

**At a Meeting of the DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (SOUTH SUNDERLAND) SUB-COMMITTEE held in the CIVIC CENTRE on TUESDAY, 26<sup>TH</sup> FEBRUARY, 2013 at 4.45 p.m.**

**Present:-**

Councillor E. Gibson in the Chair

Councillors Ball, Blackburn, Ellis, Essl, Porthouse, Price, Scanlan, Thompson, Turton, S. Watson and Wood.

**Declarations of Interest**

12/02901/FUL – 68-84 Hylton Road, Sunderland, SR4 7BA

Councillor Price made an open declaration that he had been contacted by residents about the application; he felt that he would not be able to consider the application with an open mind and would withdraw from the meeting during the decision making on the application.

**Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Copeland, Maddison, Tye and P. Watson.

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

The Deputy Chief Executive submitted a report (copy circulated) relating to the South Sunderland area, copies of which had been forwarded to each Member of the Council, upon applications made under the Town and Country Planning Acts and Regulations made thereunder.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

**12/02901/FUL – Refurbishment and extension of ground floor retail units, creation of new ground floor flat, enlarged entrance and new link access to flats. Reconfiguration and extension of first floor student accommodation and installation of new windows to front and rear at first floor level.  
68-84 Hylton Road, Sunderland, SR4 7BA**

The representative of the Deputy Chief Executive advised that the application was part retrospective as the works to construct the extension to the rear had already commenced. A development of this nature would normally be determined under the

Officers delegated powers however the application had been referred to the Committee at the request of Councillor Price. There had been representations received from 2 local residents and there was also a petition against the application which had been signed by 72 residents.

There were currently 9 commercial units and as such under the current permitted development rules there could be 18 flats created; 2 per commercial unit; without the need for planning permission.

The principle of the development was considered to be acceptable as the land was not allocated for any specific use and as such the existing land use was to prevail; as the flats had been used for at least 10 years it was felt that the residential use of the building had already been established.

There would be parking for 6 vehicles within the rear yards for residents of the flats and there was not expected to be a substantial increase in traffic or any prejudice to Highway safety.

Councillor Ellis expressed concerns that there did not seem to be sufficient parking and that there would be an increase in parking in neighbouring streets as a result of the development. The highways engineer advised that normally there would be a requirement for 1 space per dwelling however HMOs and student accommodation had lower requirements. It was acknowledged that the retail units did not have the facility for parking of large vehicles for servicing of the premises however none of the existing units had any space within their curtilage for servicing. The representative of the Deputy Chief Executive added that there would not be any parking required if the permitted development of 18 flats was carried out and as such the provision of 6 parking spaces was an improvement.

Councillor Price then spoke against the application on behalf of local residents. He stated that there had been a large number of objections from residents and that within the area there were already major parking and traffic issues. He felt that there would be major traffic problems caused by the development which would lead to cars being parked in the surrounding streets and on the pavement on Hylton Road. Policy H18 of the UDP stated that applications should be approved where the intensity of use would not adversely affect the character and amenity of the area; he felt that it would have an adverse effect given that the surrounding area was predominantly single family dwellings. He was concerned that there were already a number of properties in the area which were being converted into HMOs and Student houses and he was concerned that if there were not sufficient students then the flats would be rented to non students or could be used as hostels.

Joe Moore, agent for the applicant, then spoke in support of the application. He stated that this was a sustainable location with good public transport links and close to local services. The building was currently unused and this development would bring it back into use; the student lets had been provisionally let for September. The development would improve the visual appearance of the building. The upper floor had been in residential use for a number of years as confirmed by sworn statements from the occupants of a neighbouring office which stated that the upper floor had been used as multiple occupancy residential accommodation continuously since 2002. There were also Council Tax records dating back to 2000. Following concerns raised by the Councils highways department there had been changes made to the

plans to incorporate the parking into the rear yards. Currently there were around 20 flats in the building however the works would create 5 flats each with 5 or 6 bedrooms.

Councillor Ellis stated that in the report there was a reference to the fire service issuing a prohibition notice in 2011, she asked whether the building had been occupied since then. Mr Moore advised that the notice had been issued due to the fire safety of the flats and since it had been issued the building had not been occupied. The representative of the Deputy Chief Executive advised that although the building had been unoccupied due to health and safety reasons it was still classed as being in residential use and the building had been used for residential purposes for over 10 years.

Councillor Thompson stated that considering there could be 18 flats with no parking provision created under permitted development that the application to have 7 further properties but to include 6 parking spaces was reasonable.

1. RESOLVED that the application be approved for the reasons set out in the report and supplement subject to the 3 conditions set out in the supplementary report.

**12/03152/OUT – Outline application for the erection of a new bingo club with associated access (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale all reserved). Land off Leechmere Road, Grangetown, Sunderland**

The representative of the Deputy Chief Executive advised that the application site was actually in Ryhope ward rather than Silksworth as stated in the report. This was an outline planning application with all matters other than access reserved. The site was currently derelict and there were issues with people accessing the site without permission. There was a requirement for highways works to be carried out outside of the site boundary and it was proposed that a Grampian condition be imposed on any consent granted to ensure that these works were done.

Councillor Wood stated that he did not want there to be cars associated with this site parking on Leechmere Road as it was a very busy road. He queried whether the width of the access was satisfactory and whether there would be sufficient parking within the site. The highways engineer advised that the current access was only wide enough for a single vehicle however it would be widened to accommodate two way traffic. The proposed parking provision was considered to be sufficient to meet the demand. There were two possible options for accessing the site; turning left into and out of the site using the Asda roundabout and Hollymere junction to turn around or allowing left and right turns with an additional opening in the central reservation provided. It was felt that the left in and out system would be most appropriate and that U-turns should be prohibited at the opening in the central reservation for the entrance to the industrial estate.

Councillor Wood then suggested that the Hollymere junction may need to be changed to a roundabout in order to cope with the additional demands. He was informed that the junction suited the demands placed on it and that it was not felt that this development would impact on the effectiveness of the junction.

Councillor Porthouse expressed concerns that there seemed to be conflicting information given that it was acceptable to turn right into and out of the industrial

estate but not at the development site. The highways engineer advised that there had been consideration given to the closing of the opening in the central reservation as there had been incidents at the junction; however due to the volume of traffic accessing the industrial estate it would not be possible as undue pressure would be placed on the Asda roundabout and Hollymere junction as a result.

In response to a query from Councillor Essl the highways engineer advised that Leechmere Road had originally been built as a 2 lane dual carriageway; in recent years there had been works on the stretch between the Hollymere and Essen Way to reduce the road to one lane in each direction with space for parking and a cycle lane in what used to be the left hand lane. There were plans to continue this reduction to one lane along the remainder of Leechmere Road.

2. RESOLVED that the decision be delegated to the Deputy Chief Executive for approval for the reasons set out in the report and subject to the conditions listed in the supplementary report and subject to the expiry of the consultation period.

**12/03404/FUL – Erection of a multi-storey car park to provide 766 spaces (including 28 disabled spaces)  
Sunderland Royal Hospital (Site of Car Park C Opposite 24-38 Kayll Road),  
Chester Road/Kayll Road, Sunderland, SR4 7TP**

The Chairman moved that this application be deferred and be considered at a future meeting. Accordingly it was:-

3. RESOLVED that determination of the application be deferred to a future meeting of the Committee.

**13/00025/FUL – Change of use from Bakery (B1) to retail shop (A1) and provision of new shop front (amended description)  
Former Bakery, 150 Cleveland Road, Sunderland, SR4 7PT**

The Chairman advised that the applicant had withdrawn the application.

**Response to the Department for Communities and Local Government  
Consultation of Planning Performance and the Planning Guarantee**

The Deputy Chief Executive submitted a report (copy circulated) for the Committee to endorse the response to the DCLG consultation of November 2012, "Planning Performance and the Planning Guarantee" which was appended to the report.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

4. RESOLVED that the report be received and noted.

(Signed) E. GIBSON,  
Chairman.