

**At a Meeting of the DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (SOUTH SUNDERLAND)  
SUB-COMMITTEE held in the CIVIC CENTRE on WEDNESDAY 28<sup>th</sup> MARCH,  
2018 at 4.00 p.m.**

**Present:-**

Councillor Porthouse in the Chair

Councillors Bell, M. Dixon, English, I. Galbraith, Hodson, Kay and Scaplehorn

**Declarations of Interest**

**Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors D. Dixon, Jackson, Mordey, Smith and Waller.

**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 South Sunderland area, copies of which had 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)

**17/01761/FUL – Demolition of Existing canteen and food technology block,  
erection of an extra care facility (Use class C2) comprising of 55no apartments  
with associated landscaping (removal of trees) and car park.  
Sunderland Church High School, Mowbray Road, Sunderland, SR2 8HY**

The representative of the Executive Director of Economy and Place outlined the development proposal to Members of the Sub Committee and the relevant material planning considerations against which the application had been assessed. There had now been a response received from Sport England and they had not expressed any adverse comments in respect of the proposal as such Members were now recommended to be minded to approve the application subject to the conditions set out in the report.

Councillor M. Dixon referred to the attention that had been given to the design of the building and asked whether there would be an insistence on using materials such as

reclaimed slates in order to ensure that the building was in keeping with the conservation area. The representative of the Executive Director of Economy and Place advised that reclaimed materials would normally not be used but confirmed that high quality materials had been requested. The Conservation Officer added that samples of the materials had been requested and there was a requirement for a test panel to be produced to show the appearance of the brick and stone against the mortar to be used; traditional colours and textures would be used.

Councillor Hodson expressed his concerns over the impact of the development on the neighbouring historic buildings as these large villas were rare in Sunderland so there was a need to ensure that they were protected and he was concerned that the size and scale of the development was not in keeping with the surroundings and he queried whether there would be significant harm caused by the development. The Conservation Officer advised that there had been some amendments to the scheme to improve its appearance and it was considered that on balance there would be only a minor adverse impact. It would have been desirable to retain the large gardens from the villas however it was not feasible; there would be schemes brought forward to bring the listed buildings back into use.

Councillor Bell expressed his concerns over the appearance of the proposed development and also commented that previously there had been a 1960s building on the site which had not been visually attractive.

Councillor Kay commented that he had attended the site visit which had been held and he had struggled to see the listed buildings from Gray Road due to the high boundary wall and the trees; as such he did not have any complaints with the scale of the proposed building which he thought would complement the existing buildings. He did have concerns that this was a large scale development and asked for assurances that measures would be put in place to ensure that there was no adverse impact from the works. The representative of the Executive Director of Economy and Place advised that the proposed condition 3 would ensure that there was an agreed construction management plan in place before any works commenced.

Councillor English asked how many trees would be replaced and whether there was sufficient parking to be provided. The representative of the Executive Director of Economy and Place advised that there had been work done to improve the scheme and discussions had taken place with Historic England and they now felt that the scheme was acceptable. There would be a similar number of trees on site after the development as there was now. The Highways Engineer advised that the site was within a city centre location and it was considered likely that not all residents would own cars; the parking provision was considered sufficient to provide enough parking for residents, staff and visitors.

Councillor M. Dixon queried whether the land having been previously developed would have any implications on this application and was informed by the representative of the Executive Director of Economy and Place that the UPD land classification needed to be looked at and in this case the land was identified as 'white land' where any development should be in keeping with the nature of the surrounding area; this was a residential development within a predominantly residential area. Every application needed to be considered on its own merits.

The Chairman expressed his concerns about the design of the proposed development and whether it would be in keeping with the surrounding area and referred to the statement in the report that the proposal was a plain and uninspiring design.

The Chairman then introduced Planning Consultant Mr Stephen Courcier who was in attendance to speak in support of the application on behalf of the applicant. He stated that he felt that the proposal would respect the nature of the conservation area and the listed buildings and that the proposal would bring benefits to the local area. In order for the development to be viable there was a need for the development to have a certain number of apartments to ensure that the service charge was able to be split amongst enough residents to be affordable. The applicant had undertaken consultation exercises and there had been no objections from local residents. The applicant was an experienced operator of schemes such as this; including operating a number of schemes successfully in Sunderland. Research had shown that there was an ongoing need for developments of this type and this proposed development was in a sustainable location on the edge of the city centre. The residents of the development would spend money with local businesses which would benefit the local economy and the residents would likely be moving from family homes which would then help to improve the availability of such homes in the city. The proposal would bring a redundant site back into use.

Members considered the matter and concerns having been raised over the design of the proposal Councillor I. Galbraith, seconded by the Chairman, moved that the application should be deferred in order to allow officers to further look at the design issues Members had raised. Members gave consideration to the motion to defer the application and with all Members being in agreement it was:-

1. RESOLVED that determination of the application be deferred to a future meeting of the Committee in order to allow the officers to further consider the concerns raised by Members over the design of the proposed development.

**18/00038/FUL – Erection of a two storey side extension  
18 Halvergate Close, Sunderland, SR4 8DW**

The representative of the Executive Director of Economy and Place outlined the development proposal to Members of the Sub Committee and the relevant material planning considerations against which the application had been assessed. There was a circulatory report in respect of this application which provided clarification of the reason for refusal that it would be number 19 Halvergate Close which would be unacceptably impacted by the proposals.

2. RESOLVED that the application be refused for the reason set out in the circulatory report.

**18/00132/FUL – Erection of a two storey side extension  
4 Hunworth Close, Sunderland, SR4 8ET**

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

3. RESOLVED that the application be approved for the reasons set out in the report subject to the 3 conditions set out therein.

**18/00151/FUL – Erection of two storey extension to west side, single storey extensions to rear and front and hardstanding to southwest of property (as amended)  
71 Park Lea, Sunderland, SR3 3SZ**

The representative of the Executive Director of Economy and Place outlined the development proposal to Members of the Sub Committee and the relevant material planning considerations against which the application had been assessed. There was a circulatory report in respect of this application which set out the content of an additional representation which had been submitted by an adjoining neighbour. The additional representation had been considered and the officer's recommendation remained that the application should be approved subject to conditions.

4. RESOLVED that the application be approved for the reasons set out in the report subject to the three conditions set out therein.

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

(Signed) S. PORTHOUSE,  
Chairman.