Action on Petitions

COUNCIL

ACTION TAKEN ON PETITIONS

Council Members are asked to note the action taken in relation to the undermentioned petition which was presented to Council:-

(i) Petition - Barnes Service Station, Durham Road

At the meeting of the Council on 23rd March 2022, Councillor Antony Mullen presented a petition with 220 signatures. The petition set out an objection to planning application ref. 22/00399/FUL, which relates to the demolition of the existing petrol station and the construction of a drive thru restaurant and associated works at Barnes Service Station, Durham Road.

The statement on the petition sheet reads as follows:

We the undersigned oppose the proposal to convert the service station at the Barnes into a drive through restaurant.

The site is completely unsuitable for the proposed development. The proposed site layout provided in relation to the application reveals that from the first service window of the drive through, the site could hold a queue of 12 cars at most before Durham Road would be clogged with queuing cars. It is unrealistic to assume that the site would not exceed this level of popularity especially as residents have witnessed the large queues at the Farringdon McDonalds site and the KFC Pennywell site that regularly see queues that bring the highway to a standstill. The proposed drive through would also see peak use at certain times of the day with lunchtime and early evening usage most likely. This could result in the blocking off of the main roads and bus routes in the area. In contrast the usage of the existing petrol filling station sees its demand spread out more evenly throughout the day.

The traffic is already dangerous in this area as highlighted most recently by the crash in late February at the junction of Silksworth Lane and the A690. Residents and road users already have to navigate a stretch of road where many routes converge as part of one of the major routes into the city. The proposed development would add to the chaos and present a substantially increased risk of accidents and serious injury in an area where children from St Marys Primary, Richard Avenue Primary and Bede College are regularly crossing and which regularly sees the elderly and families with young children attempting to get to Barnes Park. The lack of crossing points in this area could see a real risk that a child is run over when attempting to reach the proposed drive through due to the increased traffic.

The proximity of the development to local places of education: St Marys RC Primary School, Richard Avenue Primary school and Bede College, with pupils form Thornhill and St Aidan's also using the area means that the development makes a mockery of the councils policies on takeaways and fast food as set out in the Sunderland Healthy City Plan 2020-2030 and the Core Strategy Development Plan. The area is already well served with a number of takeaways and any further food outlets in the area would adversely impact the health of residents and students.

Litter would adversely impact the area as can be seen form similar developments of this type (see Farringdon McDonalds, Pennywell KFC) where the impact of litter is felt a significant distance from the actual site. This and the loss of trees form the site will lead to a clear environmental and social loss from the proposed development. At a time when the Council has declared a climate emergency and Area Committees of the Council are endeavouring to improve the area for residents the loss of trees and adverse impacts of the development would set back these council priorities.

The supposed economic benefits claimed by the applicant are far outweighed by the economic losses that would be brought about by the development. The increased traffic problems in the area would adversely impact the existing businesses in the area such as the Toby Carvery as customers may be put off by the traffic issues. The traffic problems that would occur on one of the main routes into the city also has the potential to make Sunderland a worse place to do business if gridlock leads to difficulty for workers from outside the city getting to their place of work via one of the main routes into the city from the south.

Our signatures are to be found on the following pages. We live in a number of wards across the city but the traffic problems and dangers presented by the proposed development would impact upon us all'.

The petition is being treated as a formal representation in respect of planning application ref. 22/00399/FUL. The concerns raised within the petition that are 'material' planning considerations will be taken into account when assessing the acceptability, of otherwise, of the proposal ahead of its determination by the Planning and Highways Committee.

2. Petition – Request to reimburse residents of Vicarage Close for costs associated with damage done to properties by Persimmon Homes development

At the meeting of the Council on 23rd March 2022, Councillor Antony Mullen presented a petition with 47 signatures to members requesting that the Council reimburse residents of Vicarage Close for costs associated with alleged damage to their properties as a result of the adjacent Persimmon Homes housing development under construction.

The statement on the petition sheet reads as follows:

'Sunderland City Council should reimburse residents of Vicarage Close for costs associated with the damage done to their properties by the Persimmon development. We the undersigned support the above statement'.

After consideration by Council Officers, the outcome of the petition is as follows:-

To decline this petition as it is not considered appropriate for the Council, in this instance, to award individual resident's compensation for alleged damage caused as a direct result of the Persimmon Homes development. However, to ensure that any disruption caused, as a result of the development is kept to a minimum, the Council will continue to monitor the development to ensure all regulations/requirements/conditions imposed on the developers are being adhered to.

The Ward Councillors and Lead petitioner have been advised of the outcome.