

**At a meeting of the PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS (EAST) COMMITTEE held in the COUNCIL CHAMBER, on MONDAY 6<sup>th</sup> SEPTEMBER, 2021 at 5.30pm**

**Present:-**

Councillor Butler in the Chair.

Councillors Bewick, Dixon, Doyle, Foster, E. Gibson, Hodson, Morrissey, Noble, Peacock, Reed, Scanlan, P. Smith, Stewart and D. Wilson.

**Declarations of Interest**

Item 4 - Objections to the Proposed Prohibition of Motor Vehicles Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) on Part of Burdon Lane (Ryhope and Doxford Wards).

Councillor Bewick advised that he had assisted residents in making objections to the TRO however he believed that he was able to consider the matter with an open mind.

Councillor Doyle advised that he had a pecuniary interest in the item and left the meeting at the appropriate point on the agenda, taking no part in any discussion or decision thereon.

**Apologies for Absence**

There were no apologies submitted.

**Minutes of the last meeting of the Planning and Highways (East) Committee held on 2<sup>nd</sup> August, 2021.**

Councillor Doyle referred to page 4, paragraph 4 stating that he had been misquoted and that the word 'conversant' should be amended to read 'cognisant.'

1. RESOLVED that the minutes of the last meeting of the Planning and Highways (East) Committee held on 2<sup>nd</sup> August 2021 (copy circulated) be confirmed and signed as a correct record, subject to the above amendment.

**Change in the Order of Business**

The Chairman advise that he would he consider Item 5 on the agenda at this juncture in order that members of the public who were attending specifically for the item were not detained unnecessarily.

## **Planning Application Reference 21/01667/LP3 – Relocation of existing pit wheel from Albany Village Washington to new site in Silksworth**

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

(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. Members were informed that the requirements of proposed condition no. 6 had now been discharged and therefore was no longer required. In addition, Condition no. 2 had been amended to take account of amendments made in respect of Drawing No. 2112 4a.

Members were informed that the proposed development was considered acceptable in principle at the location, and that it would be acceptable in relation to its design and visual impact (including on amenity green space), have no unacceptable impacts on residential amenity, highway safety, and ecology, or in relation to contamination subject to the discharge of and compliance with the recommended conditions.

In conclusion it was therefore considered that the proposed development would accord with the relevant policies within the adopted CSDP and the saved policies within adopted UDP, as well as guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Accordingly, Members were recommended to grant approval to the application subject to the recommended conditions as amended.

The Chairman thanked the Planning Officer for his presentation and invited questions from Members.

In response to an enquiry from Councillor Hodson, the Officer advised that he had no knowledge of the anticipated waiting time regarding the installation of the replacement pit wheel at Albany, nor from where it would be sourced, as this was beyond the scope of the Silksworth application.

Councillor Doyle referred to the typo in the heading of the report which indicated that the site of the application was in St Chad's ward and asked if the Silksworth ward members had been consulted. The meeting was advised that they had. In response to further enquiries from Councillor Doyle, the Officer confirmed that the level of community engagement undertaken satisfied the requirements of Planning Policy ref BH3 with regard to the public realm and that there was no update as yet in respect of the design of the bollards required under proposed condition no.4.

There being no further questions, the Chairman welcomed Councillor Tye (Silksworth Ward) who had registered to speak in support of the application, advising him that he would be given 5 minutes to do so.

By way of introduction, Councillor Tye referred to Councillor Hodson's earlier question and advised that a replacement wheel would be provided for Albany Village and that this had been donated by the Washington F Pit museum. Councillor Tye went on to outline the history of the campaign to return the wheel to its Silksworth home following the discovery of his heritage by a local resident 4 years ago.

He advised that detailed consultations had been carried out on the plans with residents over and above the planning process. Representatives from Silksworth's former mining community had helped work on the proposals, and Councillor Tye pointed out those members of the group who were present in the public gallery. He added that it was quite phenomenal the history that Sunderland had in its localities and why it was so important for the community to be able to have something back to remember it by. To this end some residents were also fundraising locally for additions around the pit wheel, such as a memorial seat in memory of the many people who had died working at the pit including an 8 year old boy. The return of the wheel was very important to the Silksworth community.

There being no questions for Councillor Tye, the Chairman invited the Committee to consider and debate the report.

Councillor Dixon referred to his experiences working in Silksworth and stated they were some of the nicest people he had met. He advised that he was in favour of the application and would be supporting it. Councillor Doyle stated that he was happy to support the application and that there were no legitimate planning grounds to turn it down.

There being no further comments, the Chairman put the amended recommendation to the Committee, and it was:-

2. RESOLVED to grant approval to the application in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992, subject to the draft conditions detail in the report and as amended at the meeting.

### **Objections to the Proposed Prohibition of Motor Vehicles Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) on Part of Burdon Lane (Ryhope and Doxford Wards)**

The Executive Director of City Development submitted a report (copy circulated) which sought to advise the Committee of objections received, by the Council, in respect of the proposed prohibition of motor vehicles (TRO) on part of Burdon Lane, between its junctions with Nettles Lane and Woodham Drive, and to request the committee to not uphold those objections that cannot be resolved within the constraints of the scheme.

(for copy report – see original minutes)

The representative of the Executive Director of City Development presented the report highlighting the key issues. Members were also briefed on the statutory and public engagement undertaken in respect of the proposal and their attention was drawn to the drawings of the proposal as shown in Appendix A of the report together with the Summary of Objections detailed at Appendix B.

The TRO was part of the Ryhope to Doxford Link Road (RDLR) project, which had been a longstanding aspiration of the Council and was documented within the Unitary Development Plan (UPD) adopted in 1998 and expanded upon in the most recent Core Strategy and Development Plan 2015-2033.

A planning application for the RDLR project was being run in parallel with the TRO. Although both were separate statutory processes, the timescales involved in both made it prudent for them to be run in tandem, to hit the required project milestones and reduce the risk of future delays to the project. Members were informed that if the planning application was not granted, the need for the TRO would be reconsidered.

The Chairman thanked the Officer for his presentation and invited questions from Members.

Councillor Bewick referred to objection no.9 as detailed on page 17 of the agenda papers, regarding alternative suggestions from objectors to keep Burdon Lane open to motorised traffic. He asked if the suggestion to install a roundabout had been considered and fully costed. The officer replied that the roundabout option had not been fully costed. The main consideration in assessing proposals was the benefits arising compared to the costs involved. The alternative suggestion to install a roundabout would only benefit approximately 100 residents and would clearly involve huge costs. It would also require the use of additional land earmarked for recreation and therefore could not be justified.

In response to an enquiry from Councillor Hodson regarding what would happen to cyclists travelling along Burdon Lane when it intersected the new Ryhope to Doxford Link Road, the officer stated that they would be carried over it by a new bridge. He advised that because of the topography of the RDLR route, it would pass beneath Burdon Lane via a deep cutting. Burdon Lane would remain at the existing ground level, carried over the cutting by a new pedestrian and cyclist bridge.

In response to an enquiry from Councillor Reed, the Officer explained the two stage consultation process and the account taken of objections received. Councillor Reed also referred to objection 2 detailed on page 14 of the agenda papers regarding the creation of rat runs and asked how this been assessed. The Officer replied that the Transport Assessment included traffic modelling and traffic surveys to assess the impact on the local community. This had demonstrated that the proposals would have no significant impact on the existing road network. Initially signage installed in advance of the road

closure would direct traffic along the B1286 through Ryhope Village in the short term and once fully complete, along the RDLR. The existing road network in the vicinity of Burdon Lane comprised a network of winding residential streets, so there would be no benefit for through traffic in using these streets as rat runs. It was acknowledged there could be an increased number of local traffic journeys from the surrounding area to gain access to and from the B1286; however, any increase in traffic volume was expected to be relatively small and unlikely to have any impact on road safety. Any inconvenience from a relatively small increase in local journeys would be greatly outweighed by the benefits of the RDLR.

Councillor E. Gibson informed the Committee that she had campaigned to get Nettles Lane closed to traffic because it had become a magnet for fly tippers. She hoped that Burdon Lane would not suffer a similar blight. The Officer advised that the scheme tried to maximise the amount of the road that would be closed however exemptions had to be made to allow residents to access off street premises.

There being no further questions, the Chairman asked the Committee to consider and debate the report.

Councillor Bewick advised that although there was a lot about the overall scheme that he believed to be good, his concerns regarding the proposed closure were that it would provide a race track for motor bikes and off road vehicles and create the potential for rat runs eg along Bevan Avenue which would compromise road safety.

There being no further comments, the Chairman put the recommendation to the Committee, and upon a vote being taken, with 12 Members voting in favour, 1 voting against and 1 abstention, the recommendation was approved.

Accordingly it was:-

3. RESOLVED that the Executive Director of City Development be advised that:-

- i) The objections to the traffic regulation order notice, for the proposed Prohibition of Motor Vehicles should not be upheld;
- ii) The objectors are notified accordingly of the decision;
- iii) The Executive Director of City Development instruct the Assistant Director of Law and Governance to take all necessary steps to make and bring into effect the associated traffic regulation order once planning permission has been granted for section two of the RDLR; and
- iv) The Executive Director of City Development take all necessary action to implement the physical works associated with the traffic regulation order.

## **Items for Information**

Members gave consideration to the items for information contained within the matrix (agenda pages 35-42).

Councillor Doyle requested that site visits were undertaken in respect of the following applications,

- i) 17/02430/OU4 Former Groves Cranes Site, Woodbine Terrace, Pallion Sunderland – Redevelopment of Site for Residential use.
- ii) 21/01542/LP3 Former Vaux Site, Land North of Saint Marys Boulevard Sunderland – Erection of Eye Infirmary.

Councillor Doyle also referred to application 20/01442/VA3, Bay Shelter Whitburn Road. He noted that works had already started to the building and asked that members received an update as he believed that when the application was considered previously, members had expressed concern regarding the removal of the roof top seating.

Councillor Noble referred to application 21/01825/FU4 Princess of Wales Centre and sought clarification of the number of bungalows to be built on the site.

Councillor Dixon referred to an article in the Sunderland Echo regarding proposals in relation to the former Indian Restaurant at 55 John Street. He noted that the proposals did not appear on the matrix and asked would the Committee get the opportunity to determine any application.

Councillor Dixon also referred to a similar article in the Sunderland Echo regarding the approval of plans in relation to the former Gill Bridge Avenue Police station. He stated that Members had previously granted planning permission for proposals in relation to the site. He noted that the permission had since lapsed and questioned why the new proposals had not been considered by the Committee. He also asked if Committee members could receive details of the process that determined which applications were submitted to Committee for consideration and which applications were delegated.

### **4. RESOLVED that:-**

- i) the items for information as set out in the matrix be received and noted;
- ii) site visits be undertaken in respect of applications 17/02430/OU4 and 21/01542/LP3
- iii) Members receive email responses in respect of the above requests for information.

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

(Signed) M. BUTLER  
(Chairman)