

**At a meeting of the DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (NORTH SUNDERLAND)
SUB-COMMITTEE held in the CIVIC CENTRE on TUESDAY 25TH APRIL, 2017 at
4.45 p.m.**

Present:-

Councillor Jackson in the Chair

Councillors Beck, Bell, Foster, Francis, Mordey, Scaplehorn and D. Wilson.

Declarations of Interest

Item 3 – 17/00215/VAR – Dominos Pizza, 112 Sea Road, Sunderland, SR6 9EQ

Councillor Jackson made an open declaration that she was an acquaintance of an objector to the application but still retained an open mind to the proposals.

Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted by Councillors Chequer and Porthouse.

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

The Executive Director of Economy and Place submitted a report and circulatory report (copies circulated) relating to the North Sunderland area, copies of which had also been forwarded to each Member of the Council upon applications made thereunder.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

**15/02379/FUL – Demolition of existing building and erection of five storey
student accommodation, to 68 student bedrooms – Former Speedings
Sailworks, 15 Whickham Street, Monkwearmouth, Sunderland, SR6 0ED**

The representative of the Executive Director of Economy and Place outlined the development proposal to Members of the Committee and the relevant material planning considerations against which the application had been assessed.

1. RESOLVED that the application be approved for the reason set out in the report and subject to the 18 conditions contained therein.

16/01828/SUB – Demolition of existing building and erection of four storey student accommodation comprising 11no. apartments and associated works (AMENDED PLANS RECEIVED 03.03.2017) – 15 North Bridge Street, Sunderland, SR5 1AB

The representative of the Executive Director of Economy and Place outlined the development proposal to Members of the Committee and the relevant material planning considerations against which the application had been assessed.

The Chairman then introduced the applicants architect, Mr Clinton Mysleyko, who wished to speak in favour of the development and to express his disappointment with the officer recommendation to refuse the application.

Mr Mysleyko advised that whilst working on the original application, Officers had not made comments on the design of the scheme and only on scale and massing. As conflicting comments had been received from the Heritage Officers and the Design Officer it was felt that it was difficult to come up with a design that all officers would be happy with.

In terms of design, this was subjective and they felt it was suitable for the area and the impact of the building was negligible with alterations to the road on North Bridge Street helping to regenerate the area.

Mr Mysleyko wished to clarify that there would be two lifts as part of the proposal so the whole building would be accessible for disabled people.

Paul McDonald, Senior Planning Officer informed the committee that any procedural issues mentioned would not have affected the overall Officer recommendation as there had been outstanding information from the outset, whilst some additional information was submitted and addressed, not all had been covered and Officers were looking for significant adjustments to the scheme which the applicant was not willing to make.

Councillor Francis commented on the existing building being currently vacant and hoped that something could be done to maintain the structure and keep it water tight as we had lost a number of historic buildings over the years and he would hate to see this one lost too.

Councillor D. Wilson commented that he felt the Committee needed to raise the bar in terms of determining applications on design otherwise Sunderland would have the same uninspiring developments throughout the City.

Danielle Pearson, Development Control Manager commented that the original submission had been deficient in supporting documents in terms of structural details and therefore officers did not advise any further in terms of design etc. Officers do

seek to work with individuals during the planning process but this does not guarantee a positive recommendation as it is the role of the team to assess all comments to make an overall recommendation based on Policy decisions.

2. RESOLVED that the application be refused for the 4 reasons as set out in the report

17/00215/VAR – Variation of condition 3 of planning approval 15/00755/VAR (Change of use from Bank (A2) to hot food takeaway/home delivery (A5) including ventilation extract system, external compressors and associated highway/car park works (RESUBMISSION) to allow extended operating hours to 10:00 to 23:00 in addition to a hot food delivery-only service between the hours of 23:00 and 05:00 daily (AMENDED DESCRIPTION) – Dominos Pizza, 112 Sea Road, Sunderland, SR5 9EQ

The representative of the Executive Director of Economy and Place outlined the development proposal to Members of the Committee and the relevant material planning considerations against which the application had been assessed.

The Chairman advised the Committee that Paragraphs two and three on Page 40 were an error and were to be deleted and that the recommendation was to refuse the application.

3. RESOLVED that the application be refused for the reason as set out in the report

17/00427/FU4 – Demolition of existing library building and erection of 9 no. three bedroomed residential dwellings with associated landscaping and access (amended description 27/03/2017). – Former Hylton Castle Library, Cranleigh Road, Sunderland, SR5 3PQ

The representative of the Executive Director of Economy and Place outlined the development proposal to Members of the Committee and the relevant material planning considerations against which the application had been assessed.

The Chairman introduced Ms Sue Hellens who wished to speak in objection to the proposal. Ms Hellens commented that all residents in the area felt this was an overdevelopment of the site with properties overlooking one another there would be no privacy. There would be loss of light as the existing library building was only one storey whereas this development was proposed to be two storeys.

Ms Hellens commented that there were a number of old people and children who lived in the area and would be affected by the noise from a building site and the parking was a major issue as there was nowhere at all to park around the library at present and events at Hylton Castle produced parking problems in the street.

Ms Hellens also commented that many of the neighbours did not receive notification letters about the proposed development.

Andrew Browning, Senior Planning Officer referred to the claim of overdevelopment and clarified that they had to be able to identify there being significant concerns from amount of development proposed and officers had concluded the relationship between the site was acceptable as was the parking provision proposed.

Mr Browning commented that nine dwellings could be accommodated on the site and the distancing between the houses was fully compliant with the standards the Council would expect with most actually exceeding the distances expected.

In relation to noise during the development, a condition was to be imposed that the developer submits a site management plan and means of ensuring dust etc. was suppressed also.

Paul Muir, Group Engineer advised that there would be nine parking spaces provided with a further three visitor spaces also proposed in the scheme which would allow emergency vehicles to access the site if required.

In response to Councillor Mordey's enquiry, Mr Muir advised that the width of Cranleigh Road was the standard width of a typical residential street.

Councillor Beck expressed concern that most households typically have more than one car now.

Mr Muir advised that the level of parking provision included within the scheme was acceptable for the scale of this development.

Councillor D. Wilson expressed concerns over the quality of life for the residents who already lived there and expressed disbelief that nine homes were to be built here as most people did have more than one car in each home therefore we were creating a problem in a Ward that already suffered from parking issues.

Councillor Francis commented that he would like to see the corners of the development protected by double yellow lines and also expressed concern over the parking provision.

Councillor Foster advised that during a recent site visit he felt the area was looking built up as it currently stood and the development was going to intrude upon the neighbouring dwellings. Councillor Foster also referred to the petition received by residents and that he was also concerned with the claim that people hadn't received notification of the proposals.

Mr Browning advised that the level of consultation carried out was fully in line with the statutory obligations required of the Council and the parking provision also met terms of our adopted parking policies so we could not ask for over and above what was required.

Councillor Mordey enquired if additional parking could be provided on the current grass verges on the site.

Mr Muir advised that that this would be possible but it would be at the gift of the developer in order for this to occur.

The Chairman introduced Mr McCoy as the applicant to speak in favour of the proposals. Mr McCoy requested that Members bear in mind that this was a redundant/empty site that they were trying to bring back into a positive use.

In relation to noise and disruption, they would do their utmost to keep the disruption to a minimum and they were interested in listening to the residents but he wished to stress that this was something positive for the area.

Councillor Mordey commented that as the proposals complied with our policies on parking and the proposal would bring much needed three bedroomed houses to the city he asked that Members support the application.

Councillor Wilson commented that he did not feel that he could support the proposal as it stood.

Councillor Foster commented that 165 signatures on the petition against the proposal suggested that the residents had not been consulted.

Mr Browning confirmed that the Council had carried out the level of consultation that was statutorily required and this was backed up with the fact that representations had been received from residents.

Having been put to the vote, with Seven Members voting in favour, two Members voting against and one Member abstaining, it was:-

4. RESOLVED that Members grant consent under Regulation 4 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 (as amended), subject to the 15 conditions contained within the circulatory report

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

(Signed) J. JACKSON,
Chairman