

## PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS (WEST) COMMITTEE

### AGENDA

Tuesday 15<sup>th</sup> December, 2020 at 5.30 p.m.

This meeting will be held remotely. Joining details will be emailed to all participants.

The meeting will be livestreamed for the public to view on the Council's YouTube channel, 'sunderlandgov' at:-

<https://youtu.be/XVS8md1VRJ0>

#### Membership

Cllrs Armstrong, Blackett, Fagan, Lauchlan, F. Miller, Rowntree (Vice Chair), Thornton (Chair) G. Walker, P. Walker

ITEM	PAGE
1. <b>Receipt of Declarations of Interest (if any)</b>	
2. <b>Apologies for Absence</b>	-
3. <b>Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on Tuesday 27<sup>th</sup> October and the extraordinary meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> November, 2020</b>  (copies attached)	1
4. <b>Applications made under the Town and Country Planning Acts and Regulations made thereunder</b>  Report of the Executive Director of City Development  (copy herewith).	21

Elaine Waugh,  
Assistant Director of Law and Governance,  
Civic Centre  
SUNDERLAND

4<sup>th</sup> December, 2020

## Item 3a

**At a meeting of the PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS (WEST) COMMITTEE held remotely on TUESDAY 27<sup>TH</sup> OCTOBER, 2020 at 5.30 p.m.**

### **Present:-**

Councillor Thornton in the Chair.

Councillors Armstrong, Blackett, Fagan, Lauchlan, F. Miller, Rowntree, G. Walker and P. Walker.

### **Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest made.

### **Apologies for Absence**

There were no apologies for absence.

### **Minutes of the last meeting of the Committee held on 1<sup>st</sup> September, 2020.**

1. RESOLVED that the minutes of the last meeting of the Committee held on 1<sup>st</sup> September, 2020 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

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

The Executive Director of City Development submitted a report (copies circulated), which related to the West area of the City, copies of which had also been forwarded to each Member of the Council, upon applications made under the Town and Country Planning Acts and Regulations made thereunder.

(for copy reports – see original minutes)

### **19/01062/FUL – Construction of 4no. two storey buildings (Use Class B2/B8) Including Access onto Turbine Way, parking and turning space and landscaping – Land at Turbine Business Park, Turbine Way, Sunderland**

The Planning Officer representing the Executive Director of City Development outlined the proposal to Members of the Committee and the relevant material planning considerations against which the application had been assessed.

2. RESOLVED that the application be delegated to the Executive Director of City Development, who was MINDED TO APPROVE the application, subject to

i) The resolution of the outstanding matters relating to drainage, to the satisfaction of both the Lead Local Flood Authority and Northumbrian Water (including any amended or additional planning conditions).

ii) The resolution of the outstanding matters relating to ecology, to the satisfaction of the Council's Ecologist (including any amended or additional planning conditions and contributions via Section 106 agreement). And;

iii) The 13 draft condition contained within the report

**20/00021/FUL – Application for the erection of a 50 bedroom Car Home with associated car parking and landscaped gardens – Land adjacent to Springfield House Bunker Hill Houghton-le-Spring DH4 4TN**

The Planning Officer representing the Executive Director of City Development outlined the proposal to Members of the Committee and the relevant material planning considerations against which the application had been assessed.

3. RESOLVED that the application be approved, subject to the 15 conditions listed within the report and the circulatory report.

**20/00839/FU4 – Application for improvements to football pitch with associated infrastructure including flood lighting columns, dugouts, covered spectator stands, turnstile and fencing – Northern Playing Fields Stephenson Road Stephenson Washington**

The Planning Officer representing the Executive Director of City Development outlined the proposal to Members of the Committee and the relevant material planning considerations against which the application had been assessed.

4. RESOLVED that Members grant consent under Regulation 4 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 (as amended) subject to the 4 conditions contained within the report.

**20/01006/FUL – Change of use from garden room to hair salon – 23 Lyons Gardens, Hetton-le-Hole, Houghton-le-Spring, DH5 0HL**

The Committee were informed that this item had been withdrawn by the applicant and would therefore not be considered.

**20/01595/MNQ – Purchase notice under s137 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) – Purchase Notice for land adjacent to 2 Boundary Cottages, Golf Course Road, Houghton Le Spring, DH4 4PL**

The Planning Officer representing the Executive Director of City Development outlined the proposal to Members of the Committee and the relevant material planning considerations against which the application had been assessed.

5. RESOLVED that in accordance with Section 139 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, Members agreed that they were not willing to comply with the Purchase Notice for the reasons set out within the report and that a copy of the Purchase Notice and Response Notice would be sent to the Secretary of State.

#### **Items for Information**

Members having fully considered the items for information contained within the matrix, it was:-

6. RESOLVED that the items for information as set out in the matrix be received and noted;

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

(Signed) M. THORNTON,  
(Chairman)

## Item 3b

**At an extraordinary meeting of the PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS (WEST) COMMITTEE held remotely on TUESDAY 17<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER, 2020 at 5.30 p.m.**

### **Present:-**

Councillor Thornton in the Chair.

Councillors Armstrong, Blackett, Fagan, Lauchlan, F. Miller, and G. Walker.

### **Declarations of Interest**

#### **20/01182/FUL – Erection of 13 no. residential dwellings (Use Class C3) – Land West Willows Close, Columbia, Washington**

Councillor Fagan made an open declaration on the item as her brother was an employee of Gentoo and withdrew from the meeting during consideration of the item.

### **Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Rowntree and P. Walker.

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

The Executive Director of City Development submitted a report (copies circulated), which related to the West area of the City, copies of which had also been forwarded to each Member of the Council, upon applications made under the Town and Country Planning Acts and Regulations made thereunder.

(for copy reports – see original minutes)

#### **20/00795/MAW – Installation of kiosks associated with sewage treatment works – Northumbrian Water Ltd Washington Treatment Works, Pattinson Road, Pattinson Industrial Estate, Washington**

The Planning Officer representing the Executive Director of City Development outlined the proposal to Members of the Committee and the relevant material planning considerations against which the application had been assessed.

In response to Councillor G. Walkers enquiry over the noise levels of the units and if operating 24 hours a day, if they were giving off any kind of hum or drone, The Planning Officer advised that the noise from the units was

negligible and that a full noise assessment had been received and Environmental Health had determined that it was not above the background noise levels during the day or at night.

Councillor F. Miller commented that as she lived relatively close to the area she had had problems with noise, the environment agency and local residents have contacted her in relation to noise. Councillor Miller advised that she was aware of the work they were doing in regards to some of the background noise in the past so she was concerned about the noise levels in the area and queried how much of an issue this may be.

The Planning Officer advised that the noise assessment had been considered thoroughly and additional information had been requested by environmental Health who were completely satisfied upon receipt of, that there would be no additional background noise from the units.

2. RESOLVED that the Members approve consent for the reasons as set out in the report and subject to the four conditions contained therein

### **20/01182/FUL – Erection of 13 no. residential dwellings (Use Class C3) – Land West Willows Close, Columbia, Washington**

The Planning Officer representing the Executive Director of City Development outlined the proposal to Members of the Committee and the relevant material planning considerations against which the application had been assessed.

Councillor G. Walker referred to the presentation slides and commented that it showed green space to be built upon and queried if this was to be levelled and how would the profile of the houses affect the view of the existing homes toward the school ground.

The Planning Officer advised that there were two marked plateaus within the site and there would be some gradient work to Lowthian Terrace down towards the north of the site, there would not be any back filling and he would assume that the rear gardens of the properties would retain the ground levels that exist previously. There would be a need for a retaining wall between the properties to the higher part of the site.

In relation to the existing houses view, the Planning Officer advised that their view of the school playground would be obscured.

Councillor F. Miller referred to page 25 of the report and that she was concerned about pedestrian safety and that there were issues within the area between Central and East Wards and the transport/traffic issues there also.

The Highways Officer advised that in terms of pedestrian safety, this was essentially a cul-de-sac development with the open space area to the rear of the development, generally all pedestrian movements would be contained within the development and where it connects to existing, there would be new

footway connections done to an appropriate standard as found elsewhere in the city.

Councillor Lauchlan commented that he was very disappointed with the loss of green space and that he was a little confused with the report, specifically on page 17 which referred to 2.51 hectares of green space quite close to this land, which he stated there was not.

Councillor Lauchlan advised that the loss of green space seemed to depend on the NE4 Policy Criterion 4 which Members could see on page 16 of the report, the amendments that could be made to allow this development to go forward and the only thing he could see which had been amended was the fact that Gentoo have said this would be an overall betterment. Councillor Lauchlan requested if Officers could explain how taking away the green space from the children of Willows Close would be better for their mental wellbeing.

Councillor Lauchlan also queried if the pedestrian link to Ovingham Close mentioned in the report had been an error as clarified by Officers in their presentation, then did this alter the determination that there was satisfactory links to the development with the removal of this.

The Planning Officer advised that in terms of Policy NE4, the policy aimed to protect, conserve and enhance the quality of existing green space. Moving onto the caveat, this looked to replacing the quantity. Officers had looked at this very carefully across the City and across this area within the Ward to see whether or not there was an area of land in the location that could be provided to fulfil that caveat in terms of replicating quantity with quantity and in the Barmston/Columbia Ward that's not necessarily the case so Officers had looked at the wording of the Policy itself and that meant they were looking to enhance the quality and the value and accessibility of the existing green space and that was the balanced response why they believed in this particular instance the loss of quantity of open space should be allowed.

Councillor Lauchlan stated that the Policy did not refer at all about qualities and that it referred to adverse effect on amenity, recreational or nature conservation and to him taking away this green space, which was the only green space in that area then the children had absolutely nowhere to go to play and therefore it would adversely affect the 70 families that live in Willows Close so he could not see the argument about quality and quantity.

Councillor Lauchlan also commented that once the houses were built on that green space, what was left would be very little and he did not understand how this would be significantly bettered. Whilst he was not one to usually stand in the way of progress he felt this development was one too far.

The Planning Officer advised that he took on board the points made by Councillor Lauchlan, looking specifically at Policy NE4 what they had tried to highlight in the agenda report was that whilst it was acknowledged there would be a loss of open space and amenity, in summary, the uplift and the betterment to the remaining open space in addition to the delivery of the



affordable units and the biodiversity enhancements on balance had led to the recommendation to err on the side that it was acceptable in principle. It was not a quality/quantity singularity argument and had been carefully weighed against all of the material considerations that this proposal brought.

In relation to the query over the pedestrian links, The Highways Officer advised that whilst it would have been beneficial to have had a connection through to Ovingham Close in terms of connectivity the access of local amenities and services via the main entrance to the development remained acceptable.

Councillor Armstrong commented that he was very sympathetic over the need for more affordable homes and that he appreciated there were mitigating factors on this proposal, however the fact we were losing another green space in the city and in Washington was rather disheartening. Councillor Armstrong commented that he recognised the City Ecologist has had input into this, along with the Planning Officer expressing that there would be some improvements and queried what exactly the biodiversity enhancements would be and which green areas would be made better as he could not see where these would be from this development.

The Planning Officer advised that in terms of the biodiversity enhancements, the supporting ecological appraisal made it clear that there were areas potentially to the south that could contain habitats for bats, but also pointed out that there were a number of species of birds that could fly over the site and also made reference to the fact that hedgehogs may cross over that field. The report and the city ecologist concluded that with the addition of the vegetation that was proposed, they would be enhancing habitat for all three species mentioned. More trees to facilitate nesting birds, potentially also bats, low growing hedgerows and undergrowth which would facilitate refuge points for hedgehogs and also by the inclusion of the fence between the existing palisade fence and the rear of the residential properties there is the potential there to create a hedgehog highway.

The Chairman referred to the affordable housing and requested confirmation that all of the 13 dwellings would be available for rent.

The Planning Officer commented that in terms of delivery of the units, all 13 had been indicated as being affordable and the Council policy would generally be that 80% rented and 20% intermediate and he believed that at the present moment in time they were still drafting up the Section 106 therefore he could not confirm whether it was 100% but the agent of the applicant may be able to clarify this.

The Chairman introduced Councillor Dianne Snowdon who wished to speak in objection to the application. Councillor Snowdon informed the Committee that she had expressed her concerns over this development to Planning Officers and Gentoo for some time, twice since she had become a Councillor, Gentoo had looked at developing in this small pocket of green space and twice they had listened to Councillors and residents concerns over traffic, loss of green

space and other issues and no development had taken place, therefore she wondered what was different now.

Councillor Snowdon commented that the roads had not changed, aside from possibly becoming more congested and she was extremely worried about these roads. If they had been able to conduct an official site visit she was sure members would have been able to see for themselves that a development on this site was not appropriate. The roads in this area cannot cope with the current volume of traffic and was the reason why Go North East withdrew their bus service. Any additional traffic would make a bad situation worse and she did not feel access to a new build housing project in a back lane that was originally built for horse and cart and had no footpaths in the Derwent Terrace end was acceptable in 2020.

Road Safety reports showed few accidents however we all knew that low speed accidents were not recorded and residents had told her that there were often bumps, scrapes and wing mirrors lost by cars parked on Station Road.

Councillor Snowdon added that Gentoo stated they had carried out a large consultation prior to submission and this was included in the report, however she had been told by residents in private homes backing onto the site and in Ovingham on the opposite boundary that they did not receive any consultation. It was all very concerning as some Gentoo tenants living a distance away had seen these documents and it was surely those closest to the site that needed to be listened to.

On reading the report submitted for the Committee, Councillor Snowdon noticed the mention of a footpath through Ovingham and she was pleased the Planning Department had acknowledged this had been included by mistake and was to be removed from the application.

Councillor Snowdon commented that it was often difficult for residents to understand planning process and she had been contacted by some very late in the day who had stated they did not need to comment on the Council site as they had already submitted their objections to Gentoo directly and they believed their comments would be passed onto the Council. This was something that happened regularly and she believed it was something that needed greater consideration outside of this meeting.

Councillor Snowdon informed the Committee that she had attended a JFK School governors meeting, the school which joined the boundary of this site and they had claimed not to have received any notice on this proposal.

Councillor Snowdon commented that it was really hard to speak against a proposal for 100% affordable housing but she was acting on behalf of her residents and to conclude she wished to ask the planning committee to defer this application until a full site visit could be arranged once COVID restrictions were lifted so that they could see for themselves how tight this site was and the road conditions that affected the area.

The Chairman introduced Mr Mark Lloyd who wished to speak in opposition to the proposal. Mr Lloyd stated that he had lived in Washington for forty-one years and at Lowthian Terrace for fifteen years. Having grown up in council accommodation he generally supported the work of Gentoo and the development of affordable housing. He had very strong objections to this particular development and most particularly about the way they had been consulted.

Mr Lloyd was not convinced that the process of consulting local residents was conducted in a fair and accessible way for a number of reasons. Mr Lloyd suggested that if he wished to make the process as difficult as possible to get their application through under the radar he would have done the same as Gentoo had, making it a two tier process and to lead people to believe they had lodged their objections when in fact that was only the first part of the process.

He would claim to deliver a large number of leaflets, with only a small number of returns by delivering these to houses that were not really affected by the development. Mr Lloyd stated that as he lived directly opposite the development he had not received any leaflet.

Mr Lloyd advised that the second half of the process was cumbersome and online with residents having a lot of difficulty in signing up to make their objections known and in an area where there was a large demographic of people who did not have access to online resources it was very difficult for them to take part.

Mr Lloyd believed the final report for the Committee dismissed peoples legitimate concerns about traffic increase with vague statements that played the potential issues down without actually visiting the site or knowing about the area. It was easy to say that something was within the daily tolerance without having any real understanding about what the local residents had to tolerate on a daily basis.

Mr Lloyd queried if the Committee felt that having a two-tier, largely online, consultation process offered all of the residents of the area a fair and accessible opportunity to express their opinions about the development. The whole thing seemed to be focussed around the benefits to Gentoo, and when "Community" was referred to, it seemed to be about the Community resulting from the development and not the existing Community that was already there.

In reference to the quality of the land improving, Mr Lloyd queried how the Members of the Committee would feel if developments took place within their garden, taking away their space only to be told that the unwanted development had bettered their life.

The report identified quite clearly that the amount of green space was lacking in Columbia, especially with the developments taking place next to the Primary School eating into another section of green space currently available.

Mr Lloyd stated that there were a number of inaccuracies in the report and he wondered whether anyone had physically visited the area. One thing stated was there was a post office which was within 100 meters from the development. As he actually lived in the old post office and could confirm that it closed over fifteen years ago. This made him question if up-to-date information has been supplied to the planners he worried that when making decisions about amenity green space they were relying on google maps from several years ago without having actually visited the site.

Mr Lloyd commented that his biggest concern was that this was seen as a flat bit of land that was easy to develop and would tick some boxes but he would like to know if there was any evidence to suggest this area of Washington needed more houses, more than it needed green space for its children to play on and wide open space for residents to look out to. This development would take away the green space and the view of blue skies for residents.

Mr Lloyd agreed with Councillor Snowdon and suggested the Committee visit the site to see what issues such as the parking were like before they made a decision as this could be a very big development mistake.

The Chairman introduced Mr Andy Gray who wished to speak in opposition to the proposal. Mr Gray advised that he was a gentoo resident within Willows Close. He had completed the survey online, shortly after receiving the leaflet from Gentoo but unfortunately it did feel as though the results of their own survey had not been fully shared or simply dismissed within the report. It felt like it was mainly a tick box exercise and they could have at least, responded to some of the concerns raised. Mr Gray advised that he had left his contact details on the survey sent and to date he still was to be contacted by Gentoo.

Mr Gray wished to add his voice to the concerns raised by various others regarding traffic. There were a number of various junctions into Willows Close that require drivers to slow down, some drivers do not do this. Adding extra traffic to the area either from new occupiers or visiting families and deliveries did not make sense to him.

Mr Gray advised that as a dog owner, the field was used as the main area for his exercise, the loss of Columbia's last decent sized green space, he believed would be detrimental to the residents already living there. It was well used by fellow dog walkers, young people and those accessing to JFK School fields.

Mr Gray commented that lockdown in particular had shown how much we all valued green space and as a resident of Willows Close, only having a small front yard himself he felt that in a way, this field was his green space. Whilst all of these new properties would have their own garden as well as a drive, he would in a way, be losing his therefore pleaded with the Committee to decline or reconsider this application.

The City Solicitor wished to clarify that in relation to the Section 106 agreement, he could inform Members that all of the properties would be affordable rented properties.

The Development Control Manager read out the written statements received from objectors to the application, which were as follows;

A Ms Pamela Elliott submitted representation stating that she would like to know why she and other existing residents appeared to have been ignored when a few years ago they said no to the building of new properties on the Green Space. Looking at the overall dimensions of the proposed 13 new properties including their parking (off limits to existing residents) would take up most of their Green Space encroaching on a high proportion of the existing properties' space and day light.

Lowthian and Wear Terraces would be like an island with extra traffic using both Station Road (in front of the Terraces) and the back road/lane (behind the Terraces) turning the current back road into a main busy access road for the proposed properties.

Road access to those properties would be extremely dangerous, as there is currently a high traffic volume especially at busier times of the day and night with people parking their vehicles on the junction at the bottom of Willow's Close to use the businesses on Station Road, which at times restricts safe viewing from all access points of the junctions and A195 roundabout making this a dangerous area to navigate in a vehicle never mind on foot.

Extra properties would result in an even higher volume of traffic using the junctions leading into Willow's Close to access the back road behind the terraces to the proposed site, placing pedestrians and other road users at a higher risk of being involved in an RTA not to mention extra traffic and noise pollution.

The JNP report notes it wouldn't cause any extra noise or emissions pollution. Extra properties and traffic would result in extra noise and emissions pollution. The extra pollution was not only disturbing to the existing residents but to the wildlife, which JNP's report refers to no risk to wildlife as wildlife doesn't use the green space. This was incorrect as birds, hedgehogs and bats (to name but a few) had made the green space their home. In the case of the bats, they live close by and use the green space as their feeding ground. Ms Elliott also didn't agree with JNP's report advising there'd be no problems with increases of surface water and the main sewer infrastructure in the area.

Ms Elliott stated it was a fact more properties would cause an extra demand on existing utilities adding an extra strain on existing sewerage pipes and underground drainage. Resulting in a high risk of Gentoo, Sunderland City Council and Utilities having to constantly dig up their poorly conditioned roads to gain access to pipes, patching up problems caused by the addition of new properties creating a high cost to all involved especially to the existing residents.

It would be a beneficial long term investment to Washington if Gentoo, Pegasus and all involved could please focus their attention on larger plots of land with an existing housing stock in other parts of Washington that would benefit from development, creating jobs and affordable housing whilst still making a profit. There was no need for any more houses in this already heavily developed area, and not on their green space.

Ms Elliott informed that since the last week of November 2020 there had been site works on what appeared to be Green Space near Salon 2000. She was already sick of the noise and vibration from the building of what she believed would be new bungalows (this was just for 2 new properties.) The building of the proposed 13 new properties over the road on the green space would be horrendous.

Now these new bungalows would generate even more traffic to the already overly congested roads. Which in places were narrow and in some cases the view was restricted. As a long term resident she had herself experienced negotiating these roads and narrow pavements both by driving and as a pedestrian, which over the years the traffic had increased. She did not understand how anyone could say the roads around Willow's Close and Station Road were not congested. They certainly did not need any more regular traffic adding to their already overly congested roads, through the building of 13 new properties.

Ms Elliott queried the need to take away people's green spaces for building homes causing dangerous traffic congestion, when in other parts of Washington there were existing housing stock that would benefit from development.

Regarding the 13 proposed new properties, Ms Elliott strongly objected to these properties being built on their green space causing destruction, noise and traffic pollution in an already congested area.

A Mr Keith Bartlett submitted representation stating that he had been a resident in Lowthian Terrace for 33 years and he strongly objected to development of area adjacent to Willows Close

The development would result in the loss of what little Green space was left in an already over developed area, this area was popular with children playing, dog walkers, local residents exercise and a social area.

A Loss of mature trees and wildlife habitats, there were Bats and Hedgehogs present on the site which gentoo had acknowledged by stating they would include provision of 2 bat boxes only within development.

Mr Bartlett did not believe the Gentoo report had been accurate as it stated there was a post office within 100 meters or so. This Post Office closed some

10 years ago. This caused him to question what other inaccurate information was being supplied.

Another report stated there had been no traffic accidents reported during the past 10 years. This may have been true regarding the involvement of emergency services, however there had been a number of cars damaged through collisions with stationary parked vehicles and he had personally had 2 different cars damaged significantly and he was aware of neighbours also affected very recently. These incidents were dealt with through their own insurance companies and not involving emergency services.

Traffic movement was a major concern and Mr Bartlett had submitted time lapse video of traffic at the Station Road, Willows Close junction directly outside his property and whilst this showed issues with traffic it was really not a true reflection as due to COVID restrictions the traffic activity was currently significantly lower than what it would be normally. The roadway at the rear of Lowthian terrace and Wear terrace was effectively a one lane road as residents including himself park vehicles at the rear of their properties.

The area had a number of elderly residents a number of which had disabilities who were forced to use mobility aids. Due to the lack of dropped curbs they tended to use the actual roadway as a means of getting from A to B, So there was a risk to their safety. Mr Bartlett was not aware of any Risk assessment having been completed covering this area of concern.

The roadway was used daily by young children and parents travelling to and from JFK Primary school. The street lighting along rear of Lowthian Terrace was inadequate for more traffic to use currently as there were only 2 street lights covering the footpath which was set back some 3 meters behind a row of trees not really illuminating road sufficiently. It was difficult during winter months after trees had shed their leaves in summer when in full foliage they blocked almost all light (He did not wish this to be an excuse to fell trees) but if development went ahead the lamps would require relocating.

The access road between Lowthian Terrace and Wear Terrace was very narrow and had a very difficult line of site when exiting onto the front of Lowthian Terrace & Wear Terrace, he believed this was just going to force traffic to use the already busy junction which surrounded his end of terrace property on three sides which would increase noise levels and headlight reflection which would disturb his Grandchildren when they were staying.

There were 2 sandwich food shops, 1 Social club, 1 Chinese take away and 1 convenience store present which attracted a lot of vehicular traffic who used the front and back of Lowthian Terrace as simple turning routes.

In 2011 a plan to build houses on this land was rejected. Mr Bartlett questioned what had changed from 2011 to 2020. In his opinion the traffic was greater now than what it was then.

Mr Bartlett stated that the letter informing of this opportunity to speak arrived at his address on 12 November with a deadline of Sunday 15<sup>th</sup> November to respond. This he felt was not giving the residents ample opportunity to consult with each other and respond accordingly. He thought this in effect would reduce the number of responses the Committee would receive.

Mr Bartlett thanked the Committee for allowing this statement and urged the committee to reject this proposal. This was a strong happy community and already over developed so requested that they leave it as it is to help grow community spirit and not destroy it.

In relation to the consultation process, The Planning Officer advised that Gentoo had undertaken a statement of community involvement as part of their submission, the content of which their agent would be best placed to relay to the Committee and in terms of the City Council's responsibilities, the City Council was duly obligated under the Development Management Procedure Order to undertake consultations with those properties adjoining the site and they had done that. They had also posted site notices and press notices and by the number of responses received it was clearly evident that the local population surrounding the site were alive to the application being submitted during lockdown.

The Local Planning Authority therefore had carried out their statutory obligations in terms of consultation. With regards to informing on representations to the Committee, letters were drafted immediately after the agenda was published and distributed on the day. Everything was done as efficiently and to the minute as it could be in order to get the local populations input to this Committee.

The Planning Officer also wished to point out that 25 letters were sent out and we have had a number of responses received, as evidenced at this meeting.

With regards to comments made on previous projects for the site, The Planning Officer advised that he was aware Gentoo had looked at the site on a number of occasions but he could not provide any planning history to Members due to officers working from home due to COVID restrictions.

The Highways Officer wished to respond to comments and that it was important to state that this proposal would generate traffic, because it was a new development, however, as it was set out in the report, the development of 13 houses in this scale would only generate 6-7 two way trips within the peak hour which was essentially the busiest hour of the day. So in terms of capacity of the road network and road safety, the layout, the highway access all meet with Highways standards and are therefore deemed to be acceptable.



With regard to road traffic collisions, yes it was correct these weren't recorded by the police if there was no personal injury as a consequence, this was an unfortunate situation but one the Council could not change. In relation to street lighting and footway improvements mentioned by an objector, they would be required to be undertaken as part of the access works to the development, which was normal practice.

The Chairman introduced Ms Sandra Manson, the Agent on behalf of the applicant who wished to address the Committee to inform of the benefits of the development.

Ms Manson thanked the Members for the opportunity to present to the Committee and commended the Planning Officer for their report and presentation. Ms Manson advised that the delivery of the Gentoo affordable development programme was a significant opportunity for Sunderland to deliver around 900 new affordable homes across the City by 2024, supported by Homes England grant funding.

Willows Close scheme was one of a series of those sites to consider, the programme to be delivered by Gentoo Group was a commitment to deliver a meaningful range of sites with a programme that supported job creation, social, economic and environmental benefits. This needed to be considered in the context that Sunderland had a continuing significant affordable home deficit as identified in the Authority's own Strategic Housing Market Assessment of 542 dwellings every year. This need was likely to be exacerbated by the impact of the current COVID crisis with a sharp rise in the number of people claiming Universal Credit and Job Seekers Allowance.

The number of claimants within Sunderland had significantly increased by over 5600 people between March and August 2020 which meant that more people were likely to be experiencing financial pressures which then in turn led to pressure on an affordable housing need in Sunderland.

Ms Manson informed that the economic benefits statement included with the application set out the economic and social benefits that would arise from the affordable home programme which were substantial and carried significant weight. The schemes proposed, including those at Willows Close were of the highest quality design with homes that met the Nationally described space standards, garden, space, parking provision (which the scheme would be self sufficient in terms of parking within the development) and a high quality build which was energy efficient.

This assisted in addressing sustainability considerations and savings for tenants. Gentoo Group were seeking to implement low carbon technology wherever possible with precise measures to be incorporated within the scheme by way of condition.

In relation to the Willows proposal itself, Ms Manson highlighted that there had been no objections from the statutory consultees and thanked Officers who had worked with them to ensure all technical matters had been resolved

satisfactorily to ensure a scheme, recognising the timescale for delivery against the Homes England grant programme.

In response to objections and concerns that had been raised both during the application process and at this meeting, Ms Manson wished to draw Members attention to certain matters. In regards to the open space, there would be an element of loss to the open space on the site, however there would be substantial enhancement to the landscaping undertaken which would remain open for the public in an improved environment which also included biodiversity enhancements.

Currently the site was of low ecological value and amenity grassland noting that there were bats and birds that may fly over the site itself. By the inclusion of specific measures within the development and mitigation on biodiversity which was required on condition there would be overall enhancement delivered through the scheme.

Ms Manson stated that Officers had confirmed that the concerns over the Ovingham Close wasn't actually an element of the scheme and also in terms of highways matters, Officers had again outlined to Members that there were no highways issues that would arise as a result from the development of 13 units within the site itself,

Ms Manson advised that it was noted and they did understand the residents concerns over the existing issues that they had, however Planning Policy required schemes to be determined on their own merits and in terms of addressing and mitigating their own impacts, as a result of this, it was clear that the scheme would be self sufficient from a highways perspective.

In terms of accident recording, Ms Manson reiterated that this was a process nationally prescribed standard practice that had been reported effectively as it is meant to do. Ms Manson acknowledged and apologised for the error in the reporting of the location of the Post Office, however wished to point out that there still remained a post office within walkable distance of the site at Barmston, which was 0.7 miles away

Ms Manson referred to the Statement of Community Involvement and that there was an extensive exercise undertaken and consultation with 600 leaflets distributed, 48 responses were received and an additional 78 responses were received via the website. Therefore 126 responses altogether demonstrated a significant amount of consultation.

Councillor G. Walker referred to the contribution by Mr Lloyd and that he had made some valid points regarding the consultation/community involvement strategy carried out by Gentoo, whilst this was not for discussion here, he requested that Gentoo take these points on board.

Councillor G. Walker commented that at this moment in time as he was not familiar with the space at all, he felt he would benefit from the application being deferred pending a site visit. There were arguments about use of the

green space and if Members were to be on site and take a closer look at the potential of the development for the area and how this physically affects the green space that the Committee would benefit from this.

Councillor F. Miller commented that her concern was over the affordable housing aspect and that she had been told this would be social housing, which was really what she wanted to see more of in the area. As she had worked in a food bank recently she really did appreciate the work done by Gentoo and she was hoping this was what was planned as it was so important that people do get housing.

The City Solicitor advised that he had completed the draft Section 106 agreement, subject to approval being granted and could confirm that it would be for 13 houses to be let at an affordable rent.

Councillor F. Miller commented that if this was the case, then this seemed to be a win win situation because it was so important we got people in to housing and she felt Washington was full of green spaces and trees. Teal Farm was only over the road from this development and if we were giving 13 families a chance of a house over their head then it made sense.

Councillor Armstrong commented that there had been some strong representations made to the Committee and that the people who had spoken were very concise in informing of the reality in which they experienced and viewed this proposal and the assessments carried out.

The site already had bats and animals that were living quite happily and the use of the green space by local children, residents and dog owners. The strength of feeling had definitely come through and to talk about improving an area, laying concrete does not improve the area ecologically and he was in agreement with Councillor G. Walker with the suggestion of deferral as he did not know how familiar Officers were with the area and it was definitely an area that needed to be seen with the traffic formidable and further investigation would not be a bad thing whilst also giving more time for residents to provide feedback.

Councillor Lauchlan formally proposed that the application be deferred for a site visit to be undertaken once safe to do so under the COVID restrictions. Councillor G. Walker seconded the proposal.

In response to the City Solicitor's enquiry over the reasons for deferral that had not been addressed at the meeting, Councillor Lauchlan advised that the photographs shown during the presentation could tell a lot of different stories and that Members needed to see how the road layout was, how much actual green space there was as he believed Members would have a false perception of how much was available based on the photos provided.

Councillor Lauchlan also commented that where they were proposing to put the road layout up to the back of Lowthian Terrace he did not believe

Members had the right view of the actual structure of that area and they needed to see for themselves what the possibilities are for that area.

The Development Control Manager commented that what was set out before Members was a very comprehensive report that had been thoroughly assessed over a number of weeks by all the relevant technical statutory and non-statutory bodies. The site was fully accessible and obviously given the restrictions with COVID , the Government had not allowed the Planning Authority any relaxations in terms of their determination timescales so applications had to be considered and determined in a timely manner.

Had the site not been fully accessible then it could be appreciated if Members had been unable to view the site and it was also understood that the application had appeared on the Matrix which had also given Member the opportunity to request a site visit, Therefore the Development Control Manager commented that for the reasons set out she did not feel Members would gain anything further if they had not already visited the site.

Having been put to a vote, it was unanimously agreed to defer determination of the application so that a site visit could be undertaken.

3. RESOLVED that the application be deferred for a site visit to be undertaken.

**20/01136/FUL – Erection of a detached house (bungalow). (Amended Plans received 15.10.20) – Garden of 18 Hillview Road, Newbottle, Houghton Le Spring, DH4 4SH**

The Planning Officer representing the Executive Director of City Development outlined the proposal to Members of the Committee and the relevant material planning considerations against which the application had been assessed.

The Chairman introduced Councillor Julianna Heron who wished to speak in objection to the application. Councillor Heron informed the Committee that she had received a number of complaints from residents in the area and that historically the site had been left with a large garden in order to make it safer for the residents in that street and who had been told nothing would ever be built upon that site.

Councillor Heron acknowledged that she understood that the street elevation had changed and if this hadn't happened it would have been out of sync with the rest of the street and as mentioned in previous applications she felt it would have been beneficial for Members to have had site visit to this location.

Councillor Heron commented that she had problems with the highway layout as the turning area would be compromised especially with the new bungalow and would create access problems for properties 19, 20 and 21 on the opposite side of the road. The road narrowed as you reach the end as it was a cul-de-sac and people do park on the road despite also having driveways

which causes problems for bin wagons and emergency services if they needed to visit the site.

The residents did feel very strongly about this and they felt it would really create problems for them and had strong concerns about the building of the bungalow here.

The Planning Officer advised that in respect of any assurances given that the plot wouldn't be built upon, any such agreement would sit outside of planning considerations and the site hadn't been given any sort of formal protection and we were required to consider the proposal in line with national planning policies. The proposal had been considered on its merits and officers felt that the development was acceptable.

In respect of the concerns from objectors, appropriate consideration and weight had been given to those in the area but Officers were of the view that there were no issues raised by the development proposal that would warrant anything other than a recommendation for approval.

Access had been considered and the dwelling would benefit from an off-street parking space and the level of traffic that would be generated by the erection of one dwelling was going to be very low.

The Highways Officer advised that they had supported the application on the basis that off-street parking was provided for number 18 and the bungalow so based on that there was sufficient manoeuvring space to accommodate the proposal,

The Chairman introduced Mr John Waugh, who wished to speak as the agent on behalf of the applicant. Mr Waugh informed the Committee that the property had been designed as a lifetime home which had wider access, corridors and doors. A ground floor wet room with WC and would be an energy efficient, economical to run dwelling with good quality amenity space. These were all facilities that society now required and did not exist elsewhere on the estate.

The property was designed for young couples starting out in life, through family life and into single person retirement and had been professionally designed by the agent and assessed by professionals employed by the Council, who they had worked pro-actively with to progress locals concerns so that significant changes had been made, such that the Officer dealing with the application supported these proposals.

Conditions had been suggested to control the development upon which the client had found to be acceptable and he hoped that the Committee would support this application.

4. RESOLVED that the application be approved for the reasons set out within the report and subject to the 4 draft conditions contained therein.

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

(Signed) M. THORNTON,  
(Chairman)

## Planning and Highways (West) Committee

15th December 2020

---

### REPORT ON APPLICATIONS

---

#### REPORT BY THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF CITY DEVELOPMENT

##### PURPOSE OF REPORT

This report includes recommendations on all applications other than those that are delegated to the Executive Director of City Development determination. Further relevant information on some of these applications may be received and in these circumstances either a supplementary report will be circulated a few days before the meeting or if appropriate a report will be circulated at the meeting.

##### LIST OF APPLICATIONS

Applications for the following sites are included in this report.

1. 20/00238/FUL  
Durham Wildlife Trust, Mallard Way, Houghton-le-Spring, DH4 6PU
2. 20/01182/FUL  
Land West of Willows Close, Columbia, Washington

##### COMMITTEE ROLE

The Committee has full delegated powers to determine applications on this list. Members of the Council who have queries or observations on any application should, in advance of the above date, contact the Committee Chairperson or the Development Control Manager (0191 561 8755) or email [dc@sunderland.gov.uk](mailto:dc@sunderland.gov.uk).

## **DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that “where in making any determination under the planning Acts, regard is to be had to the development plan, the determination shall be made in accordance with the plan unless material consideration indicates otherwise.

### **Development Plan - current status**

The Core Strategy and Development Plan was adopted on the 30 January 2020, whilst the saved policies from the Unitary Development Plan were adopted on 7 September 1998. In the report on each application specific reference will be made to policies and proposals that are particularly relevant to the application site and proposal. The CSDP and UDP also include several city wide and strategic policies and objectives, which when appropriate will be identified.

## **STANDARD CONDITIONS**

Sections 91 and 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 require that any planning application which is granted either full or outline planning permission shall include a condition, which limits its duration.

## **SITE PLANS**

The site plans included in each report are illustrative only.

## **PUBLICITY/CONSULTATIONS**

The reports identify if site notices, press notices and/or neighbour notification have been undertaken. In all cases the consultations and publicity have been carried out in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

## **LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 – ACCESS TO INFORMATION**

The background papers material to the reports included on this agenda are:

- The application and supporting reports and information;
- Responses from consultees;
- Representations received;
- Correspondence between the applicant and/or their agent and the Local Planning Authority;
- Correspondence between objectors and the Local Planning Authority;
- Minutes of relevant meetings between interested parties and the Local Planning Authority;
- Reports and advice by specialist consultants employed by the Local Planning Authority;
- Other relevant reports.

Please note that not all of the reports will include background papers in every category and that the background papers will exclude any documents containing exempt or confidential information as defined by the Act.

These reports are held on the relevant application file and are available for inspection during normal office hours at the City Development Directorate at the Customer Service Centre or via the internet at [www.sunderland.gov.uk/online-applications/](http://www.sunderland.gov.uk/online-applications/)

Peter McIntyre

Executive Director City Development



---

**Reference No.:** 20/00238/FUL Full Application

**Proposal:** **Creation of reedbed habitat**

**Location:** Durham Wildlife Trust Mallard Way Houghton-le-Spring DH4 6PU

**Ward:** Hetton

**Applicant:** Durham Wildlife Trust Ltd

**Date Valid:** 12 February 2020

**Target Date:** 13 May 2020

---

**PROPOSAL:**

The application seeks full planning permission for the creation of a reedbed habitat at Rainton Meadows Nature Reserve, nr. Houghton-le-Spring.

The submitted covering letter explains that "the site consists of approx. 70 hectares of land recognised as the Rainton Meadows Nature Reserve, supporting a diverse range of habitats including; open water and ponds, fen & swamp, meadow, scattered scrub, woodland and hedgerows" and that "This planning application is concerned with the creation of reedbed habitat on the site that would benefit wetland bird species and other priority species of fauna".

**TYPE OF PUBLICITY:**

Press Notice Advertised

Site Notice Posted

**CONSULTEES:**

Environment Agency

Hetton Town Council

Hetton - Ward Councillor Consultation

Network Management

Northumbria Police

Fire Prevention Officer

NE Ambulance Service NHS Trust

Tyne And Wear Archaeology Officer

The Coal Authority

Environmental Health

Flood And Coastal Group Engineer

Natural England

Final Date for Receipt of Representations: **07.07.2020**

**REPRESENTATIONS:**

None received from members of the public.

**POLICIES:**

In the Core Strategy and Development Plan the site is subject to the following policies: SP1, SP6, NE2, HS3, ST2, ST3, NE8

## COMMENTS:

### Principle of the Development

The Core Strategy, at policy SP1 (Development Strategy), seeks to protect "Sunderland's character and environmental character" and policy SP6 (The Coalfield) states the Coalfield area "will be protected whilst ensuring its future sustainability".

The Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, at Section 40, states "The public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity".

The proposal, as a scheme designed to benefit wetland bird species and other priority species of fauna, would contribute towards both the development plan policies and the requirements of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006

In terms of material considerations, Hetton Town Council have advised that they have "no comments or objections"

In the absence of any other material considerations to the contrary, the principle of the proposed development with the relevant policies within the development plan and would contribute towards the local authority being able to demonstrate having regard to the provisions of Section 40 within the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006.

### Drainage

There are discussions ongoing at the time of writing in respect of sustainable drainage considerations and an update on this matter will be provided to Members at the Committee meeting.

### Ecology

The submitted Extended Phase 1 Survey Report advises that the site itself forms part of a Local Nature Reserve and lies within 2km of two SSSIs (Joes Pond and Hetton Bogs). The Survey continues by advising that the proposed works would "improve the site at Rainton Meadows and create more biodiversity within the area" and that "there will be no direct impacts on nearby designated sites and long-term effects within the area will be positive".

The applicant has also submitted a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) "designed with the objective of compliance with all relevant environmental legislation and draw together the ecological mitigation necessary for the site". The suggested mitigation includes work taking place outside the bird breeding season and habitats not being illuminated at night time.

The Council's Ecologist has advised that they have "no objections" and have made comments concerning matters relating to the Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP).

Natural England have also advised that they have "no comments".

In the absence of any material considerations to the contrary, the proposal accords with policy NE2 (biodiversity and geodiversity).

### Groundworks

The site, in terms of legacy coal mining, lies within a "Development High Risk Area". The Coal Authority have, however, advised that "when considering the nature of this particular development

proposal, it does not appear that any built development is require(d). On this basis of the type and nature of development proposed we do not consider that a Coal Mining Risk Assessment would be proportionate to the scale and nature of the development proposed in this particular case and do not object to this planning application".

The Environment Agency have advised that they "welcome the proposals" and have provided advice concerning land contamination which could be included as an informative.

The Environmental Health Officer has advised that they have "no objections".

In the absence of any material considerations to the contrary, the proposal accords with policy HS3 (contaminated land).

#### Highway

The point of access would remain the same, as would the parking and turning arrangements within the site. The Local Highway Authority have advised that they have "no observations". In the absence of any material considerations to the contrary, the proposal accords with policies ST2 (local road network) and ST3 (development and transport).

#### Landscape

The proposed development, as a reedbed habitat, would integrate successfully with the wider nature reserve. In the absence of any material considerations to the contrary, the proposal accords with policy NE8 (landscape).

#### Conclusion

The proposal, as a scheme for the creation of a reedbed habitat within a nature reserve, accords with the relevant policies within the development plan and the broader requirements of Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006. There do not appear to be any material considerations which indicate that any decision other than approval of the application should be made, however matters relating to the sustainable drainage of the application site are still being given consideration.

### **EQUALITY ACT 2010 - 149 Public Sector Equality Duty**

During the detailed consideration of this application/proposal an equality impact assessment has been undertaken which demonstrates that due regard has been given to the duties placed on the LPA's as required by the aforementioned Act.

As part of the assessment of the application/proposal due regard has been given to the following relevant protected characteristics:

- age;
- disability;
- gender reassignment;
- pregnancy and maternity;
- race;
- religion or belief;
- sex;
- sexual orientation.

The LPA is committed to (a) eliminating discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Equality Act 2010; (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;

(c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

In addition, the LPA, in the assessment of this application/proposal has given due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. This approach involves (a) removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic; (b) take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it; (c) encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.

The LPA has taken reasonable and proportionate steps to meet the needs of disabled persons that are different from the needs of persons who are not disabled include, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities, as part of this planning application/proposal.

Due regard has been given to the need to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves. Particular consideration has been given to the need to:

- (a) tackle prejudice; and
- (b) promote understanding.

Finally, the LPA recognise that compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others; but that is not to be taken as permitting conduct that would otherwise be prohibited by or under this Act.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Members be **MINDED TO APPROVE** the application, subject to:

- (1) the resolution of the outstanding drainage matters (including any additional / amended conditions).
- (2) the draft conditions below.

### **Conditions:**

1 The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date on which permission is granted, as required by section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

Reason: As amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 to ensure that the development is carried out within a reasonable period of time.

2 The development hereby granted permission shall be carried out in full accordance with the following approved plans:

Site Concept Design (RMRB01)  
Isopoach\_Cut&Fill\_Depth (DG/DRG\_NO\_1 A)  
Bund Design - Technical Specification Note  
Footpath Construction - Technical Specification Note  
Reedbed Construction - Technical Specification Note  
Scrape Construction - Technical Specification Note

Bird Screen Design (RMRB01(BS))  
Example Cross Section of Reedbed and lenses (RMRB01(CS))  
Sluice Design (RMRB01(SL))

Reason: In order to ensure that the completed development accords with the scheme approved and to comply with policy BH1 of the Core Strategy and Development Plan.

3 The construction phase of the development hereby approved shall be undertaken in accordance with the submitted Construction Environment Management Plan (June 2020).

Reason: To ensure, in accordance with policy NE2 of the Core Strategy and Development Plan, the development hereby approved, would not adversely affect the Local Nature Reserve.

**Reference No.:** 20/01182/FUL Full Application

**Proposal:** **Erection of 13 no. residential dwellings (Use Class C3).**

**Location:** Land West Willows Close Columbia Washington

**Ward:** Washington Central

**Applicant:** C/O Agent - Gentoo Group Limited

**Date Valid:** 9 July 2020

**Target Date:** 8 October 2020

## **PROPOSAL:**

The application proposes 13 residential dwelling on land at Willows Close, Washington.

The proposal is to deliver a mixture of housing types including 2no. bungalows, 5no. two bedroom dwellings and 6no. three bedroom dwellings. All 13 dwellings are proposed to be affordable units. The proposed bungalows to the north of the site will be accessed via a shared driveway.

Each dwelling will have direct parking to the front and be accessed from a new proposed estate road. The site will be accessed from Lowthian Terrace and have areas of soft landscaping across the site.

### **Site**

The site is situated to the west of Willows Close, Washington and is accessed directly from Lowthian Terrace via a new proposed access point.

The northern, eastern and southern boundaries to the site are bounded by residential dwellings with a number of pedestrian paths running to Willows Close. The western boundary is bound by the school grounds of John F Kennedy Primary school.

The application submission has been supported by:

- o Plans and particulars;
- o Planning Statement;
- o Design and Access Statement;
- o Statement of Community Involvement;
- o Ecological Report;
- o Flood Risk & Drainage Assessment;
- o Tree Survey, Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement;
- o Noise and Air Quality Assessment;
- o Construction Environmental Management Plan;
- o Sustainability Assessment.

## **TYPE OF PUBLICITY:**

Press Notice Advertised

Site Notice Posted

Neighbour Notifications

**CONSULTEES:**

Flood And Coastal Group Engineer  
Environmental Health  
Network Management  
Northumbrian Water  
Northern Electric  
Northumbria Police  
Director Of Childrens Services  
Fire Prevention Officer  
Environmental Health  
Flood And Coastal Group Engineer  
Washington Central - Ward Councillor Consultation

Final Date for Receipt of Representations: **03.11.2020**

**REPRESENTATIONS:****REPRESENTATIONS**

Neighbour Representations: 24 letters of objection have been received following the expiry of the consultation period. Material concerns raised include:

- Increased potential for flood risk.
- Inappropriate land use. (Open space deficiency quality and quantity).
- Overdevelopment of the site.
- Poor access/highways.
- Loss of wildlife and trees.
- Inadequate Statement of Community Involvement.
- Planning History.

Matters identified above will be addressed throughout the main agenda report, however in summary of the above the Lead Local Flood Authority have assessed matters pertaining to drainage and flooding. The land use element of the proposal has been carefully considered within the principle of development section of the agenda report and a balanced view and approach reported.

Access to the site has been considered by the Local Highway Authority and their findings reported within the Highways section of the agenda. Impacts upon existing wildlife and trees have been addressed within the supporting documents and considered by the City Ecologist.

With regards to the Statement of Community Involvement, the applicant has confirmed that they undertook several methods in order to advertise with consultation and encourage engagement on the development proposals, including delivering 600 leaflets to residents and creating a dedicated web page.

There are no records of any relevant planning history held on the file for site in question.

**Ward Councillor Objection:**

1. Concerns relating to Road Safety between Wear and Lothian Terrace.
2. Road Safety concerns at the junction with Willows Close and Station Road.

3. Linked and integrated footpaths.
4. Increase drainage concerns with neighbouring housing estate at Ovingham.
5. Gentoo consultation and feedback.

#### Gentoo Response to Councillor Objection:

1. The area surrounding the site does not have a history of road safety concern. Vehicle collision records show that there have been no accidents on Wear Terrace, Lowthian Terrace or Station Road in the past 10 years (2010-2019 inclusive). The nominal increase in traffic arising from 13 houses is unlikely to influence future collision statistics.

The road connecting Lowthian Terrace and Wear Terrace is a straight section of road of approximately 28 metres in length. Inter-visibility between vehicles at either end is comfortably achieved and as such, it is unlikely that two vehicles will require to pass along this section, especially when alternative route choices are available.

2. Consideration has been given to the vehicle trip generating potential of the proposed development during the lunch time period referenced in the objection. Using the industry standard trip generation forecast database, it is estimated that the proposed 13 dwellings could generate approximately 8 vehicle movements over the 2-hour period from 12:00hrs to 14:00hrs. Whilst it is acknowledged that vehicle movements would unlikely be of a uniform profile, this approximately equates to 1 vehicle every 15 minutes - if all trips are routed via this junction. This level of additional trips would not lead to an exacerbation of any congestion on the local road network and the impact would not be significant.

3. There is currently no footway provision along the northern side of Lowthian Terrace. The site constraints and footway connections have been considered as part of the masterplan process and were discussed and agreed with the Local Highway Authority prior to submission.

4. The supporting Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) prepared by JNP Group assesses flood risk at the development site from all potential sources and describes the measures adopted in the master planning process to manage such risks. It has been prepared in compliance with current policies and best practices. The proposed drainage strategy has been designed not only in accordance with Sewers for Adoption and / or Building Regulations part H and in compliance with the NPPF, but also specifically in line with local requirements and current best practices.

In relation to the surrounding area, the results included in Appendix E of the supporting FRA demonstrates how the proposed surface water drainage strategy can manage surface water flood risk at the development site without increasing flood risk elsewhere for storm events up to the 1.0% AEP + 40% climate change allowance.

5. The Applicant has had cognisance of national and local policy and guidance. The methods of consultation were devised to accord with the current Coronavirus Act 2020 and the associated Regulations and Covid-19 guidance for undertaking community consultation during this time. Unfortunately this prevented hosting a community consultation event/exhibition in the locality. However, the Applicant undertook several methods in order to advertise with consultation and encourage engagement on the development proposals. In addition to delivering the leaflets to residents, the Applicant created a dedicated web page for the proposed development and drove traffic to the website via press releases in the Sunderland Echo and the Chronicle and social media platforms such as Twitter and Facebook.



The Applicant emailed all of the Ward Councillors before the consultation commenced and were grateful for Cllr Snowdon replying to their email and providing her initial comments on the proposed development at that time.

As per practice guidance, the supporting Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) sets out the consultation process and feedback. The SCI identifies that of the 600 no. leaflets distributed within the area immediately surrounding the site, 126 no. responses were received demonstrating a total response rate of 21%. This is considered to be a strong response rate to the consultation. The personal data of respondents to the consultation (such as address) is not collected as part of the pre application consultation in order to comply with data protection rules. The planning application process provides a further opportunity for residents to provide comments on the submitted proposals via the Councils portal and to enable comments to be considered formally as part of the determination of the planning application.

Planning Policy: This response has been prepared with regard to both the adopted Core Strategy and Development Plan (CSDP) as well as the saved policies contained within the Unitary Development Plan (UDP). It focuses predominately on the principle of development which centres upon the development of an amenity greenspace for residential dwellings.

As the proposal would result in the loss of amenity greenspace CSDP Policy NE4: Greenspace is relevant. NE4 aims to protect, conserve and enhance the quality, community value, function and accessibility of greenspace and wider green infrastructure, especially in areas of deficiency identified in the council's Greenspace Audit and Report. The Policy aims to do this by allocating Greenspaces in the Allocations and Designations Plan and by requiring development to contribute towards provision and enhancement of greenspaces.

Policy NE4 is relevant to all greenspace types as defined in CSDP paragraph 10.23. This includes amenity greenspaces which the Greenspace Audit considers this site to be. In this context, it is also considered that criteria of Criterion 4 of the policy is also relevant

Criterion 4 of policy NE4, further states that development will be refused on greenspaces which would have an adverse effect on its amenity, recreational or nature conservation value unless it can be demonstrated that:

- I. the proposal is accompanied by an assessment which identifies it as being surplus to requirements or
- II. a replacement facility which is equivalent in terms of usefulness is provided; or
- III. a contribution is made to the Council for new offsite provision.

Paragraph 10.22 of the CSDP states that "the Greenspace Report sets out in detail the existing provision and where shortfalls exist". No evidence has been submitted to the Council to demonstrate how criteria 4 has been met. It is noted that the applicant's supporting Planning Statement provides a contrary view (at paragraph 6.7 and 7.8) setting out that the Criterion 4 is not triggered, as the site is not allocated greenspace. However, to reaffirm, it is considered that Criterion 4 is triggered by virtue of NE4 criterion 4, defining greenspace in broad terms and not merely focused on allocated greenspace sites.

The site is included in the Greenspace Audit. Paragraph 7.10 of the Audit (Table 11) identifies that the locality of Barmston and Columbia (where this site is located) is low in terms of amenity greenspace quantity, and is therefore a localised area of deficiency. This is reflected in the 'value' score given to the site, which has a 20 point weighting attached due to lying within an area of low

greenspace. The site score is assessed to be 106 which is considered to be above the average site value for the city

It is noted that the supporting Planning Statement provides some commentary of the Audit as set out between paragraphs 6.8 and 6.16. The Planning Statement (at paragraph 6.14) provides that 2.51 hectares of nearby amenity greenspace exists close to the site. The Statement goes on to claim that although the proposal would result in the loss of greenspace (0.51 hectares) this would still leave other greenspace provision of 2.51 hectares nearby. However, the Planning Statement acknowledges, only a small proportion of these sites are considered to be of above average quality, with 2.43 hectares of the 2.51 hectares identified by the supporting Planning Statement is greenspace being of significantly lower quality than the application site.

The decision maker should also note that NE4: Greenspace (at criterion three) also sets criteria regarding the need for major residential development to provide for the equivalent of minimum of 0.9 hectares for every 1,000 bed spaces unless a financial contribution for the maintenance/upgrading to neighbouring existing greenspace is considered more appropriate.

CSDP Policy SP8: Housing Supply and Delivery sets out that Council will achieve its housing target by (inter alia) the delivery of windfall sites (criterion five). The site would be considered a windfall site for the purposes of housing delivery and would assist in meeting the Council's housing requirement.

CSDP Policy H1: Housing Mix provides (inter alia) that residential development should provide a mix of housing types, tenures and sizes which is appropriate to its location. Criterion 2 also encourages development to ensure there is a choice of suitable accommodation for older people including bungalows. It is noted that six of the homes would be provided as three-bedroom homes and seven homes (including the proposed two proposed bungalows) would be provided as two-bedroom homes. It is considered that the housing mix is generally appropriate with roughly 45 percent of proposed dwellings consisting of family sized homes and provision of some bungalows.

CSDP Policy H2: Affordable Housing sets out that all proposals of 10 or more (or on sites of 0.5 hectares plus) should provide at least 15 percent affordable housing. It is noted that all dwellings would be provided at an affordable level. Amongst other things, the policy stipulates (at criterion two) that affordable homes should be retained in affordable use in perpetuity. If planning permission is to be granted, the decision maker should ensure that the dwellings are held in affordable tenure in perpetuity in alignment with the policy. It is noted the draft head of terms (as provided in the supporting Planning Statement) does not provide provisions that the homes will be held in perpetuity.

It is not clear how the proposal would seek to meet biodiversity net gains. The National Planning Policy Framework (2019) provides at paragraph 170, that decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural environment by (at d) minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity. CSDP Policy NE2: Biodiversity and Geodiversity sets out that proposals, where appropriate, must demonstrate how it will provide net gains in biodiversity. It is not clear from information submitted how the proposals would seek to provide net gains for biodiversity.

It is noted that there are several mature trees on the site. The decision maker should note the provisions of CSDP Policy NE3: Woodland, Hedgerows and Trees. At Criterion three the policy sets out that development should give consideration to trees and hedgerows both on their individual merit as well their contribution to amenity and interaction as part of a group within the broader landscape setting. Careful consideration should therefore be given if the proposals would result in the loss of any trees.

The decision maker should consider CSDP Policy BH1: Design Quality, to ensure that the proposals deliver a well-designed scheme. In addition, the decision maker should note CSDP Policy BH2: Sustainable Design and Construction which sets out a range of sustainable design and construction criteria.

In addition, the decision maker should note technical standards set out in CSDP Policy BH1: Design Quality and CSDP Policy H1: Housing Mix. These policies set out standards in relation to conformity to nationally described space standards and standards in relation to building regulation M4(2) adaptable and accessible homes. These standards will be applicable to outline and full planning applications approved after 1 April 2021. Should this application be approved prior on or prior to the 1 April 2021, these standards will not apply.

Conclusion: The proposal would result in a loss of amenity greenspace within an identified area of deficiency. The decision maker should form a judgement whether the proposal should include evidence to satisfy the policy requirement of NE4 criterion 4.

In addition, the decision maker should consider how the proposal will seek to provide biodiversity net gains and give careful consideration to any loss of trees.

The decision maker should consider the design impact of the proposal via policy CSDP Policy BH1: Design Quality. In relation to affordable housing, the decision maker should ensure that the proposals would maintain affordable housing in perpetuity in accordance with CSDP Policy H2.

Gentoo Response: Further to receipt of the above a planning position statement and benefits statement was received dated 08.10.2020. The statement seeks to address matters raised by the Planning Policy Section and highlight the strengths of the affordable housing programme Gentoo are proposing.

The documents provide Gentoo's response to policy considerations relating to open space, equipped play area, affordable housing provision and mix and bio-diversity and will be addressed through the main considerations section of the agenda report.

Tyne and Wear Fire and Rescue Service: No objections.

Northumbrian Water Limited: No issues to raise with the above application, provided it is approved and carried out within strict accordance with the submitted document entitled "Flood Risk Assessment" dated 24th June 2020. In this document it states that the foul flows will discharge to manhole 5903 and surface water will discharge at a restricted rate of 3.5l/s to connect into the existing surface water sewer on site between the points of connection at manholes 5802 and 6913.

NWL have subsequently requested that a condition should be attached should Members be minded to approve the application, so that the development is implemented in accordance with this document:

"Development shall be implemented in line with the drainage scheme contained within the submitted document entitled "Flood Risk Assessment" dated 24th June 2020. The drainage scheme shall ensure that foul flows discharge to the combined sewer at manhole 5903 and ensure that surface water discharges to the surface water sewer between manholes 5802 and 6913. The surface water discharge rate shall not exceed the available capacity of 3.5l/s that has been identified in this sewer. The final surface water discharge rate shall be agreed by the Lead Local Flood Authority.

Lead Local Flood Authority: With regard to application 20/01182/FUL and in relation to flood risk and drainage the LLFA have confirmed that the application could be approved with a verification condition similar to the wording that follows.

#### CONDITION

Prior to the first occupation of the development, a verification report carried out by a suitably qualified person must be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, to demonstrate that all sustainable drainage systems have been constructed as per the agreed scheme. This verification report shall include:

- o As built drawings (in dwg/shapefile format) for all SuDS components - including dimensions (base levels, inlet/outlet elevations, areas, depths, lengths, diameters, gradients etc) and supported by photos of installation and completion.
- o Construction details (component drawings, materials, vegetation).
- o Health and Safety file.
- o Details of ownership organisation, adoption & maintenance.

To ensure that all sustainable drainage systems are designed to the DEFRA non-technical standards for SuDS and comply with Core Strategy and the Local Plan.

City Ecologist: No objections.

#### Public Protection and Regulatory Services (PPRS):

Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP): To ensure the environmental impact of the site clearance and construction phases of the development is adequately managed and mitigated in the interest of the amenity of nearby occupiers the Applicant should provide, for agreement by the Local Planning Authority (LPA), a construction environmental management plan which has regard to the impacts of noise and vibration, site traffic, lighting, dust and other airborne pollutants arising from site clearance and construction works. The plan should set out appropriate operating hours and identify measures that will be implemented to minimise those impacts on nearby sensitive receptors.

Further to receipt of the above information an updated CEMP dated October 2020 was received and additional comments received from PPRS dated November 2020 have confirmed the contents are considered to be acceptable.

Land Contamination: A phase 1 and 2 report by JNP Group dated July 2020 has been submitted together with NQMS SQP declaration of document adequacy. The recommendations of the report state:

Further investigation is recommended, in order to be able to provide geotechnical data for the design of piled foundations and or the proposed retaining system. Furthermore, during detailed design further investigation may be required with regards general stability and settlement.

It is recommended that a Remediation Strategy is written to manage the contamination identified on-site. This will need to fully detail the requirements and methods of remediation however at this stage this would indicate that, depending on the site proposals in terms of levels, this is likely to consist of CS2 gas protective measures to all dwellings and proven chemically "clean" capping to soft landscaped and garden areas.

The findings of this report should be submitted for approval to the relevant authorities prior to any irrevocable actions.

In light of the above and should Members be minded to approve the application it is recommended that conditions are imposed requiring the submission of the relevant remediation and verification reports.

#### Transportation Development:

Access: Vehicular access to the development site is proposed via a new access junction with Lowthian Terrace. Lowthian Terrace is an adopted public highway with a width of approximately 5m which is satisfactory to accommodate residential traffic and service vehicles.

Lowthian Terrace links to Station Road at 2 locations, firstly via a link opposite the proposed access and secondly further east via a link opposite Willows Close, which serves a similar residential development to that proposed although it accommodates a significantly greater number of dwellings at 74. It is considered that these routes are satisfactory to serve a development of the quantum proposed.

With regards to pedestrian access this would be provided via footways within the site from the proposed access junction. Whilst there is not a footway on the northern side of Lowthian Terrace there is a footway provided on the southern side. It is requested therefore that the footways at the site access junction are extended by approximately 2m and dropped kerbs with tactile paving provided to facilitate pedestrians crossing to the existing footway on the south side of Lowthian Terrace.

A pedestrian link is also provided from the site to the north linking to Ovingham Close, which in turn provides a pedestrian route to the bus stop located on Emmerson Terrace.

It is considered therefore that satisfactory pedestrian routes are available from the site to the services and amenities available in the local area, including bus stops.

Parking: The proposed development includes parking provision fully in accordance with the Council's parking standards including visitor parking.

Trip Generation: A development of 13 dwellings would generate between 6 and 7 two-way trips during the AM and PM peak hours, which equates to a vehicular movement every 10 minutes, and approximately 70 two way movements on a daily basis.

Traffic Impact: It is considered that this increase in vehicle movements would have no material impact on the local road network and would in fact be within the day to day variations in traffic flows.

It is noted that on street parking currently occurs on Lowthian Terrace and Station Road that can obstruct the free flow of traffic as well as pedestrian movement. However, if vehicles are being parked in unsafe manner that causes concern for road and pedestrian safety then this is an enforcement issue and not a consideration for this application.

It should also be reiterated that the proposed development provides sufficient on-site parking and would generate minimal traffic on the local road network.

It is concluded therefore that the proposed development would not have a material impact on the operation of the local road network or on road and pedestrian safety.

Transportation Development therefore has no objection to the planning application provided the requested pedestrian crossing facilities as detailed above are provided.

## **POLICIES:**

In the Core Strategy and Development Plan the site is subject to the following policies; BH1, NE4, SP8, H1, H2, NE2, NE3, ST2, ST3, HS1, HS2, HS3, BH2, BH3, WWE3 and WWE4.

## **COMMENTS:**

### **LEGISLATION, PLANNING POLICY AND GUIDANCE**

The Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 are relevant in the consideration of this application.

#### **Planning policy background**

At the national level the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the Government's planning policies and how these are expected to be applied. At a local level, development plans set out planning policy for the area.

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires applications for planning permission to be determined in accordance with the statutory development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

#### **Development Plan**

The Council adopted the Core Strategy and Development Plan (CSDP) 2015-2033 on the 30 January 2020, the policies within this document should be used when considering development proposals. It should also be noted that whilst the CSDP should be used as the starting point, several Unitary Development Plan and Unitary Development Plan Alteration No. 2 policies continue to remain saved until they are replaced by the emerging Allocations and Designations Plan. A full schedule of policies which have been saved is contained within Appendix 1 of the CSDP.

## **CONSIDERATIONS**

The main issues to consider in the consideration of this application are:

1. Principle of development;
2. Highway engineering considerations;
3. Healthy and safe communities, including ground conditions and noise and vibration;
4. Design and layout;
5. Natural heritage, landscaping/ arboriculture and drainage considerations;
6. Viability and Section 106 considerations.

#### **1. Principle of development**

The proposed development would result in the loss of amenity greenspace and as such CSDP Policy NE4: Greenspace is applicable. Policy NE4 aims to protect, conserve and enhance the quality, community value, function and accessibility of greenspace and wider green infrastructure, especially in areas of deficiency identified in the council's Greenspace Audit and Report. The Policy aims to do this by allocating Greenspaces in the Allocations and Designations Plan and by requiring development to contribute towards provision and enhancement of greenspaces.

Policy NE4 is relevant to all greenspace types as defined in CSDP paragraph 10.23. This includes amenity greenspaces which the Greenspace Audit considers this site to be. In this context, it is also considered that criteria of Criterion 4 of the policy is also relevant

Criterion 4 of policy NE4, further states that development will be refused on greenspaces which would have an adverse effect on its amenity, recreational or nature conservation value unless it can be demonstrated that:

- I. the proposal is accompanied by an assessment which identifies it as being surplus to requirements or
- II. a replacement facility which is equivalent in terms of usefulness is provided; or
- III. a contribution is made to the Council for new offsite provision.

The application site is included in the Greenspace Audit. Paragraph 7.10 of the Audit (Table 11) identifies the locality of Barmston and Columbia (where this site is located) as being of low amenity greenspace in terms of quantity and is therefore a localised area of deficiency. This view is reflected in the 'value' score given to the site, which has a 20point weighting attached due to it being situated within an area of low greenspace. The overall site score is assessed to be 106 which is considered to be above the average site value for the city.

Criterion three of Policy NE4 also sets out the need for major residential development to provide for the equivalent of minimum of 0.9 hectares for every 1,000 bed spaces unless a financial contribution for the maintenance/ upgrading to neighbouring existing greenspace is considered more appropriate.

In this regard whilst it is acknowledged that the proposal would result in the partial loss of greenspace, to provide 13 affordable dwellings and associated infrastructure and soft landscaping, it is noted that the development will through the proposed landscaping scheme, bring about a significant uplift to the quality of the remaining open space in the immediate area. This would demonstrate a significant improvement to the area.

As required by policy NE4 consideration has been given to the possibility of securing a financial contribution to address the proposed partial loss of greenspace however having assessed this option further and based on the calculations contained within the adopted S106 Supplementary Planning Document the overall betterment brought about via this route would be significantly less than that currently being proposed by the applicant within their landscape proposals. The applicant recognises this variance but acknowledges that the proposed development will result in an overall net loss of quantitative provision and as such is happy to provide significant betterment to the remaining parcel of land.

CSDP Policy SP8: Housing Supply and Delivery sets out that the Council will achieve its housing target by (inter alia) the delivery of windfall sites (criterion five). The site subject of this application is considered to be a windfall site for the purposes of housing delivery and as such the proposed 13no. affordable dwellings would assist in meeting the Council's housing requirement.

CSDP Policy H1: Housing Mix provides (inter alia) that residential development should provide a mix of housing types, tenures and sizes which is appropriate to its location. Criterion 2 also encourages development to ensure there is a choice of suitable accommodation for older people including bungalows. In this regard it is noted that six of the homes would provide three-bedroom homes and seven homes (including the proposed two proposed bungalows) would be provided as two-bedroom homes. It is also considered that the proposed housing mix is generally appropriate with roughly 45 percent of proposed dwellings consisting of family sized homes as well as the provision of bungalows.

CSDP Policy H2: Affordable Housing sets out that all proposals of 10 or more (or on sites of 0.5 hectares plus) should provide at least 15 percent affordable housing. Criterion two goes on to state that affordable homes should be in affordable use in perpetuity. In this regard it is noted that all of the proposed dwellings would be provided at an affordable level and a S106 Agreement will ensure that the dwellings are held in affordable tenure in perpetuity in accordance with the policy.

#### Planning Policy Conclusions

The application proposes 13 affordable homes which will contribute towards the Council's housing supply. It is acknowledged that developing the site would result in the partial loss of green space in an identified area of deficiency. In this regard officers have approached the consideration of the principle of development and land use policy considerations with the view that the loss of this space is regrettable, however weight is given to the fact that whilst there will be a net loss of part of the open space provision there will be a significant uplift in the quality of the remaining space.

Weight is also given to the fact that the Applicant has been able to secure Homes England funding which will see the site developed as 100% affordable with a mix of family and bungalow units. The units would be maintained as affordable housing in perpetuity via a Section 106 Agreement.

In conclusion, it is considered that on balance the application proposal is acceptable in respect of green space and that subject to the completion of the proposed Section 106, as described above, the development is acceptable in principle and in respect of its land use policy considerations.

#### 2. Highway engineering considerations

A focus of the NPPF (Paragraph 108) is on sustainable transport, with planning applications needing to ensure that impacts on the transport network in terms of capacity, congestion and highway safety are acceptable. Paragraph 109 states that development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

CSDP policy ST2 states that to ensure development has no unacceptable adverse impact on the Local Road Network, proposals must demonstrate that:

- o new vehicular access points are kept to a minimum and designed in accordance with adopted standards;
- o they deliver safe and adequate means of access, egress and internal circulation;
- o where an existing access is to be used, it is improved as necessary;
- o they are assessed and determined against current standards for the category of road;
- o they have safe and convenient access for sustainable transport modes;
- o they will not create a severe impact on the safe operation of the highway network.

Policy ST3 requires that development should provide safe and convenient access for all road users; should not exacerbate traffic congestion on the existing highway network or increase the risk of accidents or endanger the safety of road users including pedestrians, cyclists and other vulnerable road users. Development should incorporate pedestrian and cycle routes within and through the site, linking to the wider sustainable transport network; and include a level of vehicle parking and cycle storage in accordance with the Council's parking standard.

Vehicular access to the proposed development is proposed via a new access junction with Lothian Terrace. Lothian Terrace is an adopted public highway with a width of approximately 5m which is considered to be satisfactory to accommodate the proposed residential traffic and vehicles.



Lowthian Terrace links to Station Road at 2 locations, firstly via a link opposite the proposed access and secondly further east via a link opposite Willow Close, which serves a similar residential development to that proposed although it accommodates a significantly greater number of dwellings at 74. It is considered that these routes are satisfactory to serve a development of the quantum being proposed.

With regards to pedestrian access this would be provided via footways within the site from the proposed access junction. Whilst there is not a footway on the northern side of Lowthian Terrace there is a footway provided on the southern side. It is requested therefore that the footways at the site access junction are extended by approximately 2m and dropped kerbs with tactile paving provided to facilitate pedestrians crossing to the existing footway on the south side of Lowthian Terrace.

Following receipt of the above request an amended site layout plan was submitted to accommodate the request of the Highway Authority.

A pedestrian link is also provided from the site to the north linking to Ovingham Close, which in turn provides a pedestrian route to the bus stops located on Emmerson Terrace.

It is considered therefore that satisfactory pedestrian routes are available from the site to the services and amenities available in the local area, including bus stops.

Parking - The proposed development includes parking provision fully in accordance with the Council's parking standards including visitor parking.

Trip Generation - A development of 13 dwellings would generate between 6 and 7 two-way trips during the AM and PM peak hours, which equates to a vehicular movement every 10 minutes, and approximately 70 two way movements on a daily basis.

Traffic Impact - It is considered that this increase in vehicle movements would have no material impact on the local road network and would in fact be within the day to day variations in traffic flows.

It is noted that on street parking currently occurs on Lowthian Terrace and Station Road that can obstruct the free flow of traffic as well as pedestrian movement. However, if vehicles are being parked in unsafe manner that causes concern for road and pedestrian safety then this is an enforcement issue and is not a consideration for this application.

It is also noted that the proposed development provides sufficient on-site parking and would generate minimal traffic on the local road network. Therefore, on the basis of the above it is not considered that the proposed development would have material impact on the operation of the local road network or on road and pedestrian safety. Consequently, the proposed development is acceptable and in accordance with CSDP policies ST2 and ST3 and Transportation Development therefore has no objection to the planning application.

3. Healthy and safe communities, including ground conditions and noise and vibration  
The NPPF, at Paragraph 180, seeks to ensure that development proposals should not contribute to unacceptable levels of noise and that they reduce to a minimum, potential adverse impacts.

Paragraph 178 requires decision taking to ensure the site is suitable for its proposed use taking account of ground conditions and any risks arising from land instability and contamination, whilst

Paragraph 179 highlights that where a site is affected by contamination or land stability issues, responsibility for securing a safe development rests with the developer and/ or landowner.

CSDP Policy HS1 requires development to take account of the amenities of adjoining properties and incorporate remediation and management measures. Policy HS2 requires that any noise generating development close to noise sensitive uses will be assessed to determine the impact on existing uses. Policy HS3 seeks to ensure appropriate remediation is undertaken when developing contaminated land.

- Noise

The application is accompanied by a screening statement which has been prepared by NJD in June 2020. The submitted noise assessment has been reviewed by Environmental Health and the following conclusion have been made.

Noise during the operational phase of the development from external sources has been screened out of the assessment and this is accepted. Noise during the construction phase will require careful control to prevent an impact on nearby existing residential properties and is dealt with in the submitted and agreed Construction Environmental Management Plan.

- Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)

The initial consultation response provided by Environmental Health requested that a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) covering matters such as how noise, lighting, dust and other airborne pollutants, vibration, smoke and odour from construction work will be controlled and mitigated, be imposed as a condition on any grant of planning permission.

Following this initial consultation response, the Applicant has prepared and submitted a CEMP which has been reviewed by Environmental Health and found to be acceptable.

- Ground conditions

The application submission has been supported by a Phase 1 & 2 report prepared by JNP Group dated July 2020 together with a NQMS SQP declaration of document adequacy. The report concludes that further investigation is required in order to be able to provide geotechnical data for the design of piled foundations and/or the proposed retaining system. Furthermore, during detailed design further investigation may be required with regard s the general stability and settlement (16.2.1).

It is recommended that a Remediation Strategy is written to manage the contamination identified on site. This will be needed to fully detail the requirements and methods of remediation however at this stage this would indicate that, depending on the site proposals in terms of levels, this is likely to consist of CS2 gas protective measures to all dwellings and proven chemically 'clean' capping to soft landscaped and garden areas. (16.2.2)

The findings of this report should be submitted for approval to the relevant authorities prior to any irrevocable actions' (16.2.3).

The submitted reports have been assessed by Environmental Health and the conclusions of the report are accepted subject to the standard conditions.

In conclusion, the application submissions have been assessed in respect of its potential impacts on the amenities of the area and whether there are any noise sensitivity issues whilst also demonstrating the site is suitable for redevelopment. It is considered that subject to the imposition

of the relevant conditions the application is acceptable and in accordance with CSDP policies HS1, HS2 and HS3.

#### 4. Design and layout

CSDP policy BH1 seeks to achieve high quality design and where possible incorporate sustainable design and construction methods (policy BH2), whilst policy BH3 seeks to ensure existing and proposed areas of public realm are well designed and accessible.

The site entrance has been designed to utilise the existing entrance from Lowthian Terrace with soft landscaping towards the entrance to create an attractive entrance and street scene. Dwellings within the development face inwards providing natural surveillance of the parking areas and pedestrian routes, thereby creating a safe and secure feel.

The proposed layout is such that each home will benefit from its own private driveway with the 3 bedroom dwellings having space for two vehicles. It is noted that each property will benefit from reasonably sized front and rear garden areas. The layout is considered to account for the Council's spacing standards, thereby ensuring a good level of amenity for the proposed residents. Within the development the turning head arrangements not only provide the space within which refuse vehicles can manoeuvre safely they also, by virtue of the surrounding proposed properties, help to define the self-contained nature of the development.

The dwellings will be built from a palette of good quality, robust materials which will be in keeping with the context of the area. Materials such as facing brick and pitched slate effect concrete tile roofs will form the basis of the external materials and will be supplemented with glazing in upvc and composite type doors. The suggested palette of materials ensures the proposed elevational treatments sits well within the surrounding built form.

In terms of the development's sustainability credentials the accompanying Sustainability Assessment July 2020 highlights that the various measures will be explored in order to reduce carbon emissions and promote the efficient use of energy and natural resources. Amongst the measures suggested includes renewable or low carbon energy technology, heat pumps, smart metering, electric vehicle charging, triple glazing, use of porous paving as well suitable facilities and storage for recycling and waste.

In conclusion, it is considered that site provides for a sustainable development opportunity and will contribute to the provision of a balanced mix of housing size, type and affordability in the area. The density and spacing of the development, as well as the proposed house-types, will provide for a good quality form of development both in terms of its residential and visual amenity. The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable and in accordance with local planning policy.

#### 5. Natural heritage, landscaping/ arboriculture and drainage considerations

At the national level, the NPPF sets out requirements for development to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment, including ensuring that impacts on biodiversity are minimised and net biodiversity gain is achieved where possible (Paragraph 170). It also seeks to preserve and enhance the natural environment, including avoiding development that results in the loss or damage of irreplaceable habitats (Paragraph 174). In relation to flooding, paragraph 155 of the NPPF states that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk, but where development is necessary, making it safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Paragraph 163 requires the decision maker to ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere, whilst Paragraph 165 states

that major developments should incorporate sustainable drainage systems unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate. The systems used should:

- take account of advice from the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA);
- have appropriate proposed minimum operational standards;
- have maintenance arrangements in place to ensure an acceptable standard of operation for the lifetime of the development; and
- where possible, provide multifunctional benefits.

CSDP policies NE1 and NE2 require development to maintain and improve green and blue infrastructure and to protect biodiversity and geodiversity. Policies NE3 and NE4 seek to conserve trees, woodlands and hedgerows whilst protecting and conserving the quality of greenspaces. Policies WWE3 and WWE4 seek to protect the quantity and quality of surface water and groundwater bodies.

- Natural heritage

The application submission has been supported by an Ecological Assessment prepared by BSG.

The application has been assessed by the Councils ecology team who have confirmed that they have no objection to the proposal subject to the imposition of a planning condition, should consent be granted, relating to Species Mitigation, Compensation and Enhancement as detailed in the Willows Close, Sunderland: Ecological Assessment, Final by BSG Ecology submitted in support of this application.

- Landscaping and arboriculture

The application has been supported by a comprehensive planting schedule including the planting of 28 trees within the site, ornamental planting and hedges to add to the overall visual appearance of the existing grassed area.

- Drainage

Northumbrian Water have assessed the proposal insofar as it relates to their infrastructure and assets and have advised that provided the development is approved and carried out in strict accordance with the submitted document entitled "Flood Risk Assessment" dated 24th June 2020 then no objections are raised to the development. The aforementioned document states that the foul flows will discharge to manhole 5903 and surface water will discharge at a restricted rate of 3.5l/s to connect into the existing surface water sewer on site between the points of connection at manholes 5802 and 6913.

Subsequent to this consultee response NWL have subsequently requested that a condition be imposed should Members be minded to approve the application, so that the development is implemented in accordance with this document:

Condition

"Development shall be implemented in line with the drainage scheme contained within the submitted document entitled "Flood Risk Assessment" dated 24th June 2020. The drainage scheme shall ensure that foul flows discharge to the combined sewer at manhole 5903 and ensure that surface water discharges to the surface water sewer between manholes 5802 and 6913. The surface water discharge rate shall not exceed the available capacity of 3.5l/s that has been

identified in this sewer. The final surface water discharge rate shall be agreed by the Lead Local Flood Authority.

The submitted Flood Risk Assessment prepared by JNP Group confirms that the site is located within Flood Zone 1 but acknowledges that the site is at Medium to High Risk of surface water flooding in the North East corner, as well as being situated within the Critical Drainage Area of Washington Central. As a consequence, no development is proposed within the identified Medium to High surface water flood risk zones whilst the actual development itself is at Low Flood Risk from surface water flooding.

The Lead Local Flood Authority have reviewed the submissions and have confirmed that following various amendments to the detail design of the drainage system the application proposal is now acceptable subject to the following condition:-

Prior to the first occupation of the development, a verification report carried out by a suitably qualified person must be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, to demonstrate that all sustainable drainage systems have been constructed as per the agreed scheme. This verification report shall include:

- o As built drawings (in dwg/shapefile format) for all SuDS components - including dimensions (base levels, inlet/outlet elevations, areas, depths, lengths, diameters, gradients etc) and supported by photos of installation and completion.
- o Construction details (component drawings, materials, vegetation).
- o Health and Safety file.
- o Details of ownership organisation, adoption & maintenance.

To ensure that all sustainable drainage systems are designed to the DEFRA non-technical standards for SuDS and comply with policies WWE3 and WWE4 of the Core Strategy and Development Plan.

This is further to the Northumbrian Water's requested condition, as stated above.

In conclusion, the ecological report is considered to suitably qualify the site and that appropriate measures have been demonstrated subject to the imposition of a suitably worded planning condition should consent be granted. In relation to drainage and flood risk it is considered that the details submitted demonstrate that the application will achieve an acceptable drainage solution.

The application proposal is considered to be acceptable and in accordance with relevant CSDP policy.

## 6. Viability and Section 106 considerations

As set down in statute by Regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010; Paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) instructs that obligations can only be sought where they meet all the following tests:

- a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- b) directly related to the development; and
- c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

It is also important to note that in view of the full affordable housing nature of the development and the resultant impact this has on the economics of the development.

## 1. Education

The applicant has agreed to make an education contribution of £16,527.60 towards the funding of new additional extended and/or improved secondary and special educational needs facilities.

It is considered that this request satisfies the three tests as laid out by the CIL Regulations and Paragraph 56 of the NPPF.

## 2. Affordable housing

It is noted that the development is proposing to deliver 100% affordable housing, which has factored within the planning balance of the application proposal. Consequently, to ensure that affordable housing is delivered at the site the Applicant has proposed in their heads of terms confirmation that 13 homes will be for affordable rent. A rent which is set in accordance with the Government's rent policy for Affordable Rent. or is at least 20% below market rents.

It is considered that this request satisfies the three tests as laid out by the CIL Regulations and Paragraph 56 of the NPPF.

### **Equality Act 2010 - 149 Public Sector Equality Duty**

During the detailed consideration of this application/ proposal an equality impact assessment has been undertaken which demonstrates that due regard has been given to the duties placed on the LPA's as required by the aforementioned Act.

As part of the assessment of the application/ proposal due regard has been given to the following relevant protected characteristics:

- o age;
- o disability;
- o gender reassignment;
- o pregnancy and maternity;
- o race;
- o religion or belief;
- o sex;
- o sexual orientation.

The LPA is committed to (a) eliminating discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Equality Act 2010; (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

In addition, the LPA, in the assessment of this application/proposal has given due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. This approach involves (a) removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic; (b) take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it; (c) encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.

The LPA has taken reasonable and proportionate steps to meet the needs of disabled persons that are different from the needs of persons who are not disabled include, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities, as part of this planning application/proposal.

Due regard has been given to the need to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves. Particular consideration has been given to the need to:

- (a) tackle prejudice, and
- (b) promote understanding.

Finally, the LPA recognise that compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others; but that is not to be taken as permitting conduct that would otherwise be prohibited by or under this Act.

## CONCLUSION

The application is considered to be acceptable in respect of its land use, design, highway and drainage engineering considerations, whilst the submission has demonstrated that through the use of appropriate conditions it should ensure a healthy and safe environment in both the construction and operational phases of the development. Significant weight is being given to the 100% affordable housing on offer within the development and the ability of the development to deliver a proportion of Section 106 being requested of it, particularly in view of its viability considerations.

It is therefore considered that the application is acceptable and is recommended for approval subject to the conditions detailed in the main body of the report and listed below; and subject to the completion of the Section 106 Agreement.

## RECOMMENDATION:

Members are recommended to **APPROVE** the application, subject to the completion of the Section 106 and subject to the draft conditions listed below:

Paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework specifies that planning conditions should be kept to a minimum and only be imposed where they meet the following six tests:

- o necessary;
- o relevant to planning;
- o relevant to the development to be permitted;
- o enforceable;
- o precise; and
- o reasonable in all other respects.

The proposed conditions are as follows

## Conditions:

1 The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date on which permission is granted, as required by section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 to ensure that the development is carried out within a reasonable period of time.

2 The development hereby granted permission shall be carried out in full accordance with the following approved plans:

RES786-BHA-V1-00-DR-A-1202 RevP08 (Proposed Site Layout).

RES786-BHA-V1-00-M2-A-A-1410 RevP06 (Boundary Treatments and Hard landscaping Plan).

RES786-BHA-V1-XX-M3-A-1301 RevP02 (Proposed Site Elevations).

N968-ONE-ZZ-XX-DR-L-0201 Rev P03 (Proposed Soft Landscaping Plan).

GENHTR-PHS-01a-XX-DR-A-1001\_P1\_0 (Proposed Elevations House Type 01a-2B3P Bungalow).

GENHTR-PHS-01a-ZZ-DR-A-2001\_P1\_0 (Planning General Arrangements House Type 01a-2B3P Bungalow).

GENHTR-PHS-05b-XX-DR-A-1001\_P1\_0 (Planning Elevations House Type 05b -2B4P House).

GENHTR-PHS-05b-ZZ-DR-A-2001\_P1\_0 (Planning General Arrangements House Type 05b -2B4P House).

GENHTR-PHS-07b-XX-DR-A-1001\_P1\_0 (Planning Elevations House Type 07b - 3B5P).

GENHTR-PHS-07b-ZZ-DR-A-2001\_P1\_0 (Planning General Arrangements House Type 07b - 3B5P).

In order to ensure that the completed development accords with the scheme approved and to comply with policy BH1 of the Core Strategy and Development Plan.

3 Development shall not commence until a detailed Remediation Scheme to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use (by removing unacceptable risks to human health, buildings and other property and the natural and historical environment) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The Remediation Scheme should be prepared in accordance with the Environment Agency document Land contamination: risk management and must include a suitable options appraisal, all works to be undertaken, proposed remediation objectives, remediation criteria, a timetable of works, site management procedures and a plan for validating the remediation works. The Remediation Scheme must ensure that as a minimum, the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to the intended use of the land after remediation. Once the Remediation Scheme has been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority it shall be known as the Approved Remediation Scheme.

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraphs 170, 178, 179, and 183d.



The details are required to be submitted and approved in advance of works commencing on site to ensure the development is undertaken in a manner to protect future users of the site.

4 The Approved Remediation Scheme for any given phase shall be implemented in accordance with the approved timetable of works for that phase.

Within six months of the completion of measures identified in the Approved Remediation Scheme and prior to the occupation of any dwelling in that phase, a Verification Report (that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out) must be produced and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraphs 170, 178, 179, and 183d

5 In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. A Risk Assessment must be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of DEFRA and the Environment Agency's "Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination CLR11" and where remediation is necessary a Remediation Scheme must be prepared and submitted to the Local Planning Authority in accordance with the requirements that the Remediation Scheme must ensure that the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to the intended use of the land after remediation. Once the Remediation Scheme has been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority it shall be known as the Approved Remediation Scheme. Following completion of measures identified in the Approved Remediation Scheme a verification report must be prepared and submitted in accordance with the approved timetable of works. Within six months of the completion of measures identified in the Approved Remediation Scheme, a validation report (that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out) must be submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraphs 170, 178, 179, and 183d

6 Development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted "Construction Environmental Management Plan" dated October 2020.

Reason: In order to protect the amenity of the area and to comply with Core Strategy Development Plan policies HS1 and HS2.

7 Prior to the first occupation of the development, a verification report carried out by a suitably qualified person must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, to demonstrate that all sustainable drainage systems have been constructed as per the agreed scheme. The verification report shall include:

As built drawings (in dwg/shapefile format) for all SuDS components - including dimensions (base levels, inlet/outlet elevations, areas, depths, lengths diameters, gradients etc) and supported by photos of installation and completion.

Construction details (component drawings, materials, vegetation).

Health and Safety file.

Details of ownership organisation, adoption and maintenance.

Reason: To ensure that all sustainable drainage systems are designed to the DEFRA non-technical standards for SuDS and in accordance with Core Strategy Development Plan Policy WWE3.

8 Development shall be implemented in accordance with Chapters 5-7 of the submitted "Arboricultural Survey, Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Arboricultural Method Statement dated June 2020.

Reason: To comply with Policy NE3 of the Core Strategy and Development Plan.

9 No part of the development shall be occupied until the off-street parking provision has been constructed, surfaced, sealed and made available in accordance with the approved plans. This parking area shall then be retained and permanently reserved for the parking of vehicles to ensure that adequate and satisfactory provision is made for all off-street parking of vehicles.

Reason: To comply with Policy T22 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policy ST3 of the Core Strategy Development Plan.

10 All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting season following the occupation of the buildings or the completion of the development whichever is the sooner, and any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority give written consent to any variation.

Reason: To protect and enhance the character of the site and the area, and ensure its appearance is satisfactory and to comply with Core Strategy and Development Plan Policies BH3, NE1, NE2 and NE3.

11 Development shall be implemented in accordance with paragraphs 4.12-4.15 of the submitted "Ecological Assessment" dated 15th June 2020 (prepared by BSG Ecology).

Reason: In the interest of nature conservation and enhancement and to accord with Core Strategy Development Plan policy NE2.

12 Development shall be implemented in line with the drainage scheme contained within the submitted document entitled "Flood Risk Assessment" dated 7th October 2020. The drainage scheme shall ensure that foul flows discharge to the combined sewer at manhole 5903 and ensure that surface water discharges to the surface water sewer between manholes 5802 and 6913. The surface water discharge rate shall not exceed the available capacity of 3.5l/s that has been

identified in this sewer. The final surface water discharge rate shall be agreed by the Lead Local Flood Authority.

13 In the event that Electric Vehicle Charging points and Air Source Heat Pumps are installed on the site, in line with a sustainability initiative, details are to be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason : In line with Policy BH2 of the Core Strategy and Development Plan.

## ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

LIST OF OTHER APPLICATIONS CURRENTLY ON HAND BUT NOT REPORTED ON THIS AGENDA  
WHICH WILL BE REPORTED WITH A RECOMMENDATION AT A FUTURE MEETING OF THE  
PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS WEST COMMITTEE

Application Ref and Ward	Applicant and Address	Proposal	Date Valid	Determination Date
19/01319/OUT	<b>Gladman Developments Ltd</b>	Outline planning application for up to 250 dwellings, with public open space, landscaping and sustainable drainage system (SuDS) and vehicular access points from North Road. (All matters reserved except for means of access.)	23/10/2019	22/01/2020
Hetton	Land West Of South Lodge Farm North Road Hetton-le-Hole Houghton-le-Spring			
20/01360/FUL	<b>Gentoo Group Limited</b>	Erection of 86 no. residential dwellings (Class C3)	31/07/2020	30/10/2020
Hetton	Land At Cragdale Gardens Hetton-le-Hole Houghton-le-Spring			

Application Ref and Ward	Applicant and Address	Proposal	Date Valid	Determination Date
20/00134/LP3	<b>City Development</b>	Installation of solar panels to roof of existing building, solar carports within carparking area and associated battery storage.	05/02/2020	01/04/2020
Hetton	Evolve Business Centre Cygnets Way Rainton Bridge South Houghton-le-Spring DH4 5QY			
14/01371/OUT	<b>Mr Colin Ford</b>	Outline application for erection of 82 dwellings (all matters reserved) (reconsultation on amended scheme).	17/11/2014	16/02/2015
Hetton	Coal Bank Farm Hetton-le-Hole Houghton-le-Spring DH5 0DX			
20/01591/FU4	<b>Hellens Land Ltd</b>	Erection of units for retail, cafe/restaurant (within Use Class E) and takeaway (Sui Generis) uses, with new vehicular access, parking, servicing areas and landscaping (additional archaeology and ground investigation reports received).	08/09/2020	08/12/2020
Houghton	Former Houghton Colliery Newbottle Street Houghton-le-Spring			

Application Ref and Ward	Applicant and Address	Proposal	Date Valid	Determination Date
20/01722/LP3	<b>Sunderland City Council</b>	External highways works to provide over-flow (parent drop-off) car-parks and set down lay-by to Houghton Road, Hawthorn Street and Fairbairn Drive, to provide additional car-parking capacity to Newbottle Primary Academy.	23/09/2020	18/11/2020
Houghton	Land Adjacent To Newbottle Primary Academy Houghton Road Newbottle Houghton-le-Spring DH4 4EE			
19/01743/MAW	<b>The Durham Company Ltd</b>	Part retrospective application for the erection of a picking station for sorting recyclable materials.	13/12/2019	13/03/2020
Houghton	The Durham Company Hawthorn House Blackthorn Way Sedgely Industrial Estate Houghton-le-			

Application Ref and Ward	Applicant and Address	Proposal	Date Valid	Determination Date
19/01446/FUL	<b>Karbon Homes</b>	Erection of 38 dwellings with associated works, including relocation of a substation.	24/09/2019	24/12/2019
Houghton	Land Off Hutton Close And Ninelands Houghton Le Spring			
17/02445/FUL	<b>Persimmon Homes Durham</b>	Erection of 141no. residential dwellings with associated access, landscaping and infrastructure (Phase 2). Amended plans submitted July 2018.	21/12/2017	22/03/2018
Houghton	Land North Of Coaley LaneHoughton Le SpringNewbottle			

Application Ref and Ward	Applicant and Address	Proposal	Date Valid	Determination Date
17/00589/FUL	<b>Persimmon Homes Durham</b>	Demolition of existing scrapyard and Cosyfoam industrial unit and erection of 252 no residential dwellings with associated access, landscaping and infrastructure (AMENDED DESCRIPTION - FEBRUARY 2019).	21/03/2017	20/06/2017
<b>Houghton</b>	Land AtLambton LaneHoughton-le-Spring			
20/02027/HE4	<b>Taylor Wimpey North East</b>	Full planning permission for 116 residential dwellings (use class C3) with associated infrastructure and landscaping and outline planning permission (all matters reserved except access) for up to 324 residential dwellings (use class C3), associated infrastructure and landscaping.	17/11/2020	09/03/2021
<b>Shiney Row</b>	Land South West Of Herrington Country ParkChester RoadPenshawSunderland			



Application Ref and Ward	Applicant and Address	Proposal	Date Valid	Determination Date
20/02190/MAW	Mr J M Atkinson	Change of use to resomation and associated training facility (sui-generis use) (Resubmission)	19/11/2020	18/02/2021
Shiney Row	Marson House Freezemoor RoadNew Herrington Industrial EstateHoughton-Le- SpringDH4 7BH			
20/01990/MAW	Biffa Waste Services Limited	Provision of a substation building, transformer compound and a compressor building	23/10/2020	22/01/2021
Washington East	Biffa Waste Services Ltd Wilden RoadPattinson SouthWashingtonNE38 8QA			

<b>Application Ref and Ward</b>	<b>Applicant and Address</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Date Valid</b>	<b>Determination Date</b>
<b>20/01309/FUL</b>	<b>Windsor Engineering LTD</b>	Erection of 2no. commercial units including new vehicular access and associated parking /service areas.	11/08/2020	10/11/2020
<b>Washington North</b>	4 Turbine WaySunderlandSR5 3NZ			
<b>20/01754/FUL</b>	<b>Homes By Esh And Hellens Group</b>	Residential development of 75 dwellings (Use Class C3) including 15% affordable housing, vehicle access from Mount Lane, landscaping, public open space, pedestrian footpath, children's play area, surface water flood attenuation, and associated ancillary works. PLEASE NOTE: new consultation letter to advise of Planning Committee procedures.	23/09/2020	23/12/2020
<b>Washington West</b>	Land To The North Of Mount LaneSpringwellNE9 7UQ			