

At an EXTRAORDINARY meeting of the PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS (EAST) COMMITTEE held in the CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER on MONDAY 11 APRIL 2022 at 5.30 p.m.

Present:-

Councillor Butler in the Chair.

Councillors Dixon, Doyle, Foster, Nicholson, Peacock, Reed, Scanlan, Stewart and Wilson.

Declarations of Interest

Item 4, Applications made under the Town and Country Planning Acts and Regulations made thereunder – Planning Application 21/02938/FD4 Sunderland City Council Civic Centre Burdon

Councillor Dixon made an open declaration that he had met with Planning Officers, Vistry and Ward residents and had been involved in arranging site visits and public events. He had also expressed concerns about the removal of trees on the site. He had however made no comments on the merits or otherwise of the application and was satisfied that he was able to consider the application with an open mind.

Councillor Reed made an open declaration that he had met Planning Officers and attended public events regarding the matter but was satisfied that he was able to consider the application with an open mind.

Councillor Doyle made an open declaration that his employer had had early sight of the initial proposals however he has satisfied that he was able to consider the application with an open mind.

Item 4, Applications made under the Town and Country Planning Acts and Regulations made thereunder – Planning Application 22/00161/LP3 Land at Blandford Street Sunderland.

Councillors Doyle and Reed made open declarations that they had met with the Assistant Director of Infrastructure, Planning and Transportation regarding the application but were satisfied that they able to consider the matter with an open mind

Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted to the meeting on behalf of Councillors Essl, E. Gibson, Hodson, Noble and P. Smith.

Planning Application Reference 21/02938/FD4 Demolition of Civic Centre, car park and associated buildings and structures, including footbridge across Burdon Road, and the redevelopment of the site for up to 265 residential dwellings/apartments with associated vehicular and pedestrian accesses, parking, landscaping, infrastructure and engineering works and the removal of, and works to, various trees. Burdon Road Sunderland SR2 7DN 21/02676/OU4

The Executive Director of City Development submitted a report (copy circulated) in respect of the above matter together with a supplementary report (copy tabled).

(for copy reports – see original minutes)

The representative of the Executive Director of City Development presented the report informing members that the proposed development affected Sunderland Civic Centre, which occupied a site covering approximately 4.8ha on the south side of Sunderland City Centre. The Civic Centre building stood within the eastern part of the site, with areas of grassed open space to the west and southern parts of the site. A multi-storey car park occupied the northernmost part of the site.

The application site also included the temporary surface-level car park located between the existing City Green apartment block and Cowan Terrace. The car park formed part of the wider application site for a development which included the City Green and Benedict Court apartment blocks. The planning permission for the site (application ref. 07/03301/SUB) also involved the erection of a 2 – 5 storey office block on the car park site; although this element of the approved development had not been built, the permission for the block would remain extant given the wider planning permission for the development of the site has been implemented.

The application site was bordered by Burdon Road to the east, which partially ran through a cutting. Beyond this was Mowbray Park, with which the Civic Centre was connected via a footbridge. To the north, also in a cutting, lay the section of Metro line between Park Lane and Sunderland Central stations. Beyond this was the commercial heart of the City Centre. To the south and south-west were areas of greenspace and a range of Victorian residential terraces and individual buildings within Ashbrooke, with further greenspace, a temporary car park and more modern dwellings and apartment blocks to the west. West Park Church, adjacent to the north-west corner of the site, was now partly in residential use. Park Lane Bus and Metro Interchange lay to the north-west, across Cowan Terrace.

The planning application firstly proposed to demolish the Civic Centre and associated buildings and structures, including the multi-storey car park and footbridge into Mowbray Park. Full planning permission was required for this work by virtue of the site's location within the Conservation Area.

The demolition programme was estimated to last for 41 weeks and would commence from the southern part of the site and extend progressively northwards, demolishing each section of the superstructure in sequence, with a total of 10 phases of demolition planned. The cleared site would then be developed to provide a total of 265 residential properties, with associated vehicular and pedestrian accesses, parking, landscaping, infrastructure and engineering works and the removal of, and works to, trees at the site

The 265 properties would be delivered as both dwellinghouses and apartments, with 145 no. houses and 120 apartments. The mix would be:-

- 4 no. 2-bed apartments over garages;
- 82 no. 3-bed dwellinghouses;
- 59 no. 4-bed dwellinghouses;
- 41 no. 1-bed apartments;
- 79 no. 2-bed apartments;

Dwellinghouses within the development would be 2- 2.5 and 3-storeys in height, with the 3-storey dwellings lining formal park spaces and main streets and the 2- and 2.5-storey dwellings lining secondary and tertiary streets. The apartment blocks would be 4-storeys in height and located at key corners and junctions around the edges of the site. The layout of the proposed development was built around one main north-south route, which was designed to re-establish an historic connection from Park Lane to the southern end of Burdon Road, lost following the development of the site for the Civic Centre. East-west connections would also be available.

The representative of the Executive Director of City Development then informed the Committee of the key issues to consider in determining the application, including:-

- The Council's position in respect of housing land supply and delivery;
- Land use and housing policy considerations;
- Built heritage considerations;
- Design, layout and landscaping considerations;
- Residential amenity considerations;
- The implications of the development in respect of health and social value;
- The implications of the development relative to archaeology;
- The impact of the development in respect of highway and pedestrian safety;
- The impact of the development in respect of ecology and biodiversity;
- The impact of the development in respect of flooding and drainage;
- The impact of the development in respect of ground conditions;
- The implications of the development in respect of education provision;
- The implications of the development in respect of affordable housing;
- Contributions required under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended);

In conclusion Members were informed that regard must be given to all relevant material considerations and all the relevant policies of the Council's development plan before it could be determined whether the proposed development accorded with the development plan or not. Where conflict with development plan policies was identified, it was then incumbent upon the Committee, to attribute weight to the benefits of the proposed development and establish whether these benefits outweighed negative aspects of the development and the associated policy conflict.

With regard to the analysis of the relevant planning policies and material considerations set out in the report it was considered that the principle of a residential development of the site was acceptable and that the proposed scheme successfully addressed the requirements and objectives of the majority of the policies and guidance applicable to the site. The main point of policy conflict was in relation to affordable housing, given that the planning decision would not secure affordable housing in line with the objectives of the NPPF and policies H2 and ID2 of the CSDP. There would also be some minor amenity impacts arising from the development of the site, both permanent as a result of the presence of new housing and temporary during demolition and construction works.

For the reasons set out in the report and presented to the meeting, the representative of the Executive Director of City Development considered that in this case, the significant benefits of the proposed development, especially in terms of housing delivery at a highly sustainable central location, the scheme supporting the regeneration and transformation of the Urban Core and the enhancement of heritage assets, should be seen to outweigh the absence of affordable housing being secured through the planning application process. Accordingly, the application was recommended for approval subject to the conditions set out in the supplementary report.

The Chairman thanked the representative of the Executive Director of City Development for his report and invited questions from Members.

Councillor Doyle referred to page 5 of the report which described Hillside Street as containing tertiary streets to provide more intimate, mews- and courtyard-type settings with reinforced pedestrian and cycle priority created by narrower, shorter streets. He asked if this was to be secured by additional means such as traffic calming measures. In reply the Committee was advised that this would be secured primarily by the street layout. The specifics of highways management in respect of Hillside Street were still to be determined.

Councillor Doyle referred to the statement on page 6 of the report that all homes were designed to meet Nationally Described Spacing Standards and that 40% of the properties would meet the 'Accessible Dwellings' standards of Part M4(2) of the Buildings Regulations. He asked why the figure of 40% had been considered appropriate? The representative of the Executive Director of City Development replied that the policy requirement of the Council was only

10% and therefore the figure of 40% represented a significant uplift above that requirement.

In response to an enquiry from Councillor Doyle regarding the mechanism that would require the viability of the development to be re-tested in the event Vistry did not provide the grant-funded affordable housing at a level which was compliant with Council policy, the representative of the Executive Director of City Development confirmed that the mechanism would be secured via a clause in the Section 106 agreement and if required, any retest would be reviewed by an independent third party.

Councillor Doyle referred to the acceptance that the scheme was unable to support the delivery of affordable housing due to the significantly negative residual land value and asked what the values were, both in respect of a scheme which contained 15% affordable housing and one that was 100% private residential? In reply the Committee was advised that the figures were minus £5.3m and minus £4.36m respectively.

Councillor Dixon stated that there had been a lot of discussion regarding the requirement for a Community Parking Management Scheme however its inclusion in the proposals via a funding contribution secured in the Section 106 agreement had come out of the blue. The Highways Officer advised that the belief that a scheme was required arose from the proximity of the site to the city centre making it an attractive parking option for commuters and visitors. He assured Councillor Dixon that the approval of any CPMS would be reliant on a positive outcome following extensive public consultation and discussions with ward Councillors.

Councillor Dixon stated that ward Councillors had not been consulted on the element of the Section 106 Agreement regarding the £22,000 contribution towards allotment provision in the area. He believed that the purpose of such an agreement was to make local improvements to mitigate the impact of the development on local facilities nearby. He referred to the poor state of the play facilities in nearby Backhouse Park and believed there was now an ideal opportunity to address them via Section 106 funding. Likewise, he felt that Mowbray Park could also benefit in this way and believed that it would be a much more appropriate form of mitigation than allotment provision.

The representative of the Executive Director of City Development replied that the mitigation was in line with the recommendations of the Council's Planning Obligations SPD, on the basis that there was a dearth of allotment options in the St. Michael's and Hendon Wards. Play facilities were being provided as part of the development and therefore to also improve play facilities off site would mean in effect that play was being double counted. Any amendments to the agreement would need to be discussed with the applicant however the proposed mitigations were policy compliant as informed by the Council's adopted policy position.

Councillor Dixon replied that he would liked to have been in the position to make his point about the proposed mitigations a little earlier in the process.

In response to enquiries from Councillor Scanlan regarding where the allotments would be located and whether the mitigation could be switched from allotments to play parks, the representative of the Executive Director of City Development advised that locations had not be finalised and that he would welcome in put from ward Councillors in this regard. He explained that with regard to a switch from allotments to play parks as a form of mitigation this would go against the methodology of the SPD and as a result would not be policy compliant.

Councillor Reed stated that £22,000 seemed a great deal of money and asked if it was to be invested in new provision or in improving existing allotments. In reply, the representative of the Executive Director of City Development stated that it was most likely that it would be invested in improving existing provision.

There being no further questions for the representative of the Executive Director of City Development, the Chairman welcomed and introduced Mr Jack Deverson who had registered to speak in objection to the application advising that he would be given 5 minutes to address the Committee.

Mr Deverson informed the Committee that his objection was based on the following issues:-

- Whilst he was supportive of the application as a whole, the noise during the demolition and construction phases which were scheduled to last for over five years could damage his business irreparably.
- The business (Evidenced based Education) worked with school trusts, colleges and various government agencies providing live training and support such as the delivery and recording of webinars, podcasts and video sessions. As such, the sensitivity of the business to noise disruption when conducting its day-to-day business was significant and fairly exceptional. The level of sensitivity could be judged from the fact that a particularly loud seagull in the car park had interrupted business in the past.
- The potential loss of amenity in the area because of noise had been investigated by Environmental Health however its focus was on residents rather than business with the hours of demolition and construction being largely the same as business hours.
- The issue was exacerbated by the location of the business in the Grade II listed Grange Terrace which precluded the use of double glazing. The quieter areas of the premises, given the existing road noise, were at the back of the building and it was here where the recording and delivery of online work took place. It was this side of the building which would now directly face the demolition and construction site. The unpredictability of construction and demolition noise would make it impossible to plan for uninterrupted recording and/or delivery of sessions.
- The company flew the flag for small innovative businesses looking to locate in Sunderland however if the application was approved it may

struggle to continue to operate unless measures to mitigate the noise such as acoustic screening were implemented by the applicant.

The Chairman thanked Mr Deverson for his presentation and invited questions of clarification from Members.

Councillor Doyle referred to the planning policies described on page 51 of the agenda papers and asked if there was anything in the policies regarding the impact of construction noise on businesses. The representative of the Executive Director of City Development replied that the policy Councillor Doyle mentioned referred specifically to the amenity of future residents on the site. With regard to the noise arising from demolition and construction, it was not a ground on which planning authorities could withhold planning permission as it was an inevitable outcome of the development process. Instead, the authority would look to ensure that any potential impact was mitigated.

In response to an enquiry from Councillor Doyle, the Environmental Health Officer confirmed that businesses would be considered as being noise reception sensitive however the Team would consider the most sensitive noise receptors to be residential properties. This was coupled to the fact that residential standards were the only standards that were established nationally within planning policy. The closest homes were on St George's Way which was actually closer to the development than Mr Deverson's business. The use of several mobile acoustic barriers were an option in mitigation, together with the use of the right kind of plant and the density of the vehicle loadings. Given the size of the site, the difficulty would be in finding the most appropriate location for the mitigation.

There being no further questions, the Chairman informed Members that the second person registered to speak in objection, Ms Joanne Lavender, had advised that she was not able to attend but had supplied a written copy of her objection and asked that an Officer read it out to the Committee.

Ms Lavender's statement was read to the meeting. The Committee was informed that she was not against the development as a whole, being supportive of the site being used for the good of the community, however, she had strong concerns regarding the height and proximity of the town houses to St Georges Way numbers 4-8, and the effect it would have on the light, privacy, access and amenity to the front of her house and those of her neighbours.

She contended that other options available to the developer could include:-

- Moving the townhouses to the other side of the proposed St Georges Park, so that both the new and current residents could have open access to it.
- Move the townhouses and fences further away from St Georges Way by reducing the width of St Georges Park, and giving St Georges Way residents a wider access path.

- Move the townhouses to the unused area to the side of St Georges House, where there were no residents in close proximity, and the current park could be retained for current residents and the local community.

In conclusion she reiterated that she felt strongly that the townhouses should be moved, or reduced in height, to allow the current residents light, privacy and amenity - rather than having a 3 storey block in front of the windows and that access plans should also be re-considered to give current residents a wider access route than proposed.

The Chairman then welcomed and introduced Mr Michael Hepburn from the applicant's agent Lichfields and the applicant Mr Andrew Rennie from Vistry Partnership Limited advising that they would be allowed 5 minutes each to address the Committee.

Mr Hepburn and Mr Rennie having spoken in support of the application, the Chairman invited questions of clarification from Members of the Committee.

Councillor Dixon referred to the location of the 3 storey town houses and stated that he found it difficult to understand why they had been placed so close to St George's Way and asked if it was possible to rearrange the location of the planned housing types so that the 3 storey town houses were placed where there were no residents in close proximity as suggested by Ms Lavender? Mr Rennie replied that the location and design of the townhouses was intended to create a town square effect. The position of the different housing types was designed to optimise the site. To switch the locations around would result in a reduction in the number of units available which would negatively affect the strength of the development's viability.

Councillor Dixon referred to the assessment on page 54 of the agenda that the properties on St George's Way currently had very little privacy given the lack of boundaries or screening to the public open space beyond and advised that this was not accepted by Ms Lavender who believed that her privacy would be lost.

The being no further questions, the Chairman asked the Committee to consider and comment on the application.

Councillor Doyle stated that he agreed with the conclusions of the report that the benefits were significant and whilst having concerns regarding the affordable elements of the proposal he would be happy to support the application.

Councillor Dixon stated that he would be supporting the application although he wished to place on record his disappointment regarding the Section 106 mitigations and the location of the 3 storey townhouses.

The Chairman believed that it was a very well thought through development and one that would be important in attracting residents to the city centre.

There being no further comments, the Chairman put the Officer recommendation to the Committee as detailed in the supplementary report and accordingly it was:-

1. RESOLVED that consent be granted for the proposed development under Regulation 4 of the Town and Country Planning (General Regulations) 1992, subject to the completion of s106 agreement and the list of re-worded draft conditions as detailed in the supplementary report.

Planning Application 21/02550/FUL Full Application Erection of 16 No. x 1 bed bungalows for older people - social housing within the city. Former Site of Coutts and Findlater Ltd Hudson Road Sunderland SR1 2LJ

The Executive Director of City Development submitted a report (copy circulated) in respect of the above matter.

(for copy report – see original minutes)

The representative of the Executive Director of City Development presented the report, advising the Committee of the key issues to consider in determining the application.

In conclusion members were informed that the proposed development would comprise a social housing scheme for older people (55 years and over), in a sustainable, built up City Centre location, with good access to public transport links. It would contribute to the residential offer in the City Centre and contribute to its wider mixed-use nature. It would provide an acceptable density of development, and it would contribute to meeting affordable housing needs, with two bungalows being secured as affordable via a Section 106 legal agreement. It would provide a housing type, tenure and size that would be appropriate at the location and so it would be acceptable in principle.

Subject to the compliance with recommended conditions it was considered that the proposed development would be of an acceptable design and have no harmful visual impacts on any non-designated heritage asset or when viewed from the public domain. There would be no unacceptable impacts on the amenity of the occupiers of existing dwellings in the vicinity of the application site including during the construction process. It was also considered that the proposed development would afford future occupiers of the bungalows with an acceptable standard of amenity. Subject to the discharge of and compliance with recommended conditions, it was also considered that the proposed development would have no unacceptable impacts on highway and pedestrian safety or in relation to flooding / drainage and contamination nor in relation to ecology. Accordingly, the application was recommended for approval.

The Chairman thanked the representative of the Executive Director of City Development for her presentation and invited questions of clarification from Members.

Councillor Doyle referred to the consultation response from the Highways Authority that the applicant should consider secure, covered cycle parking for the development, and asked if the applicant had given any reason for not taking up this recommendation. The Highways Officer replied that no reason had been given although it was possible that it was due to the tightness of the location.

Councillor Doyle also asked if any reason had been given by the applicant for not seeking accreditation to the Secured by Design scheme as recommended by Northumbria Police. Again, the Committee was advised that no reason had been given.

Councillor Doyle stated that the application was not policy compliant in that that it would result in a net loss rather than a net gain in biodiversity and asked the Council's Ecologist to talk the Committee through the process of mitigation. The Ecologist advised that in assessing net loss or gain an investigation was undertaken looking solely at what was there at present. The current habitats represented species-poor grassland created via seeding a previously developed and cleared site and therefore had a very limited potential suitability to support protected species. By way of mitigation, it was considered that the measures included within the Ecological Impact Assessment would increase the site's suitability for a range of protected and notable species such as bats, hedgehogs and swifts.

There being no further questions, the Chairman asked the Committee to consider and comment on the application.

Councillor Dixon expressed his disappointment that the applicant had decided against the Police suggestion that accreditation to the Secured by Design scheme was sought. Councillor Doyle echoed these sentiments and noted that a lot of applications avoided seeking the accreditation. He also referred to the assertion on page 98 of the agenda that given that the bungalows would be for the over 55s it was not anticipated that there would be much demand for cycle storage. He felt that he should push back against this noting that in the Netherlands 17% of the over 65s cycled on a daily basis.

There being no further comments, the Chairman put the Officer recommendation to the Committee as detailed on page 116 of the agenda and accordingly it was:-

2. RESOLVED that planning permission be granted, subject to the recommended schedule of conditions listed in the report and the completion of a Section 106 legal agreement.

**Planning Application 21/01825/FU4 Full Application (Reg 4) Proposal:
Demolition of existing building and erection of 19no bungalows for the
over 55's. Princess of Wales Centre Hylton Road Sunderland**

The Executive Director of City Development submitted a report (copy circulated) in respect of the above matter.

(for copy report – see original minutes)

The representative of the Executive Director of City Development presented the report, advising the Committee of the key issues to consider in determining the application.

In conclusion the Committee was advised that Planning Officers considered that the adverse impacts from the proposed development were minor / moderate; whereas the benefits were significant. As such the planning balance indicated that planning permission should be granted and the application was therefore recommended for approval.

The Chairman thanked the representative of the Executive Director of City Development for his presentation and invited questions of clarification from Members.

In response to an enquiry from Councillor Doyle regarding the impact of the proposal on the amenity of the house to the south of the development given the separation distance did not conform with the SDP, the representative of the Executive Director of City Development advised that the property had one window on the gable end which appeared to serve a secondary space. The proposed development, as a series of bungalows, would not have the same level of impact as a two or three storey house and therefore it was considered that the level of the adverse impact would be negligible.

Councillor Doyle stated that he sensed there was a theme of non compliance with regard to the application and cited the following examples:-

- Policy VC5 - the applicant had failed to provide written evidence that they had marketed the property, being a former Community facility for at least 24 months.
- The applicant had failed to provide the further information requested by the Council's ecologist regarding the landscape proposals and Biodiversity Net Gain
- Policy NE4 – Although the Greenspace Audit highlighted that St Anne's Ward had a low quality and quantity of amenity greenspaces the applicant had chosen not to make a contribution towards the improvement of local greenspace.

In reply, the representative of the Executive Director of City Development advised that the applicant was aware of the issues but had chosen not to address them. In terms of the negative impacts of the areas of non-compliance the Committee's attention was drawn to the planning balance

section at the conclusion of the report which highlighted how the negative impacts had been weighed up against the benefits of the proposal.

Councillors Scanlan, Foster and Peacock expressed concern regarding the felling of trees on site without prior approval. Councillor Scanlan advised that residents had been told they were being felled because of the impending planning application. Councillor Peacock, a St Anne's Ward Councillor, informed the Committee that the felled trees were mature, appeared to be healthy and had been removed from the site immediately.

In response to an enquiry from Councillor Peacock, the representative of the Executive Director of City Development confirmed that the access road to St George's Playing Field would be retained. In response to a further enquiry from Councillor Peacock, the meeting was informed that residents had been consulted via a letter drop, and public notices both on site and in the press. No comments had been received in response.

Councillor Peacock referred to the proposed condition requiring the submission of a detailed landscape scheme. He noted that the original application had been for 15 rather than 19 bungalows and asked if the additional properties replaced a landscaping scheme that was present in the original application. The representative of the Executive Director of City Development replied that he was unaware whether or not the original application contained a landscaping scheme. No scheme had been submitted as part of the current application and it was not unusual within planning to seek to secure one via a condition. It was a balancing exercise in determining what information was required upfront as part of the submission and what could be secured via conditions.

In response to an enquiry from Councillor Reed, the representative of the Executive Director of City Development explained the content and purpose of Recreation Mitigation Strategy prepared as part of draft Allocations & Designations Plan. In response to a further enquiry from Councillor Reed the Committee was advised that the role of the "dedicated staff" as part of the package of mitigation measures was to act as wardens overseeing and managing the areas of protected coastline within the purview of the Council.

The being no further questions, the Chairman asked the Committee to consider and comment on the application.

At this juncture the representative of the Executive Director of City Development advised that policy H2 of the Core Strategy, required that a development of this size should provide at least 15% affordable housing. The report indicated that 2 affordable homes were to be provided however 3 were required to make it policy compliant.

Councillor Peacock stated that he was keen to see the site developed but had concerns about the developer's conduct especially in relation to the felling of the trees.

Councillor Dixon stated that issues had been raised in the past regarding the developer and asked if there was anything Planning Officers could do pro-emptively to address issues with applicants before they arose. The representative of the Executive Director of City Development advised that Officers would always try to be proactive but would nevertheless take reactive enforcement action when required. It was also important to remember that planning rested with the land not the individual. There was no fit and proper person test for applicants in planning terms.

Councillor Doyle stated that he was annoyed that the applicant was not present and annoyed at the repeated examples in the application of non compliance together with the lack of any explanation. He was particularly concerned that the development did not accord with policy NE4 of the Core Strategy with regard to improvements to green space. He asked if it was possible to amend the recommendation in order to seek a contribution to secure the green space improvements and also the provision of 3 affordable homes and the planning obligation regarding the coastline?

The representative of the Executive Director of City Development advised that it was within the Committee's power to amend the recommendation, however if the amendment was approved it would need to be referred to the applicant, and if he was not satisfied the application would be brought back before the Committee.

There being no further comments, the Chairman stated that he sensed that the Committee was not minded to support the Officer recommendation as it currently stood and asked if any member wished to move an amendment.

It was moved by Councillor Doyle and seconded by Councillor Peacock that the recommendation be amended to include that the grant of consent would be subject to the completion of a planning obligation for the provision of mitigation for the protected coastline, three affordable houses on site, and the improvement of local green spaces as required by policy NE4 of the Core Strategy.

Upon being put to the Committee the amendment was approved, and accordingly it was:-

3. RESOLVED that the Committee was minded to grant consent in accordance with Regulation 4 of the Town and Country Planning Regulations 1992 (as amended), subject to the completion of a planning obligation for the provision of mitigation for the protected coastline, three affordable houses on site; the improvement of local green spaces as required by policy NE4 of the Core Strategy and the draft conditions as listed in the report.

Planning Application 22/00161/LP3 Local Authority (Reg 3) Construction of a new road linking Blandford Street, Brougham Street and Maritime Terrace with associated landscaping. Land at Blandford Street Sunderland

The Executive Director of City Development submitted a report (copy circulated) in respect of the above matter.

(for copy report – see original minutes)

The representative of the Executive Director of City Development presented the report, advising the Committee that the proposed development was for the construction of a new road linking the west end of Blandford Street, Broughman Street and Maritime Street, together with associated landscaping. The development would include:-

- New road surfacing to link Blandford Street, Broughman Street and Maritime Street as part of a wider infrastructure improvement scheme to create a one-way clockwise gyratory system within Sunderland City Centre;
 - A proposed footway link between Maritime Street and Broughman Street to the east of the proposed road; and
 - Landscaping to the east and west of the proposed road.
- of the key issues to consider in determining the application.

The representative of the Executive Director of City Development then informed the Committee of the key issues to consider in determining the application, including:-

- Principle of the proposed development;
- Design and impact on visual amenity;
- Impact on residential amenity;
- Impact on highway safety;
- Impact on archaeology

In conclusion it was considered that overall, the proposed development, as part of a wider unique scheme to facilitate improvements to the Holmeside infrastructure and vehicle movements, would provide significant enhancements to Sunderland City Centre. It would be an acceptable form of development, and therefore it was recommended that planning permission was granted subject to the schedule of conditions as set out in the report.

The Chairman thanked the representative of the Executive Director of City Development for her presentation and invited questions of clarification from Members.

Councillor Peacock expressed concerns in respect of pedestrian safety as he felt the proposals created an island, isolating shopping units and encircling them with a road. What was once a well used pedestrianised zone was being replaced by a busy road and would surely endanger pedestrians. The Highways officer replied that the link road in question was part of and a facilitator for a wider scheme. There would always be concerns about introducing traffic into an area where it wasn't present before however it was incumbent upon highways officers to provide for pedestrian safety.

Councillor Peacock referred to the impact of the scheme on footfall which he believed would decline in Blandford Street. The representative of the Executive Director of City Development replied that impact on footfall was difficult to assess however with the wider scheme seeking to improve connectivity and accessibility within the Urban Core of the city centre together with improved pedestrian accessibility and safety, it was felt there was the potential to attract greater footfall to Blandford Street and Brougham Street.

In response to further enquiries from Councillor Peacock regarding highway safety and the impact on the loading areas off Brougham Street to the back of the Bridges, the representative of the Executive Director of City Development, drew the Committee's attention to the Road Safety Audit and Transport Statement in which these concerns were addressed.

In response to an enquiry from Councillor Reed, the representative of the Executive Director of City Development explained the benefits of the proposals in relation to their support for the wider regeneration of the city by opening the area up and attracting people in.

The being no further questions, the Chairman asked the Committee to consider and comment on the application.

Councillor Doyle stated that he would normally be loathe to approve an application that removed space from pedestrians however it was clear the proposals would improve the city's connectivity all be it not on foot. He believed that the application was policy compliant and he would be supporting the recommendation.

Councillor Reed welcomed the application which he agreed was policy compliant, stating that any improvement to Blandford Street represented a big improvement.

There being no further comments, the Chairman put the Officer recommendation to the Committee as detailed on page 155 of the agenda and accordingly it was:-

4. RESOLVED that in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 (as amended), planning permission be granted subject to the recommended schedule of conditions detailed in the report.

Planning Application 22/00264/LP3 – Replacement of existing external hard standing area and minor public realm works comprising 2no. paddlestone walls with fixed timber bench seat and 4no. planting beds. Land North of Dykelands Road and West of the A183 Whitburn Road Seaburn Sunderland

The Executive Director of City Development submitted a report (copy circulated) in respect of the above matter.

(for copy report – see original minutes)

The representative of the Executive Director of City Development presented the report, advising the Committee of the key issues to consider in determining the application.

There being no questions or comments, the Chairman put the Officer recommendation to the Committee as detailed on page 161 of the agenda and accordingly it was:-

5. RESOLVED that the application be granted consent under Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Regulations) 1992 (as amended), subject to the conditions set out in the report.

Planning Application 21/02941/SUB – Erection of dormer bungalow including new boundary walls/ access gates. (Re-Submission) Land at Rears of Bede Street, Benedict Road and St Andrews Terrace Sunderland

The Executive Director of City Development submitted a report (copy circulated) together with a supplementary report (copy tabled) in respect of the above matter.

(for copy reports – see original minutes)

The representative of the Executive Director of City Development presented the reports, advising the Committee of the key issues to consider in determining the application.

There being no questions or comments, the Chairman put the Officer recommendation to the Committee as detailed in the Supplementary Report and accordingly it was:-

6. RESOLVED that the application be refused on the grounds that:-

i) the proposal would be detrimental to the amenities of the adjacent residential properties by reason of visual intrusion, loss of outlook, overshadowing and consequent loss of daylight and as such would be contrary to policy BH1 of the City Council's adopted Core Strategy and Development Plan and paragraph 5.23 of the Development Management Supplementary Planning Document; and

ii) the application was not accompanied by an up-to-date report which takes into account the ecological impact of development and, in lieu of any conclusive evidence to the contrary, the proposal is considered to be potentially harmful to local wildlife and its habitat and contrary to policy NE2 of the City Council's adopted Core Strategy and Development Plan and para 180 of the NPPF.

Items for information

Members gave consideration to the items for information contained within the matrix (agenda pages 171-177).

In response to an enquiry from Councillor Scanlan in respect of Planning application 21/02435/FUL - Rowlandson House, the Development Manager advised that the application was currently scheduled for submission to the Committee at its first meeting of the new municipal year in June.

The Councillors as indicated requested that site visits were undertaken in respect of the following applications,

- i) 21/00091/FUL Grindon Broadway Service Station. Demolition of existing petrol filling station and convenience store and erection of a new convenience store with associated works and access. (Councillor Reed)
- ii) 21/02627/FUL The Cavalier Silksworth Lane Sunderland SR3 1AQ Demolition of public house and construction of 14 dwelling houses and a three storey building to provide five apartments (including associated car parking, landscaping and new pedestrian access (Councillor Doyle)

8. RESOLVED that the items for information as set out in the matrix be received and noted and that site visits be undertaken in respect of the applications as detailed above.

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

(Signed) M. BUTLER,
(Chairman)