane, Easington Lane,  
Houghton Le Spring**

The Planning Officer representing the Executive Director of City Development outlined the proposal to Members of the Committee and the relevant material planning considerations against which the application had been assessed.

2. RESOLVED that the application be approved for the reasons set out in the report subject to the 8 conditions contained therein.

**20/02026/LP3 – Refurbishment and extension of disused school building to form 15no. residential accommodation units with support. The Old School Building, Albert Place, Columbia, Washington, NE38 7BP**

The Planning Officer representing the Executive Director of City Development outlined the proposal to Members of the Committee and the relevant material planning considerations against which the application had been assessed.

Councillor Blackett commented that he understood the building was not in use but queried if there were similar provision of that sort within the vicinity. The Planning Officer advised that there was provision in close proximity,

Councillor Lauchlan commented that he was delighted to see the building being brought back into use after such a long time and that there was a Community Centre near by which offered similar provision.

Councillor Lauchlan raised concerns that the roads were very narrow in this area and 5 bungalows had just been built here, which needed protecting and he worried where the construction vehicles would gain access to the site. The Highways Officer advised that a Construction Management Plan was conditioned as part of the application so this would address any issues in relation to site access.

Councillor G. Miller commented that he was delighted to see this application come forward as it had been 12 years since the building was last in use and he was pleased to see it wasn't being torn down and would instead be used for specialist supported accommodation, something this city had a need for and would help the community going forward.

3. RESOLVED that Members grant consent under Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 (as amended) subject to the 15 recommended schedule of conditions contained within the report

**21/00483/FUL – Development of 45 no. dwellings (Use Class C3), with associated car parking, landscaping and infrastructure (amended plans and updated drainage and ecology information submitted). Land South of Redburn Row, Redburn Row, Houghton Le Spring**

The Planning Officer representing the Executive Director of City Development outlined the proposal to Members of the Committee and the relevant material planning considerations against which the application had been assessed.

A circulatory report was also provided to the Committee relating to late representations.

Councillor Fagan referred to page 47 of the agenda and Durham Wildlife Trusts representations that the development would lead to a biodiversity net loss and commented that whilst financial contributions were in place, this wouldn't replace the loss involved.

The Planning Officer advised that they had consulted with the Councils Ecology expert and they had secured net gains via the financial contributions, these net gains would be delivered off site, whilst they wouldn't be specifically on this development they would be within the locality.

Councillor Fagan referred to page 66 of the agenda relating to the previous Gleeson Homes application for the development of 50 dwellings which was refused and queried what had changed in terms of justification for the differing recommendations, given the similar number of dwellings on both proposals.

The Planning Officer advised that the proposal before Members was able to meet every financial contribution requested by the Council for services such as Education and off site play for example. The previous application submitted by a different developer couldn't meet these obligations and therefore had an unacceptable affect on the area so the key difference between the two applications had been that the previously refused application had not been able to provide mitigation from its impacts.

The Chairman introduced Councillor Heron, as Ward Councillor who wished to speak in objection to the proposal. Councillor Heron referred to page 41 of the agenda which states the proposal was in the Hetton Ward when in fact it was the Houghton Ward and this was a very emotive issue for her and the residents in the Ward as Redburn Road and Black Boy Road had seen a number of developments with building work having never stopped over the past 5 years so she couldn't blame residents for their complaints over construction traffic etc.

Councillor Heron raised concerns over the settlement break of Joe's pond and the adjoining field. Fencehouses already had a number of affordable homes built and Councillor Heron stated that whilst there was nobody who wanted affordable housing more than her, it was considered that there was more than enough in this rural area and that more and more green space was being eaten up.

Councillor Heron wished to highlight the wildlife within Joe's pond and the importance this has had for residents mental health, especially over the past year and a half during the pandemic. Councillor Heron had also received emails in relation to developments at Elba Park and the oversubscription of nearby schools and the NHS being stretched to its limit already.

Councillor Heron summarised that whilst this proposal was only for 45 dwellings it was not appropriate for this area which has had development

upon development. Green space was becoming ever smaller and she had seen Houghton grow to the point where enough was enough.

The Chairman introduced Councillor Neil MacKnight as Ward Councillor who wished to speak in objection to the proposal. Councillor MacKnight commented that he fully agreed with his Ward colleagues comments and that this proposal did cause a conflict as they did want to see social/affordable housing being built, but this area had seen a great deal built upon so his objections were in the same vein as Durham Wildlife Trust and that this proposal would result in a net loss in biodiversity.

Councillor MacKnight commented that we either had a Core Strategy or we didn't and a line needed to be drawn in the sand as Houghton was now the largest populated ward in the city with constant piecemeal developments nibbling away at the green space.

The Chairman introduced Mr Joe Ridgeon of Hedleys Planning, who wished to address the Committee on behalf of the applicant. Mr Ridgeon advised that the proposed properties would be managed by Karbon Homes, who had provided the high quality homes in Fencehouses.

Mr Ridgeon fully supported the Officers recommendation and thanked them for the report and that they had tried to address all concerns where possible. The development would deliver 100% affordable homes, meeting the housing needs along with much needed bungalows whilst also delivering all requested financial contributions totalling £340,000 so that all impacts were mitigated.

The development would deliver highways safety works on Redburn Road and whilst Hetton Town Council and residents had concerns over the number of properties proposed, this development proposed 13% more open space than the other schemes previously approved for the area and would provide the appropriate rounding off of Chilton Moor.

Mr Ridgeon commented that whilst he appreciated residents wanting to protect green space there was a need for affordable housing which this proposal provided the opportunity for 100% of affordable homes and he requested that Members approve the officer recommendation contained within the report.

In response to the representations made at the meeting, the Planning Officer advised that Officers did recognise the amount of housing built within the Hetton/Houghton area, however the proposal was not in conflict with the Core Strategy and the area was designated/allocated for housing in the future. The Land to the south was protected but in relation to this site, there was no conflict.

In relation to Ecology, the site had been subject to numerous surveys and the advice given by experts was that the mitigation and financial contributions were considered to be acceptable. With regard to the value of open green

space, Officers recognised this but did not feel there would be any reduction in accessibility from this proposal.

The Planning Officer commented that ideally brownfield land would always be used but realistically some green field sites needed to be brought forward to meet our housing needs and this site was always intended to support the Council's housing delivery in the next 5 years.

Councillor Fagan commented that she had concerns over this application and did not like the perception that should developers throw enough money at the Council then the recommendation changed to one of approval and that we could not reverse the damage which would be done to wildlife and biodiversity on this site, therefore she would be voting against this recommendation.

Having been put to the vote, with 5 Members voting in favour of the recommendation and 3 Members voting against, it was:-

4. RESOLVED that Members be minded to approve the application, subject to the expiry of the public consultation, the completion of an agreement under s106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and subject to the 20 draft conditions contained within the report

**21/01192/TC3 – Felling of two conifers. (Amended description 29.6.21) – The Green, Washington Village, Washington**

The Planning Officer representing the Executive Director of City Development outlined the proposal to Members of the Committee and the relevant material planning considerations against which the application had been assessed.

5. RESOLVED that Members grant consent under Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Regulations) 1992, subject to the two conditions contained within the report.

**21/01423/FUL – Extension to car park and erection of close boarded fence (Retrospective) Mamas Italian Kitchen, Houghton Road, Newbottle, Houghton-le-Spring, DH4 4EF**

The Planning Officer representing the Executive Director of City Development outlined the proposal to Members of the Committee and the relevant material planning considerations against which the application had been assessed.

6. RESOLVED that the application be refused for the three reasons listed within the report.

### **Items for Information**

Members having fully considered the items for information contained within the matrix, it was:-

7. RESOLVED that the items for information as set out in the matrix be received and noted

The Chairman then thanked everyone for their attendance and closed the meeting.

(Signed) M. THORNTON,  
(Chairman)



**At a meeting of the PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS (WEST) COMMITTEE held in the Council Chamber, City Hall, Plater Way on TUESDAY 1<sup>st</sup> MARCH, 2022 at 5.30 p.m.**

**Present:-**

Councillor Thornton in the Chair.

Councillors Blackett, Fagan, G. Miller, Lauchlan, Peacock, Price and Warne.

**Declarations of Interest**

**21/01805/FUL – Construction of 4 new dwellings – Land at 2 Wylam Close, Stephenson, Washington, NE37 3DR**

Councillor Thornton made an open declaration as she was an acquaintance of the applicant therefore felt it appropriate to withdraw from the meeting during consideration of this item.

**Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted to the meeting on behalf of Councillor Donaghy

**Minutes of the last meeting of the Committee held on Tuesday 1<sup>st</sup> February 2022.**

1. RESOLVED that the minutes of the last meeting of the Committee held on Tuesday 1<sup>st</sup> February, 2022 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

**Applications made under the Town and Country Planning Acts and Regulations made thereunder**

The Executive Director of City Development submitted a report (copy circulated), which related to the West area of the City, copies of which had also been forwarded to each Member of the Council, upon applications made under the Town and Country Planning Acts and Regulations made thereunder.

(for copy reports – see original minutes)

**21/00605/OU4 – Application for Outline Planning Permission with all matters reserved for the erection of industrial units for light industrial, general industrial and storage and distribution uses with ancillary office floorspace – Land to the East of Infiniti Drive, Washington**

The Planning Officer representing the Executive Director of City Development outlined the proposal to Members of the Committee and the relevant material planning considerations against which the application had been assessed.

2. RESOLVED that Members grant consent for the development under Regulation 4 of the Town and Country Planning (General Regulations) 1992 (as amended) subject to
  - i) Confirmation from the Agent/Applicant of the matters noted within the consultation response from the Council's ecology consultant
  - ii) The 30 draft conditions/legal agreement contained within the report

**21/01805/FUL – Construction of 4 new dwellings – Land at 2 Wylam Close, Stephenson, Washington, NE37 3DR**

As the Chairman withdrew from the meeting during this item, Councillor G. Miller took the Chair as Vice Chair of the Committee.

The Planning Officer representing the Executive Director of City Development outlined the proposal to Members of the Committee and the relevant material planning considerations against which the application had been assessed.

In response to Councillor Fagan's enquiry, the Planning Officer advised that they were not aware of the specific numbers of occupants who had used the land during winter periods and that the percentage of storage left on the land was that which was outside of the plots currently there and that the space to the south east of the proposal was now a soft play centre.

Councillor Lauchlan commented that he was confused with the assessment given and referred to the statement that bricks and mortar weren't acceptable on this site, despite there being two properties already built there. The Planning Officer informed that the two buildings on site had already been agreed before the Councils Core Strategy was approved, which safeguarded the land for Travelling Show People. As the new development proposed permanent bricks and mortar dwellings, this would compromise the provision of sites for travelling show people over the remainder of the development plan period up to 2033.

In relation to Councillor Lauchlan's further query that the proposed buildings were still to be used for the travelling community, the Planning Officer advised that the land was allocated for transient accommodation and that bricks and mortar building would sterilise the land. Under the Core Strategy the site had to be safeguarded to provide space for the transient accommodation to suit the mobile nature of Travelling Show people, including for the storage and repair of their equipment.

In response to the Chairman's enquiry, the Development Control Manager advised that the two previous buildings had been determined under the

Unitary Development Plan, which was a very old document and the policies had not been up to date. The Council now had an up to date Core Strategy.

The Chairman queried that having gone through extensive consultation on the Core Strategy, what sort of feedback did the Council receive from the travelling community for the proposals for this site. The Development Control Manager clarified that extensive consultations were carried out over the Core Strategy and its allocations and she was not aware of any objections to this site and was not subject to any examination in the public enquiry.

In response to Councillor Peacock's query as to if there were any grounds to be able to go against officer recommendation, the Development Control Manager advised that all policies had been applied and followed in determining the Officer recommendation.

The Chairman introduced Councillor Jill Fletcher, as Ward Councillor, who wished to speak in support of the proposal. Councillor Fletcher wished to inform the Committee that no travellers had ever set up on the site for the winter period and the land had been a derelict site.

Councillor Fletcher believed that a precedent had been set in allowing the construction of two family homes on the site previously and that these plans aimed to extend the provision of family homes for the applicants immediate family and a long serving member of staff.

The Land was owned by the Noble family and this was an opportunity to build 4 homes in total, all at the same time, which would stop any disruption to residents during construction.

Councillor Fletcher advised that the Noble family had a great involvement with charitable work within the community and that she believed Officers were misconstruing the difference between show people and travellers and that by denying this application the Council would be doing a disservice to this family therefore she hoped the Committee would look at reconsidering the recommendation.

The Chairman introduced Gavin Brown, the agent on behalf of the applicant to address the Committee. Mr Brown informed the Committee that the initial application had been for five homes which was reduced to four on the basis of the Coal Authorities report, who now had no objections to the proposal. The land had been purchased at a time when there was no covenant on the land and they could not understand how a piece of private land could be protected in such a way.

Mr Brown informed that he had spoken with his clients with regards to consultation and they had advised that they were never contacted directly over this proposal to designate the land as protected and they would have raised objections if they had been aware.

The Committee heard that the properties were for family members and members of staff and that the family were happy to work with the Council to find an alternative site for the travelling community allocation.

Mr Brown advised that they were keen to utilise local contractors in building the homes, creating economic benefits and employment opportunities and that it was felt the Council were relying on an outdated image of travelling show people and to deny this proposal was to put unfair restrictions on a private piece of land therefore he requested the Committee reconsider the recommendation put before them.

Upon being put to the Committee, with Councillor Lauchlan requesting his abstention be noted, it was:-

3. RESOLVED that the application be refused planning permission for the reasons contained within the report.

### **Items for Information**

Members gave consideration to the items for information contained within the matrix (agenda pages 49-55).

4. RESOLVED that the items for information as set out in the matrix be received and noted

The Chairman then thanked everyone for their attendance and closed the meeting.

(Signed) M. THORNTON,  
(Chairman)

## Planning and Highways (West) Committee

29<sup>th</sup> March 2022

---

### REPORT ON APPLICATIONS

---

#### REPORT BY THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF CITY DEVELOPMENT

##### PURPOSE OF REPORT

This report includes recommendations on all applications other than those that are delegated to the Executive Director of City Development determination. Further relevant information on some of these applications may be received and in these circumstances either a supplementary report will be circulated a few days before the meeting or if appropriate a report will be circulated at the meeting.

##### LIST OF APPLICATIONS

Applications for the following sites are included in this report.

1. **22/00098/LB3**  
**War Memorial, Spout Lane, Washington**

##### COMMITTEE ROLE

The Planning and Highway West Committee has full delegated powers to determine applications on this list. Members of the Council who have queries or observations on any application should, in advance of the above date, contact the Planning Committee Chairperson or the Development Control Manager  
email [dc@sunderland.gov.uk](mailto:dc@sunderland.gov.uk) .

## **DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that “where in making any determination under the planning Acts, regard is to be had to the development plan, the determination shall be made in accordance with the plan unless material consideration indicates otherwise.

### **Development Plan - current status**

The Core Strategy and Development Plan was adopted on the 30 January 2020, whilst the saved policies from the Unitary Development Plan were adopted on 7 September 1998. In the report on each application specific reference will be made to policies and proposals that are particularly relevant to the application site and proposal. The CSDP and UDP also include several city wide and strategic policies and objectives, which when appropriate will be identified.

## **STANDARD CONDITIONS**

Sections 91 and 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 require that any planning application which is granted either full or outline planning permission shall include a condition, which limits its duration.

## **SITE PLANS**

The site plans included in each report are illustrative only.

## **PUBLICITY/CONSULTATIONS**

The reports identify if site notices, press notices and/or neighbour notification have been undertaken. In all cases the consultations and publicity have been carried out in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

## **LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 – ACCESS TO INFORMATION**

The background papers material to the reports included on this agenda are:

- The application and supporting reports and information;
- Responses from consultees;
- Representations received;
- Correspondence between the applicant and/or their agent and the Local Planning Authority;
- Correspondence between objectors and the Local Planning Authority;
- Minutes of relevant meetings between interested parties and the Local Planning Authority;
- Reports and advice by specialist consultants employed by the Local Planning Authority;
- Other relevant reports.

Please note that not all of the reports will include background papers in every category and that the background papers will exclude any documents containing exempt or confidential information as defined by the Act.

These reports are held on the relevant application file and are available for inspection during normal office hours at the City Development Directorate at the Customer Service Centre or via the internet at [www.sunderland.gov.uk/online-applications/](http://www.sunderland.gov.uk/online-applications/)

Peter McIntyre  
Executive Director City Development

1. Washington  
**Reference No.:** 22/00098/LB3 Listed Building Consent (Reg3)

**Proposal:** **Inscription of name on War Memorial**

**Location:** War Memorial Spout Lane Washington

**Ward:** Washington Central  
**Applicant:** Sunderland City Council  
**Date Valid:** 19 January 2022  
**Target Date:** 16 March 2022

**PROPOSAL:**

The application is for Listed Building Consent to correct a misspelt name inscription on the War Memorial, by inscribing the correct name in full on a separate part of the Memorial.

The name in question is currently inscribed as CARR WD, and was misspelt when the Memorial was refurbished in 1986. Evidence to confirm that the name should read CARR W.P. has been provided.

The stone mason employed to undertake the works advised that inscribing the name again in full using the same font, and with the correct spelling, on the fresh area of stone proposed would be practically easier and provide a more aesthetically sympathetic outcome. There is also some precedent for this approach as new names have been inscribed on the memorial over the years. It is proposed to inscribe directly below Arbuckle R.

**SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

The site is located at the cross roads in Washington Village Conservation Area, located on the green. It is a tall Celtic cross in Heworth Bluestone. The front face of the cross is richly ornamented with carved interlace patterns. The cross shaft rises from the pedestal, on a five-stepped base. It is sited within decorative, circular railings with landscaping surrounding it. The front face of the cross is richly ornamented with carved interlace patterns. The cross shaft rises from the pedestal, square on plan, which stands on a five-stepped base.

The Washington Village War Memorial is a grade II listed building and prominent feature on the village green at the heart of Washington Village. It was erected and unveiled in 1920 by the Earl of Durham to commemorate 181 servicemen who lost their lives in WW1, and subsequently 101 service personnel who died in WW2.

**TYPE OF PUBLICITY:**

Press Notice Advertised  
Site Notice Posted

**CONSULTEES:**

Washington Central - Ward Councillor Consultation  
Tyne And Wear Archaeology Officer  
Conservation Officer

Final Date for Receipt of Representations: **22.02.2022.**

**REPRESENTATIONS:**

No third party representations were received.

The County Archaeologist commented as below

The war memorial (HER 11188) is located on Sprout Lane in Washington Village within a fenced enclosure on the site of the infilled village pond. The 16ft high 1914-18 war memorial is based on a standing Celtic Cross design. It was unveiled on the 9th June 1920 by the Earl of Durham and was sculpted by J.W. Reed of Newcastle. The monument was restored in 1986 by Washington Village Society. The memorial became Grade II listed in February 2017 (List entry 1441367) and it is located within Washington Village conservation area. The proposed work involves re-inscribing a name which was misspelt when the Memorial was refurbished in 1986. The design, access and heritage statement provides details to explain why the name will be re-inscribed rather than work being undertaken to correct the misspelt version. I do not consider that archaeological intervention is required in association with this application. The proposal complies with Policy BH9 in this respect.

**POLICIES:**

In the Core Strategy and Development Plan the site is subject to the following policies:



BH1: Design Quality.  
BH8: Heritage Assets.  
BH9: Archaeological and Recording Assets.

## **POLICY BACKGROUND**

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the principals by which developers and local authorities should approach the conservation, enhancement and reuse of historic buildings and places.

Paragraph 193 of the NPPF states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

Paragraph 194 of the NPPF states that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.

Paragraph 195 states that where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:

- a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and
- b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and
- c) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and d) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.

Paragraph 196: Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

The Core Strategy and Development Plan policies which are considered to be pertinent to the determination of this application are BH1, BH7 and BH8.

Policy BH1 of the CSDP is relevant and requires that development must achieve high quality design and positive improvement. It should be of a scale massing, layout, appearance and setting which respects and enhances the positive qualities of nearby properties and the locality, whilst retaining acceptable levels of privacy and ensuring a good standard of amenity for all

existing and future occupiers of land and buildings.

Whilst Policies BH7 and BH8 of the CSDP state that to preserve or enhance the significance of Conservation Areas and listed buildings, development should be in accordance with the objectives and proposals of the adopted Character Appraisal and Management Strategy for the relevant Conservation Area, should make a positive contribution to the character and distinctiveness of the Conservation Areas and should be of a high design quality.

The Council's Conservation team commented as below:-

The Conservation Team has no objection to the above application. The proposed inscribing of a new name on the Washington Village War Memorial is a minor addition to the listed structure and will importantly rectify an erroneous previous inscription when the name was misspelt during refurbishment works in the 1980s. The supporting Heritage Statement fully explains and justifies the need for the new inscription and the choice of location on the memorial and will have a positive impact on the communal value of the significance of the listed building.

The proposal has no adverse impact to the listed building or the Conservation Area and is considered acceptable in compliance with policies BH7 and BH8 of the CSDP.

## ARCHAEOLOGY

Policy BH9 of the CSDP relates to Archaeology and recording of heritage assets:-

1. Development which adversely affects the archaeological interest or setting of a Scheduled Ancient Monument (or nondesignated heritage asset of equivalent significance) will be refused planning permission unless exceptional circumstances exist that satisfy the requirements of the NPPF.
2. The council will support the preservation, protection and where possible the enhancement of the city's archaeological heritage by requiring that:
  - i. applications that may affect buried archaeological remains must be supported by an archaeological deskbased assessment and evaluation reports where appropriate;
  - ii. where development affects heritage assets of archaeological interest, preference will be given to preservation in situ. However where loss of the asset is justified in accordance with national policy, the remains should be appropriately archaeologically excavated and recorded, the findings assessed and analysed, the resulting archive report deposited with the Tyne and Wear Historic Environment Record and the physical archive deposited with the relevant collecting museum. Significant findings will also be published in an archaeological journal to make them publicly accessible and to enhance understanding; and
  - iii. where demolition or part demolition of a designated built heritage asset or non-designated building of significance has been justified, or substantive changes are to be made to the asset, works must not commence until archaeological building recording of the asset has been carried out and the results deposited with the Historic Environment Record and Tyne and Wear

Archives.

Further to consultations with the County Archaeologist the proposal is considered to be acceptable and compliant with relevant CSDP policies

## **CONCLUSION**

The proposal would not lead to any significant harm to the architectural special interest of the listed building and Conservation Area. It is not considered to be contrary to the NPPF and Local Plan.

The proposal is compliant to Policies BH1, BH7, BH8 and BH9 of the CSDP and the above relevant paragraphs of the NPPF and it is recommended for members to be minded to grant Listed Building Consent under Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Regulations) 1992 (as amended), subject to the draft conditions below:

### **Equality Act 2010 - 149 Public Sector Equality Duty**

During the detailed consideration of this application/proposal an equality impact assessment has been undertaken which demonstrates that due regard has been given to the duties placed on the LPA's as required by the aforementioned Act.

As part of the assessment of the application/proposal due regard has been given to the following relevant protected characteristics: -

- age;
- disability;
- gender reassignment;
- pregnancy and maternity;
- race;
- religion or belief;
- sex;
- sexual orientation.

The LPA is committed to:

- (a) eliminating discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Equality Act 2010;
- (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
- (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

In addition, the LPA, in the assessment of this application/proposal has given due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. This approach involves:

- (a) removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;
- (b) take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it;
- (c) encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.

The LPA has taken reasonable and proportionate steps to meet the needs of disabled persons that are different from the needs of persons who are not disabled include, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities, as part of this planning application/proposal.

Due regard has been given to the need to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves. Particular consideration has been given to the need to:

- (a) Tackle prejudice, and
- (b) Promote understanding.

Finally, the LPA recognise that compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others; but that is not to be taken as permitting conduct that would otherwise be prohibited by or under this Act.

**RECOMMENDATION:** In accordance with Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Regulations) 1992 (as amended), Members Grant Listed Building Consent subject to the draft conditions below:

**Conditions:**

1. The works to which this permission relates must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date on which permission is granted, as required by section 18 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 to ensure that the works are carried out within a reasonable period of time.
2. The development hereby granted permission shall be carried out in full accordance with the following approved plans:
  - Existing and proposed plans received on 19.1.22
  - Location plan received on 19.1.22

In order to ensure that the completed development accords with the scheme approved and to comply with policy BH1 of the Core Strategy and Development Plan.

## ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

LIST OF OTHER APPLICATIONS CURRENTLY ON HAND BUT NOT REPORTED ON THIS AGENDA WHICH WILL BE REPORTED WITH A RECOMMENDATION AT A FUTURE MEETING OF THE SUB COMMITTEE

<b>Application Ref and Ward</b>	<b>Applicant and Address</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Date Valid</b>	<b>Determination Date</b>
<b>21/01566/FUL</b>	<b>Jean Stratton Potts</b>	Agricultural land improvement and remediation of sink holes, utilising imported soil materials and creation of temporary works access.	18/08/2021	17/11/2021
<b>Copt Hill</b>	Land South Of Low Haining Farm Stoneygate Houghton-le-Spring			
<b>14/01371/OUT</b>	<b>Mr Colin Ford</b>	Outline application for erection of 82 dwellings (all matters reserved) (amended/updated information received October 2021, revised drainage info received 07/02/22).	17/11/2014	16/02/2015
<b>Hetton</b>	Coal Bank Farm Hetton-le-Hole Houghton-le-Spring DH5 0DX			

<b>Application Ref and Ward</b>	<b>Applicant and Address</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Date Valid</b>	<b>Determination Date</b>
<b>20/00134/LP3</b>	<b>City Development</b>	Installation of solar panels to roof of existing building, solar carports within carparking area and associated battery storage.	05/02/2020	01/04/2020
<b>Hetton</b>	Evolve Business Centre Cygnets Way Rainton Bridge South Houghton-le-Spring DH4 5QY			
<b>21/00603/FUL</b>	<b>Persimmon Homes (Durham)</b>	Construction of 275 dwellings (use class C3).	22/04/2021	12/08/2021
<b>Hetton</b>	Land East Of North Road Hetton-le-Hole Houghton-le-Spring			

<b>Application Ref and Ward</b>	<b>Applicant and Address</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Date Valid</b>	<b>Determination Date</b>
17/00589/FUL	<b>Persimmon Homes Durham</b>	Demolition of existing scrapyard and Cosyfoam industrial unit and erection of 252 no residential dwellings with associated access, landscaping and infrastructure (AMENDED DESCRIPTION - FEBRUARY 2019).	21/03/2017	20/06/2017
<b>Houghton</b>	Land AtLambton LaneHoughton-le-Spring			
17/02445/FUL	<b>Persimmon Homes Durham</b>	Erection of 141no. residential dwellings with associated access, landscaping and infrastructure (Phase 2). Amended plans submitted July 2018.	21/12/2017	22/03/2018
<b>Houghton</b>	Land North Of Coaley LaneHoughton Le SpringNewbottle			

<b>Application Ref and Ward</b>	<b>Applicant and Address</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Date Valid</b>	<b>Determination Date</b>
<b>19/01446/FUL</b>	<b>Karbon Homes</b>	Erection of 36 dwellings with associated works, including relocation of a substation (additional information uploaded 07.10.2021).	24/09/2019	24/12/2019
<b>Houghton</b>	Land Off Hutton Close And Ninelands Houghton Le Spring			
<b>19/01743/MAW</b>	<b>The Durham Company Ltd</b>	Part retrospective application for the erection of a picking station for sorting recyclable materials.	13/12/2019	13/03/2020
<b>Houghton</b>	The Durham CompanyHawthorn HouseBlackthorn WaySedgeleth Industrial EstateHoughton-le-			



<b>Application Ref and Ward</b>	<b>Applicant and Address</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Date Valid</b>	<b>Determination Date</b>
<b>21/01409/FUL</b>	<b>Russell Foster Tyne and Wear Sports Foundation</b>	Change of use from playing fields to private garden.	02/08/2021	01/11/2021
<b>Houghton</b>	The Russell Foster Football Centre Staddon WayHoughton-Le- SpringDH4 4WL			
<b>21/02737/LP3</b>	<b>Sunderland City Council</b>	Change of use of existing building to community centre with associated elevational alterations, including replacement roof,gutters and piping, new entrance doors to front , steps/handrail to side, and patio area to front.	24/01/2022	21/03/2022
<b>Washington North</b>	Usworth Park PavilionUsworth Recreation ParkManor RoadConcordWashingt on			

<b>Application Ref and Ward</b>	<b>Applicant and Address</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Date Valid</b>	<b>Determination Date</b>
<b>22/00136/FUL</b>	<b>Barmston Developments</b>	Construction of four detached buildings to provide 9no. units with ancillary offices for general industrial (Use Class B2), storage or distribution (Use Class B8) and light industrial (Use Class B1(c)); including parking and turning space, landscaping and accesses onto Turbine Way.	31/01/2022	02/05/2022
<b>Washington North</b>	Land AtTurbine WaySunderland			
<b>22/00204/FUL</b>	<b>Standard Life Investments Property Holdings Ltd</b>	Change of use of building (and associated curtilage) from B2 general Industrial and amenity greenspace to the north, to B8 distribution, including installation and alteration of shutters and doors, additional lighting, construction of new yard, installation of diesel fuel tank, parking areas and landscaping.	07/02/2022	09/05/2022
<b>Washington North</b>	SNOP UK LimitedRainhill RoadStephensonWashingtonNE37 3HP			

<b>Application Ref and Ward</b>	<b>Applicant and Address</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Date Valid</b>	<b>Determination Date</b>
<b>22/00294/FU4</b>	<b>Taylor Wimpey (North East)</b>	Erection of 190no. dwellings with associated access, landscaping and boundary treatment	04/03/2022	03/06/2022
<b>Washington North</b>	Former Usworth Sixth Form Centre Stephenson Road Stephenson Washington NE37 2NH			
<b>21/02898/FU4</b>	<b>Esh Construction Limited And Gladglider Projects Limited</b>	Extra care Housing Development incorporating the erection of a three storey building to provide 84no extra care units (Use Class C2) and 13no. bungalow dwellings (Use Class C3), ancillary support services, associated parking, drainage and landscaping and two new pedestrian / vehicular accesses onto Moorway	12/01/2022	13/04/2022
<b>Washington West</b>	Land West Of Moorway And South Of Havannah Road, Washington.			

<b>Application Ref and Ward</b>	<b>Applicant and Address</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Date Valid</b>	<b>Determination Date</b>
<b>22/00137/FU4</b>	<b>Taylor Wimpey And BDW Trading Ltd</b>	Erection of 49no. dwellings with associated vehicle access and landscaping.	01/02/2022	03/05/2022
<b>Washington West</b>	Land To The North Of Stone Cellar RoadUsworthWashingt on			