At a meeting of the PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE held in COMMITTEE ROOM 2 on TUESDAY, 13th JUNE, 2017 at 5.30 p.m.

Present:-

Councillor Bell in the Chair

Councillors Chequer, M. Dixon, English, Francis, I. Galbraith, Hodson, Kay, Middleton, Mordey, Porthouse, Scaplehorn, P. Smith, Turner, M. Turton, W. Turton, G. Walker and P. Walker.

Declarations of Interest

Item 7 – Councillors Hodson, I. Galbraith and Kay made open declarations that whilst Members of long standing working groups on parking schemes they still retained open minds on the proposals.

Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Ball, Beck, Jackson, Lauchlan, Taylor, P. Watson and D. Wilson.

Minutes of the last meeting of the Committee held on 12th April, 2017

1. RESOLVED that the minutes of the last meeting held on 12th April, 2017 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

Report of the Meeting of the Development Control (North Sunderland) Sub Committee held on 25th April, 2017

The report of the meeting of the Development Control (North Sunderland) Sub-Committee held on 25th April, 2017 (copy circulated) was submitted.

(For copy report – see original minutes)

2. RESOLVED that the report be received and noted.

Report of the meeting of the Development Control (South Sunderland) Sub Committee held on 27th April, 2017

The report of the meeting of the Development Control (South Sunderland) Sub-Committee held on 27th April, 2017 (copy circulated) was submitted.

(For copy report – see original minutes)

3. RESOLVED that the report be received and noted.

Report of the meetings of the Development Control (Hetton, Houghton and Washington) Sub Committee held on 25th April and the extraordinary meeting held on 8th May, 2017

The report of the meetings of the Development Control (Hetton, Houghton and Washington) Sub-Committee held on 25th April and the extraordinary meeting held on 8th May, 2017 (copies circulated) were submitted.

(For copy reports – see original minutes)

4. RESOLVED that the report be received and noted.

Objections to Traffic Regulation Order for Proposed Phase 4 Community Parking Management Scheme in the Sunderland Royal Hospital Area (Barnes, Pallion and Millfield Wards)

The Executive Director of Economy and Place submitted a report (copy circulated) to advise the Committee regarding three objections that had been received in respect of the proposed Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for Phase 4 of the Community Parking Management Scheme (CPMS) that was intended for the area of Sunderland Royal Hospital (SRH) and to request the Committee to not uphold those objections that could not be resolved within the constraints of the scheme, as set out in the report

(For copy report – see original minutes)

Peter Graham, Engineer, presented the report and was on hand to answer Members queries.

The Chairman introduced Mr Philip Avery who wished to speak in objection to the proposals. Mr Avery advised the Committee that he had moved to the area as his wife works in the hospital and his street in question, Arlington Street had voted not to be included in the scheme and as a democracy this should be upheld.

Mr Avery commented that including this part of the street in the scheme would result in his street becoming Fordland Place and queried if the gable ends of other streets names would need changing. It was also commented that he felt this was boundary tampering, it would confuse motorists and could claim to be entrapment.

Mr Avery also commented that he felt the scheme should not be imposed upon his street just because there was nowhere else to locate the signs. Mr Graham clarified that Arlington Street did vote on the whole to reject the scheme however other surrounding streets did vote for, with nearly 56% in favour at the eastern half of Arlington Street and Fordham Place also in favour, the voting patterns were taken into consideration. It was in terms of the gateways where support for the scheme began to disappear.

Mr Graham advised that unfortunately the signs could not be placed in any other locations as this would result in utilities having to be relocated which would be very costly and should the signs not be clearly visible then entrapment could be argued.

Councillor Porthouse raised a query in relation to the consultation process for each street and if it was made clear on the voting results. Mr Graham advised that it was made clear and they had obtained a level of community support in moving forward.

Paul Robinson, Engineer advised that they carry out a consultation to gain opinion then use this to shape the engineers proposals which then goes back out for approval with the residents and this Committee. The boundaries need to be taken into account and this scheme has been deemed the best and most logical way to do that.

Councillor Mordey commented that this was the fourth phase of the scheme and it was right to consult street by street but it was his understanding that there was clear reference in the literature that it circulated that these schemes only proceed when there is clear community support for them and this phase had been led by residents as part of a working group and he was confident that the boundaries proposed for the scheme had the support of residents.

Councillor M. Dixon commented that he was very supportive of such schemes but wished to enquire if there were any other options for the locations of the signs.

Mr Graham advised that this was the optimal location to place the signs as the other locations had maintenance liabilities.

The Chairman commented that the signs had to be clearly visible and the Council had to be very careful with regards to legal obligations so that the tickets were enforceable.

Carolyn Forster, Solicitor advised that the Committee needed to consider that the scheme was to be cost neutral and relocating utilities would come at great expense.

In response to Mr Avery's enquiry that despite his street voting against the scheme he was going to be made to purchase a permit, Mr Graham advised that the frontage of Mr Avery's property was outside of the scheme.

The Chairman introduced Mrs Ginnette Bentley, a Member of the Barnes/Pallion and Millfield Residents Association who wished to speak in support of the scheme. Mrs Bentley advised that the residents association was delighted to see the proposed scheme advertised as this had been the culmination of many years hard work and efforts from officers of Sunderland Council, Councillors and residents.

Mrs Bentley informed the Committee of the problems experienced by residents in the affected area and believed that this scheme would go some significant way to alleviate those problems.

Mrs Bentley commented that she knew from residents in other streets that had the scheme implemented already that they were thrilled to find it had enhanced their quality of life.

Mrs Bentley also felt that the petition submitted from people who were not actually residents in the area should not be considered appropriate.

Members having fully considered the report and the representations made at the meeting, it was:-

5. RESOLVED that

- a) The objections to the Traffic Regulation Order, for the proposed Phase 4 Community Parking Management Scheme in the area of Sunderland Royal Hospital not be upheld
- b) The Council continue to monitor the parking situation within vicinity of Sunderland Royal Hospital and seek to address displacement and any other identified issue within a future phase
- c) All Objectors to be advised accordingly of the decision
- d) The Head of Transport and Infrastructure instruct the Head of Law and Governance to take all necessary steps to make and bring into effect the associated Traffic Regulation Order
- e) The Head of Transport and Infrastructure take all necessary action to implement the physical works associated with Sunderland Royal Hospital Community Parking Management Scheme Phase 4.

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

(Signed) R. BELL (Chairman)