

PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS (WEST) COMMITTEE

AGENDA

Tuesday 2nd February, 2021 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/z3nE-kApyW0>

Membership

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

ITEM	PAGE
1. Receipt of Declarations of Interest (if any)	
2. Apologies for Absence	-
3. Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on Tuesday 15th December, 2021 and the extraordinary meeting held on 23rd December, 2021	1
(copies attached)	

4. **Reference from Cabinet – 8 December 2020
Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):-** 15

(A) Draft Allocations and Designations Plan

**(B) Land East of Washington (Washington Meadows)
Supplementary Planning Document Scoping Report**

**(C) Draft Development Management Supplementary
Planning Document.**

Report of the Executive Director of City Development
(copy attached).

Appendices to the report are available online on the link
below:-

<https://committees.sunderland.gov.uk/committees/cmis5/Meetings/tabid/73/ctl/ViewMeetingPublic/mid/410/Meeting/10251/Committee/1988/Default.aspx>

5. **Applications made under the Town and Country
Planning Acts and Regulations made thereunder** 43

Report of the Executive Director of City Development
(copy herewith).

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

25th January, 2021

At a meeting of the PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS (WEST) COMMITTEE held remotely on TUESDAY 15TH DECEMBER, 2020 at 5.30 p.m.

Present:-

Councillor Thornton in the Chair.

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

Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest

Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor F. Miller.

Minutes of the last meeting of the Committee held on 27th October and the extraordinary meeting held on 17th November, 2020.

1. RESOLVED that the minutes of the last meeting of the Committee held on 27th October and the extraordinary meeting held on 17th November, 2020 be confirmed and signed as correct records.

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)

The Chairman advised the Committee that in relation to application 20/01182/FUL – Erection of 13 no. residential dwellings (Use Class C3) – Land West Willows Close, Columbia, Washington, as the 17 November meeting was deferred for Member site visits, rather than adjourned, it was considered necessary for those residents who had participated in the application process to be notified of this new meeting. It was therefore recommended that the item be rescheduled to Wednesday 23 December to enable Officers to undertake this re-consultation process.

**20/00238/FUL – Creation of Reedbed habitat, Durham Wildlife Trust
Mallard Way, Houghton le Spring, DH4 6PU**

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 Planning Officer updated the Committee in relation to the drainage issues advising that he had spoken with the Councils lead local flood authority and there was a great deal of common ground that existed between the applicants' drainage engineer and the lead local flood authority. The outstanding matter related to how surface water flows would be managed and from that discussion, Officers are confident that there were solutions to this and should be able to reach a resolution on these matters in the very near future.

With this in mind the recommendation was as stated in the report to grant permission subject to the conditions albeit with resolution that outstanding drainage matters delegated back to Officers before the issuing of the decision notice.

In response to Councillor G. Walkers query, The Planning Officer advised that he would make further investigations into what the "other priority species of fauna" as mentioned in the report was and provide details to Councillor Walker directly.

Councillor Rowntree wished to clarify that the application was in the Hetton Ward rather than the Hetton-le-Hole Ward.

Councillor Armstrong commented that this application had his full support and he hoped all Members could support this.

2. RESOLVED that Members be minded to approve the application, subject to the resolution of the outstanding drainage matters delegated back to Officers (including any additional / amended conditions) and the three draft conditions contained within the report

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

This item was deferred to the extraordinary meeting of the Committee arranged to be held on Wednesday 23rd December 2020.

Items for Information

Councillor Lauchlan enquired as to why there was such an urgency to determine the Willows Close application before Christmas when there were quite a few applications on the matrix which had a determination date before Christmas which weren't being looked at.

The Planning Officer advised that the Willows Close application was part of a whole host of applications the Council had received and it was linked to Homes England funding. The application went to Committee in November and the intention had been to consider it at this meeting so the applicant was keen to have it determined due to the links with Homes England funding.

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

4. 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)

At an extraordinary meeting of the PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS (WEST) COMMITTEE held remotely on WEDNESDAY 23RD DECEMBER, 2020 at 5.30 p.m.

Present:-

Councillor Thornton in the Chair.

Councillors Armstrong, Blackett, Lauchlan and P. Walker.

Declarations of Interest

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

Councillor P. Walker made an open declaration on the item as a former 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 Fagan, F. Miller, Rowntree and G. 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)

20/01182/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 Lauchlan commented that he knew the area very well and there wasn't a lot of open space to begin with and enquired as to what the betterment of the quality of the remaining open space would be.

The Planning Officer advised that the betterment comes from the additional planting and increase of native species to the area. 28 trees and around 2000 shrubs would be added to the remaining open space so it was a betterment in terms of the number of species that would be allowed to flourish within that piece of land.

Councillor Lauchlan enquired if the residents of Willows Close had been consulted on the planting of these trees and shrubs as some of their properties looked out onto this proposed development and could their view be obscured by these trees.

The Planning Officer advised that the planting schedule formed part of the planning application, the species had been considered and based on visits of the site it was not considered that any of the species would lead to degrees of loss of light or overshadowing from the properties to the west of the site so in summary yes the planting scheme has been considered on its merits and its potential impact.

Councillor Lauchlan referred to page 6 of the report and commented that it was obvious the Council was in disagreement with Gentoo about the green space and Criterion 4 which said that the area was low in green space quality and was therefore a localised area of deficiency. Councillor Lauchlan queried why we were allowing this area of greenspace to be taken away when there were other areas of brown space to be used in the City.

Councillor Lauchlan added that as said previously, he was not against progress but he did not feel this was the right place for this development and could not see why they needed to take away green space from Columbia and Barmston when there wasn't any more nearby.

The Planning Officer responded with regards to Policy NE4, it did point in the direction of trying to replace with lost quantity elsewhere within the Ward. Gentoo have attempted to do so but there was no alternative land that could be brought forward to replace the quantity of the land which was proposed to be removed, with that in mind, the Policy and its additional text within does allow for the improvement of the remaining quality of what they began with. Gentoo have set out in their planning application that there is no land available to bring forward that could replace the land that is being lost so in order to deliver the 13 affordable homes they were seeking to improve the quality of the remaining area of open space that is on site at this present moment in time.

The Planning Officer informed that Policy NE4 does refer to the aim to protect, conserve and enhance the quality of the community value function and accessibility of green space, so it did allow to enhance the quality of the site, the accessibility would be retained as all footpaths were inherently linked to the existing surrounding properties with additional footpath connection to the south west of the site.

It could be accepted they were losing an amount, but in terms of community value, it was fully accessible for everyone within the area and it would be visually significantly improved. Therefore it was the Local Planning Authority's opinion that based on balancing the case of the loss of the quantity with the uplift of the quality, that the provision of these 13 affordable homes and the uplift in the quality of the remaining land was sufficient to put forward the recommendation that was before Members.

Councillor Lauchlan commented that this proposal took away 75% of the greenspace and those little areas on the side of the proposal were very small so there would be very little that could be done to uplift the quality of those and as Officers have agreed, there wasn't any other green space in the area that could then be used by residents.

Councillor Lauchlan commented that he believed the Council did not agree with Gentoo on the use of this green space and whilst he loathed to go against affordable housing he did not believe this was the right place for it.

The Chairman introduced Councillor Linda Williams who wished to speak in objection to the application. Councillor Williams referred to the green space and informed the Committee that in Washington they had the vast majority of their shrubs taken out recently via work in conjunction with the Council and Gentoo as they had become litter traps so what we were saying with this particular group of houses was that we would be looking to put in something that was being removed elsewhere and she would expect these would end up being removed quite quickly also. Therefore this would erode the quality of that space.

Councillor Williams referred to the document she had circulated previously to the Committee Members including google maps of the area. The first map referred to JFK primary school, which was a large school with around 400 pupils in attendance, this end also had a range of different shops therefore she felt this was particularly busy. Further down from this there were difficulties in turning via Wear Terrace and Councillor Williams did not believe this was safe at all.

Councillor Williams referred to the bottom end of the road, where A195 ran along, which was a very busy road with a number of shops and houses which were being converted into businesses exacerbating the whole problem with parking.

Councillor Williams referred to the unaccompanied site visits Members were offered for this application and felt that it had been a missed opportunity to attend with Officers and believed these could have taken place whilst social distancing.

Councillor Williams commented that looking at the application on the whole, the housing proposal was beautiful and just what Members would be happy to have but the access and reduction of green space was just that step too far. Some of these original properties in Washington were built in the 1930's

therefore they were very tight, very crowded and at various points in later years additional properties had been put in. At that stage residents wouldn't have had cars.

Councillor Williams advised that this was a very difficult assessment to make for the area but would like to say that Washington Central and the Barmston area were not the same. Barmston came under Washington East and this needed to be taken into account and questioned why the application was being determined so quickly and no traffic survey had been carried out. This area was saturated and planning permission had just been granted for 4 bungalows in the area so an additional 13 houses was just too much.

The Planning Officer read out the written statements received from objectors to the application, which were as follows;

A Mr Mark Lloyd submitted a written representation stating that he would like to thank the planning committee and the council for giving him the opportunity to present his views about the proposed development at the meeting. Mr Lloyd's statement was largely in relation to questioning the process that Gentoo had used to present the views of the public to the planning committee.

He feared that unless the planning committee were given the detailed information collected by the Gentoo survey then the summary of the findings that he saw in the report might seem to suggest that the strength of feeling against the development was relatively low. Mr Lloyd expressed concern that the "consultation" was conducted and reported in such a way that the planning committee may be led to believe that local residents were generally in favour of the scheme. He didn't really receive a specific answer on that or any of the questions he had asked because of only being allowed five minutes.

The first question on the original leaflet asked people to rank their agreement or disagreement to the following statement "The site is a suitable and sustainable location for residential development"

Mr Lloyd wished to ask the planning committee - Have Gentoo made them aware of how that question was answered by the 21% of respondents from the 400 leaflets delivered.

At the previous meeting there was some discussion about where the 400 leaflets had been delivered to. He raised that question as he hadn't had one. He recalled someone saying that they may have been delivered to Gentoo residents in areas not really effected by the development. Have Gentoo made the planning committee aware of where the leaflets were delivered?

Mr Lloyd thanked the members of the planning committee for deferring their decision to be able to visit the area and he hoped that during their visit they got a picture of Columbia as a vibrant urban community that welcomes visitors from all over Washington to share their local amenities, shops, businesses and take-aways.

He hoped they witnessed the area at peak times to see how even a small increase in traffic would have an impact on the quality of life for local residents. He hoped they were able to see first-hand how little green space they have, not only because they lack gardens in their predominantly terraced properties but also in comparison to other areas of Washington. Mr Lloyd hoped that they saw that sending their children to play at Teal Farm was not really practical or safe and that the conclusion of their visit was a better understanding of why they care so passionately about safeguarding their few remaining views of blue skies and undeveloped patches of land. Mr Lloyd sincerely hoped that taking those things into account they voted against this development.

A Ms Pamela Elliot submitted a written representation stating that at the last meeting there was a suggestion that the local existing residents would be able to go to Teal Farm for Green Space and so the proposed new properties could be built on their existing Green Space as affordable houses. Ms Elliott disagreed stating that she understood the requirement for affordable houses for people, but in the right environment. Their Green Space was not the right environment and she believed there were lots of other properties and other more suitable land crying out for affordable housing in Washington.

Ms Elliott stated that as a single woman she would not be comfortable walking by herself any time of the day to Teal Farm, some of the way was quite a lonely track and there's the A195 road to contend with. Also if she had children she wouldn't like to think of them going off to Teal Farm by themselves for green space.

Their Green Space was important to existing residents and they needed their own space. Ms Elliott understood affordable houses were important, but their Green Space was just as important to the existing residents especially for both their physical and mental health.

Ms Elliott commented that personally speaking it was nice to just be able to walk a few yards from her home to the Green Space and see some greenery, wildlife and have chance to meet other residents (albeit at these times briefly at a safe distance) even if it was just to say "hello" as they are walking by.

Since the last meeting she had noticed there was even more traffic, some quite noisy using Station Road on a regular daily basis. And every day without fail there were vehicles of all descriptions using Willow's Close and Station Road to park up (at times blocking the junctions) to use the businesses on Station Road. They didn't need any more regular traffic which is what these properties would bring.

During the last meeting it was mentioned some residents didn't receive any literature which informed existing residents what was happening and giving people the opportunity to have their say regarding these proposed 13 new properties.

Ms Elliott informed that on Friday 28th August 2020 a young man was delivering leaflets with information regarding the proposed 13 properties. She opened the door thinking it was a sales leaflet, so only got to have a quick chat with the young man accidentally after he'd just walked out of my garden gate, and all of a sudden a man who lives over the road from me rushed out and quickly pulled some leaflets out of his neighbours doors and rushed in and slammed the door.

Whilst this was happening the young man who was delivering the leaflets advising residents to act now, told me the man over the road has done this before taking some leaflets out of a few of his neighbours letterboxes and that he isn't happy to see the young man. On Friday 28th August, there were at least 2 houses that didn't receive information regarding this matter.

The young man delivering the leaflets told me existing residents only have until early September 2020 to register objections. I had already registered mine weeks before.

I strongly object to the proposed new builds being built on our Green Space and request the new builds be built on a more suitable area in Washington or take the opportunity to utilise some of the existing housing stock again in a more suitable area in Washington which would really benefit from refurbishment.

A Mr Keith Bartlett submitted a written representation stating that he was very pleased and grateful that the committee decided to defer a decision until members could actually visit the site and see first hand what the development entailed. The Committee was to be commended for taking this action and it gave him hope as a resident that his concerns and that of his neighbours was being considered seriously.

Mr Bartlett hoped that they arrived at the same conclusion as him concerning safety, loss of green space (the quality of green space improvements as gentoo are arguing is of no use to us if we cannot walk amongst it).

One point he had not raised earlier which can be checked was that Northern Bus used to run Mini link services through every village in Washington before withdrawing them all they actually stopped the service in Columbia first due to the accessibility along Derwent Terrace, Wear Terrace and Lowthian Terrace and hold up of service as buses were continuously delayed because of access, he witnessed one of these buses collide with a car outside the Take Away opposite his house. This was stopped some years ago and the traffic now was greater than what it was then.

Mr Bartlett wondered if this overdevelopment was going to affect house prices in the area, He was due to retire shortly and not in a position to purchase a new home with access to a green space within short walking distance to exercise and walk his dog especially late at night before bed.

Mr Bartlett urged members to take note of local residents concerns and support this community and not destroy it by allowing this development to go ahead.

The Planning Officer wished to respond to the submissions advising for clarity that safeguarding views of skies and green spaces was not a material consideration in determining this planning application. Local residents did not have a right to a view over this land. Also to reemphasise that there was unhindered access to the green space improvements, these improvements were not just for the new residents but would be for all the surrounding residents and wider areas.

The mention of house prices in the area was also not material in the consideration of this planning application and with reference to the bus deregulations the Planning Officer wished to defer to Highways Officers on this as he believed the bus companies was totally out of the control of the planning authority.

The Highways Officer commented that it was acknowledged that these were busy streets and this was clear. It was important to note that in terms of the scale of development, this housing site would generate a very minimal amount of trips in terms of impact, as such they tended to look at peak hour trips (worst case situation) and they were looking at 6-7 two way trips per hour, which equated to a car every 10 minutes. Therefore in terms of scale it was very minimal.

The Highways Officer advised that for these reasons the Highways Team had supported the application in terms of traffic and parking provision which was also satisfactory. In terms of the scale of the development, a traffic survey was not required in this instance.

The Highways Officer advised that the stopping up order issues, was a separate process that was managed by the Secretary of State and not by the Council in this case, this was to seek approval to stop up and remove the footpaths. Alternatives were to be provided as part of the development.

The Highways Officer also advised that in terms of the bus services, unfortunately these were commercially operated services and the Council were often at the whim of the operators as to where they could run their routes and where they choose to remove them.

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, 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 2187 dwellings with a net imbalance of 542 per annum. The SHLAA goes on to identify the importance of the Gentoo Affordable Housing Programme in meeting that affordable need.

Ms Manson commented that it was easy to lose sight of what that may mean in terms of people. At present Gentoo had over 15,000 people on the waiting list for a Gentoo home and whilst that would include a significant proportion of tenants already on the books looking to move to a bigger house or a house in a different area it was nevertheless a compelling figure of need being expressed. In terms of demands, Gentoo got on average 134 expressions of interest in every property that was advertised. This was based on older stock and where new build stock was advertised, demand was significantly higher.

This need was likely to be exacerbated through the impact of the current Covid crisis that we continued to face 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 commented that the need for good quality affordable housing was significant and was a significant material consideration which was recognised in the draft Sunderland Allocations and Designations plan 2020 (which was out for consultation, having been approved by the Council). This plan identified potential housing sites to meet market and affordable need and the site at Willows Close being identified as a potential housing site under draft allocations policy H8.9 for 13 dwellings.

Ms Manson informed that the scheme proposed at Willows Close was of the highest quality design with homes that met the Nationally described space standards, higher than policy standard parking provision so that there was no issue of exacerbating existing parking considerations in the locality and high quality builds that were energy efficient.

Ms Manson referred to the local concerns raised and that these had been noted and addressed in detail by Officers and the consultees and the scheme responded to the specifics of the site so as such, there were no objections received by the statutory consultees to the application.

In relation to comments on the community consultation, the application within its documents has a statement of community involvement which was prepared and documented how the consultation, pre submission, was undertaken. This included how 600 leaflets were hand delivered within the locality, the plan appended to this identified the area it pertained to. Whilst instances referred to by the written objector was unfortunate, this was beyond the control of Gentoo but nevertheless the statutory consultation processes had still been undertaken and as referenced in the Committee report there were a relatively low number of objections to the application.

The site was identified in the SHLAA to support the delivery of affordable homes through the gentoo affordable homes programme, the need for affordable housing was critical as demonstrated and was a significant material consideration. The scheme did not ignore the local context and over provides on car parking to ensure it does not create any issues on existing problems.

Considerable investment in planting and landscaping on site through a £47,000 investment. Planting of 28 trees to compensate for the loss of 2 trees and over a thousand shrub and hedge plants as well as other biodiversity measures. The scheme seeks to meet the needs of new and existing residents and as such they asked that Members concur with Officers recommendation and approve the scheme that was before them.

Councillor Lauchlan enquired as to why Gentoo had suggested that residents could exercise at Teal Farm when there was no green space there also. Ms Manson advised that she was not aware of where this reference had come from so she was unable to respond to this.

Councillor Lauchlan commented that it was very worrying that Gentoo were suggesting this and also claiming there was 2.15 hectares of amenity greenspace close to the site when there clearly was not. Claims were being made about footpaths to Ovingham and Post Offices in the area and he felt this whole report was rather a shambles and he urged Members to have another look at this.

Councillor Lauchlan also enquired why a site visit wasn't arranged under the rule of 6 with regards to Covid guidelines. The City Solicitor advised that the reason group visits weren't arranged was due to the fact that at start of the coronavirus pandemic a format of site visit was agreed for the safety of Members and Officers whereby Members were to visit the sites unaccompanied. This was perfectly in line with the Councils procedures at the moment and was to safeguard Members and Officers alike.

Councillor Lauchlan commented that he did not see why it could not have been arranged under the rule of 6 as it was an outside venue that social distancing could have been maintained and it just felt that a lot of this had been rushed through for Gentoo and the nature of the affordable housing aspect. There are other places where this housing could be built and he did not think Willows Close was the right place.

Councillor Armstrong wished to comment that based on the presentations given, it appeared to him that a lot of the residents were against this, Ward Members on behalf of their constituents were not happy with the proposal. One of the last pieces of green space was being taken away from the area and whilst it may look nice, it would be inaccessible for people.

Councillor Armstrong queried where the children would be able to play and the thought of them having to travel to Teal Farm was a worry due to the number of roads they would be required to cross. It was heartening to hear other Members express such concerns as this decision was not an easy one because we were all in favour of affordable housing but it was the sites they were proposed for that was the issue.

Councillor Armstrong also commented that people were really appreciative of the green spaces available to them, especially at this moment in time with COVID. Whilst he loathed to go against developers such as Gentoo who were honourable in their desire to create more affordable homes, a message had to be sent to developers that green space could not be taken away whilst there was brownfield sites still available to be built upon and he would be voting against this proposal.

The Planning Officer advised that the recommendation was made on balance that the uplift in the remaining space and the provision of 13 affordable units would tip the planning balance towards a recommendation for approval.

The Chairman wished to address the numbers of Members in attendance for the meeting and felt that if there was such strong feeling about a development of this nature then they should be in attendance to vote. This has then left the remaining Members in a very difficult situation. The Chairman advised that she had similar concerns to those expressed by Councillors Armstrong and Lauchlan about the use of green space for development whilst on the other hand she was a very strong supporter of social housing which these 13 properties would be.

The Chairman advised that she visited the site independently on a number of occasions to view traffic and spoke with a number of residents and requested the Planning Officers advise the Committee of the implications of a potential contrary decision proposed.

The City Solicitor commented that if the Committee intended to propose a contrary decision then he suggested a closed session in which to exclude the press and public so that he could provide some confidential legal advice under Section 100A (2) and schedule 12A paragraph 5 of the Local Government Act 1972.

On the Chairman putting the matter to members, the committee unanimously agreed to go into a closed session. At this juncture, there was a short recess for the City Solicitor to consult with the Members of the Committee in private. At this point the live streaming was stopped.

Upon the reopening of the meeting, the live stream recommenced and the Chairman enquired if any Members wished to propose an alternative recommendation and if so, to state the grounds on which this was requested.

Councillor Lauchlan proposed that the application be refused on the grounds that Policy NE4 Criterion 4 had not been satisfied and the loss of green space and lack of other alternatives in the area. Councillor Armstrong seconded the motion.

Having been put to a vote, it was unanimously agreed that

3. RESOLVED that the application be refused for the following reason:-

The application proposal was unacceptable in principle as it would have an adverse effect on the amenity, recreational and community function value of the site as greenspace, which was within an area of the City identified as having a deficient quantity of amenity greenspace, contrary to CSDP policy NE4.

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

(Signed) M. THORNTON,
(Chairman)

PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS (WEST) COMMITTEE

2 FEBRUARY 2021

REFERENCE FROM CABINET – 8 DECEMBER 2020

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENTS (SPD):-

- (A) Draft Allocations and Designations Plan**
- (B) Land East of Washington (Washington Meadows) Supplementary Planning Document Scoping Report**
- (C) Draft Development Management Supplementary Planning Document.**

Report of the Assistant Director of Law and Governance

1. Purpose of this Report

- 1.1 To set out for the advice and consideration of this Committee reports which were considered by Cabinet on 8 December 2020 to seek approval to undertake public consultation on the Draft Allocations and Designations Plan, the Land East of Washington (Washington Meadows) Supplementary Planning Document Scoping Report and the Draft Development Management Supplementary Planning Document.

2. Background and Current Position

- 2.1 The Cabinet, at its meeting held on 8 December 2020, gave consideration to reports of the Executive Director of City Development to seek Cabinet approval to undertake public consultation on the Draft Allocations and Designations Plan, the Land East of Washington (Washington Meadows) Supplementary Planning Document Scoping Report and the Draft Development Management Supplementary Planning Document.
- 2.3 In respect of the Draft Allocations and Designations Plan, the Cabinet:-
 - approved public consultation on the Draft Allocations and Designations Plan attached at Appendix 1, Policies Map as attached in Appendix 2 and supporting Evidence as listed in Appendix 5; and
 - delegated authority to the Executive Director of City Development in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Dynamic City to make any minor modifications to the Draft Allocations and Designations Plan and Policies Map in advance of consultation.
- 2.4 In relation to the Land East of Washington (Washington Meadows) Supplementary Planning Document Scoping Report, the Cabinet:-
 - approved public consultation on the Land East of Washington (Washington Meadows) Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) Scoping Report (Appendix 1); and

- delegated authority to the Executive Director of City Development in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Dynamic City to make any minor modifications to the Scoping Report prior to the consultation.

2.5 In respect of the Draft Development Management Supplementary Planning Document, the Cabinet

- approved public consultation on the Draft Development Management SPD attached at Appendix 1; and
- delegated authority to the Executive Director of City Development in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Dynamic City to make any minor modifications to the draft DM SPD prior to the consultation.

2.6 Copies of the 8 December 2020 Cabinet agenda are available online to all Members of the Council.

3. Conclusion

- 3.1 The reports are referred to this Committee for advice and consideration as part of the consultation process. The comments of this Committee will be reported to Cabinet when it receives further reports following the consultation exercises.

4. Recommendation

- 4.1 The Committee is invited to give advice and consideration on the attached reports of the Executive Director of City Development.

5. Background Papers

- 5.1 Cabinet Agenda, 8 December 2020.

- 5.2 A copy of the Agenda is available for inspection from the Assistant Director of Law and Governance or can be viewed on-line at:-

<https://committees.sunderland.gov.uk/committees/cm5/Meetings/tabid/73/ctl/ViewMeetingPublic/mid/410/Meeting/10397/Committee/1953/Default.aspx>

Contact Peter McIntyre
Officers: 0191 561 1134

peter.mcintyre@sunderland.gov.uk

Elaine Waugh
0191 561 7849

elaine.waugh@sunderland.gov.uk

CABINET MEETING – 8 DECEMBER 2020

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY SHEET – PART I

Title of Report:

Draft Allocations and Designations Plan.

Author(s):

Executive Director of City Development

Purpose of Report:

The purpose of this report is to seek Cabinet approval to consult on the Draft Allocations and Designations Plan (A&D Plan) (Appendix 1), Policies Map (Appendix 2) and supporting evidence (as listed in Appendix 5).

Description of Decision:

It is recommended that Cabinet:

- approves public consultation on the Draft Allocations and Designations Plan attached at Appendix 1, Policies Map as attached in Appendix 2 and supporting Evidence as listed in Appendix 5; and
- delegates authority to the Executive Director of City Development in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Dynamic City to make any minor modifications to the Draft Allocations and Designations Plan and Policies Map in advance of consultation.

Is the decision consistent with the Budget/Policy Framework? Yes

If not, council approval is required to change the Budget/Policy Framework

Suggested reason(s) for Decision:

The decision is required to allow public consultation to be undertaken on the Draft Allocations and Designations Plan in accordance with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

Alternative options to be considered and recommended to be rejected:

The option to proceed without developing an Allocations and Designations Plan was considered. However, the Council is legally required to prepare a Local Plan Document.

Impacts analysed:

Equality ☐ Y Privacy ☐ x Sustainability ☐ Y Crime and Disorder ☐ x

The Draft A&D Plan will designate and allocate land to meet the strategic objectives outlined in the Core Strategy and Development Plan. The Plan will support and provide guidance on a range of planning matters, which will be of benefit to a wide range of interested groups.

An Equalities Impact Assessment has been undertaken for the Allocations and Designations Plan (Appendix 4). In addition, the Allocations and Designations Plan has also been subject to a Sustainability Appraisal (incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment). A summary of the outcomes of this process is attached in Appendix 3.	
Is the Decision consistent with the council's co-operative values?	Yes
Is this a "Key Decision" as defined in the Constitution?	Yes
Is it included in the 28-day Notice of Decisions?	Yes

DRAFT ALLOCATIONS AND DESIGNATIONS PLAN**Executive Director of City Development****1. Purpose of the Report**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek Cabinet approval to consult on the Draft Allocations and Designations Plan (Appendix 1), Policies Map (Appendix 2) and supporting evidence (as listed in Appendix 5).

2. Description of Decision (Recommendations)

- 2.1 It is recommended that Cabinet:
- approves public consultation on the Draft Allocations and Designations Plan attached at Appendix 1, Policies Map as attached in Appendix 2 and supporting Evidence as listed in Appendix 5; and
 - delegates authority to the Executive Director of City Development in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Dynamic City to make any minor modifications to the Draft Allocations and Designation Plan and Policies Map in advance of consultation.

3. Background**Local Plan**

- 3.1 All Local Planning Authorities are required to produce a Local Plan. Local Plans set out a vision and framework for the future development of an area, addressing needs and opportunities in relation to housing, the economy, community facilities and infrastructure – as well as a basis for safeguarding the environment, adapting to climate change and securing good design. The Local Plan is an essential tool for guiding decisions on individual development proposals and is the starting point for considering whether a planning application can be approved.
- 3.2 Local plans must be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy in accordance with section 20 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 3.3 Sunderland's Local Plan consists of three parts: the Core Strategy and Development Plan (CSDP) which was adopted in 2020, the International Advanced Manufacturing Park Area Action Plan (IAMP AAP) which was adopted in 2017 and the final part will be the Allocations and Designations Plan (hereafter referred to as the A&D Plan).

- 3.4 Upon its adoption, the A&D Plan will supersede and replace all remaining saved policies of the Unitary Development Plan and Unitary Development Plan Alteration No.2.

The A&D Plan

- 3.5 As set out above, the A&D Plan is the third and final part of the Local Plan. Its purpose is to allocate and designate land to help deliver the overarching strategy and strategic objectives set out within the CSDP. The CSDP set out the overarching development strategy for Sunderland until 2033. This included the requirement to deliver at least 13,410 net new homes, 7,200 new jobs and the development of at least 45,400m² of new comparison retail development. The CSDP also established detailed development management policies to protect the area's assets such as its greenspaces and the historic environment, and policies to create sustainable, healthy communities.
- 3.6 Whilst the policies of the CSDP go some way in facilitating the delivery of the overarching development strategy, the A&D Plan will allocate and designate land to ensure that the development strategy can be delivered in full.

Preparing the A&D Plan

- 3.7 As part of the preparation of the draft A&D Plan (Appendix 1), the Council has prepared a detailed evidence base (as listed in Appendix 5) which has been used to inform the policies contained within the A&D Plan. In addition to the evidence base, the A&D Plan has also been subject to a Sustainability Appraisal (incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment), Habitats Regulations Assessment, Health Impact Assessment and Equalities Assessment. These impact assessments have considered the impacts of the A&D Plan on the environment, health and equalities issues. In addition to satisfying statutory requirements, this has helped to shape the content of the A&D Plan in order to maximise beneficial effects for local communities and the environment.
- 3.8 The Council has also worked closely with neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies during the preparation of this Plan on strategic planning matters as part of its duty-to-cooperate. The Council will continue, as part of the duty-to cooperate, to discuss any strategic issues which arise as a consequence of this consultation. The Plan has been prepared in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)¹, Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)² and legislation³.

¹ <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/3-plan-making#para17>

² <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/planning-practice-guidance>

³ Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2004/5/section/19>, Neighbouring Planning Act 2017 <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2017/20/section/8>, The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2012/767/part/4/made>

4. Current Position

4.1 To meet the overall development strategy set out in the CSDP, the draft A&D Plan proposes to:

- **Allocate sufficient land to meet housing needs** – The CSDP identifies that Sunderland will need to deliver approximately 13,410 new homes during the plan period (between 2015 and 2033). Although a substantial amount of these homes have already been delivered, or have planning permission, there is a need to identify sufficient land to meet the housing needs. The A&D Plan proposes to allocate sites for housing across the city to deliver approximately 4246 new homes by 2033. These sites are mainly brownfield sites and are all within the existing urban area.
- **Allocate Riverside Sunderland** - Riverside Sunderland is located in the heart of the Urban Core. Over the next 20 years, it is expected that Riverside Sunderland will transform into a successful business location, a popular place to live and a focal point for community life. The A&D Plan will allocate the site and alongside the Riverside Sunderland Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) ensure that development is coordinated and comprehensive.
- **Focus regeneration and new development at North East Washington** - North East Washington is an area of the city with a significant amount of development potential. The A&D Plan identifies Land East of Washington (Washington Meadows) as a sustainable urban extension to Washington. The site was previously safeguarded by the CSDP, however through preparing the draft A&D Plan it has become apparent that the site should be allocated to meet the city's needs. It is considered that Washington Meadows will become an example of a low carbon, sustainable development and a destination of choice for families. The development will achieve high standards of sustainability, design and provide a range of supporting facilities to help foster a strong sense of community. The creation of well connected, integrated and sustainable transport links will be essential to making this a sustainable neighbourhood, which is why the A&D Plan proposes to safeguard land for a metro/rail station on the site. The Council is preparing the Land East of Washington (Washington Meadows) SPD in tandem with the A&D Plan to ensure the site is delivered comprehensively. The A&D Plan recognises the wider benefits development in the area may bring and therefore identifies Sulgrave as a Regeneration Area.
- **Allocate the former Houghton Colliery site as a development opportunity and extension to Houghton Town Centre** - The CSDP sets out the aspiration to deliver at least 45,400m² of new comparison retail floorspace over the plan period to 2033. The Council recognise that the dynamic of the retail sector has been changing over recent years, with the growth of online retail and consolidation of many retailers into fewer outlets particularly focussed upon high order centres. Notwithstanding this, the Sunderland Retail Needs Assessment (2016) recognises that there is currently a significant amount of leakage in terms of retail expenditure from the Coalfield

sub-area. The former Houghton Colliery site has been a long-standing allocation for retail development in order to help address this need and would represent a logical extension to Houghton Town Centre. Therefore, the A&D Plan allocates this site.

- **Designate heritage assets** – The Council recognise the importance of the built and historic environment within the city and the need to preserve these assets for future generations. The CSDP contains several detailed policies which set out how the Council will determine applications which may have a potential impact upon the historic environment, including designated and non-designated heritage assets. Whilst the specific policies for dealing with such applications were set out within the CSDP, the formal designations were not shown on the Policies Map. The draft A&D Plan therefore seeks to formally designate these heritage assets.
- **Protect the natural environment** – The Council recognise the important role that the natural environment plays within the city and has set out a range of policies within the CSDP to protect and enhance this. Whilst the CSDP sets out the policy framework against which applications will be assessed, the majority of the environmental designations are not currently shown on the adopted CSDP Policies Map. The Council has done a substantial amount of work to ensure that key environmental assets are protected for our communities. This includes greenspaces, Local Wildlife Sites, Wildlife Network, key views as well as burial sites.
- **Designate land potentially suitable for wind energy development** – The Council recognise the importance of renewable energy supply in helping the city reduce its carbon emissions and the threat of climate change. CSDP Policy WWE1 sets out the Council's supportive approach to the development of decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy. However, with regard to onshore wind turbine development, the NPPF indicates that proposed wind energy development involving one or more turbines should not be considered acceptable unless it is in an area identified as suitable for wind development in the development plan. The A&D Plan therefore seeks to identify areas potentially suitable for new wind energy development. The areas identified are based on the recommendations of the council's Wind Capacity Study (2020). At this stage of plan making, potential locations have been identified for consultation purposes. Subject to this consultation, the Council will then determine which areas should be designated in the next iteration of the Plan.
- **Safeguard land for the future expansion of the Metro network, including potential Park and Ride locations** – The Metro Futures Study identifies opportunities for future expansion of the Tyne and Wear Metro network including a possible future extension to Doxford Park, resources permitting. In addition, the study also identifies a number of locations for potential future Metro stations, some of which will be located on national lines and may have scope to provide national rail services. The A&D Plan seeks to designate these on the Policies Map and safeguard them against any other forms of development which may restrict the future expansion of the Metro network or provision of national rail services.

Park and Ride sites can help to improve accessibility to sustainable transport routes and services in the city. In particular, they support Metro and rail routes in the city area, providing a convenient and safe location for users to park while they make use of Metro/rail services to travel to their destination. Schemes such as this assist in reducing vehicle congestion in city and town centres and contribute to lower carbon outputs. The A&D Plan proposes to safeguard land for Park and Ride facilities.

- **Safeguards Eppleton Quarry** - Eppleton Quarry is of strategic importance to mineral extraction in Sunderland and the rest of the Tyne and Wear sub-region. It represents the only operational quarry within the local authority area and one of only two operational quarries within the Tyne and Wear sub-region. To ensure that the operations of the quarry are not impeded by other development, the site is identified on the Policies Map as a safeguarded site.

5. Next Steps

- 5.1 In accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, a Local Plan Document must be consulted on for a minimum of six weeks. The Council are keen to involve as many people in the process and have prepared a communication and engagement plan to ensure that people are aware of the consultation. This includes sending letters, emails, social media campaigns, press campaign and engaging with partners. Consultation is expected to commence on 18 December but has been extended to an eight weeks consultation given the Christmas period. Consultation will close on 12 February 2020.
- 5.2 Due to the exceptional circumstances regarding Covid 19, arrangements have been put in place to ensure consultation on the draft A&D Plan can be carried out in line with Government guidance and social distancing requirements. The Council has prepared a Statement of Representation Procedure (Appendix 6) which sets out how the Council will publish the draft A&D Plan, inform all statutory bodies and Duty to Cooperate partners and make the relevant material available in accessible locations including online and in paper format.
- 5.3 Following consultation on the draft A&D Plan, the Council will take into consideration the outcomes of the consultation and will prepare the pre-submission draft in 2021.

6. Reasons for the Decision

- 6.1 The decision is required to allow public consultation to be undertaken on the draft A&D Plan in accordance with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

6. Alternative Options

- 6.1 The option to proceed without developing an Allocations and Designations Plan was considered. However, the Council is legally required to prepare a Local Plan Document.

7. Impact Analysis

- (a) **Equalities** – An Equalities Impact Assessment has been undertaken for the Allocations and Designations Plan (Appendix 4).
- (b) **Sustainability** – the Allocations and Designations Plan has also been subject to a Sustainability Appraisal (incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment). A summary of the outcomes of this process is attached in Appendix 3.
- (c) **Reduction of Crime and Disorder – Community Cohesion/Social Inclusion** – The A&D Plan will seek to provide allocations and designations for development across the City which will have positive benefits in terms of community cohesion.

8. Other Relevant Considerations/Consultations

- (i) **Financial Implications** – The costs associated with the A&D Plan consultation will be met through existing Local Plan budgets.
- (ii) **Risk Analysis** – It is not considered that a risk analysis is necessary.
- (iii) **Legal Implications** – The applicable legislation, as referenced in the report, will be adhered to throughout the process.
- (iv) **Policy Implications** – The A&D Plan, once adopted, will be a Development Plan Document and therefore will be a material consideration when determining planning applications.
- (v) **Implications for Other Services** – The A&D Plan will be used in the determination of planning applications and therefore will not have any direct implications for other Services.
- (vi) **The Public/External Bodies** – The Council will be consulting on the Draft A&D Plan.

9. List of Appendices (available online on the link below)

<https://committees.sunderland.gov.uk/committees/cm15/Meetings/tabid/73/ctl/ViewMeetingPublic/mid/410/Meeting/10397/Committee/1953/Default.aspx>

[Appendix 1 Draft Allocations and Designations Plan](#)

[Appendix 2 Draft Allocations and Designations Plan Policies Map](#)

[Appendix 3 Draft Allocations and Designations Plan Sustainability
Assessment Summary](#)

[Appendix 4 Draft Allocations and Designations Plan Equalities Impact
Assessment](#)

[Appendix 5 Draft Allocations and Designations Plan Evidence List](#)

[Appendix 6 Draft Allocations and Designations Plan Statement of
Representation Procedure](#)

CABINET MEETING – 8 DECEMBER 2020

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY SHEET – PART I

Title of Report:

Land East of Washington (Washington Meadows) Supplementary Planning Document Scoping Report

Author(s):

Executive Director of City Development

Purpose of Report:

The purpose of this report is to seek Cabinet approval to consult on the Land East of Washington (Washington Meadows) Supplementary Planning Document Scoping Report.

Description of Decision:

It is recommended that Cabinet:

- approves public consultation on the Land East of Washington (Washington Meadow) Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) Scoping Report (Appendix 1); and
- delegates authority to the Executive Director of City Development in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Dynamic City to make any minor modifications to the Scoping Report prior to the consultation.

Is the decision consistent with the Budget/Policy Framework? Yes

If not, council approval is required to change the Budget/Policy Framework

Suggested reason(s) for Decision:

The decision is required to allow public consultation to be undertaken on the Washington Meadows Scoping Report in accordance with Regulations 12 & 13 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

Alternative options to be considered and recommended to be rejected:

The option to proceed without developing an SPD for Land East of Washington (Washington Meadows) was considered. However, the Council considers it necessary to ensure the comprehensive and coordinated development of the area.

Impacts analysed;

Equality ☒ Privacy ☒ Sustainability ☒ Crime and Disorder ☒

The SPD will support and provide guidance on a range of planning matters, which will be of benefit to a wide range of interest groups.

An Equalities Impact Assessment has been undertaken for the Land East of Washington (Washington Meadows) SPD Scoping Report. In addition, as part of the preparation of the Draft Allocations and Designations Plan, which this document supplements, an Equalities Impact Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal was also undertaken.	
Is the Decision consistent with the council's co-operative values?	Yes
Is this a "Key Decision" as defined in the Constitution?	Yes
Is it included in the 28-day Notice of Decisions?	Yes

LAND EAST OF WASHINGTON (WASHINGTON MEADOWS) SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT SCOPING REPORT

Executive Director of City Development

1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek Cabinet approval to consult on the Land East of Washington (Washington Meadows) Supplementary Planning Document Scoping Report.

2. Description of Decision (Recommendations)

- 2.1 It is recommended that Cabinet:
- approves public consultation on the Land East of Washington (Washington Meadow) Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) Scoping Report (Appendix 1); and
 - delegates authority to the Executive Director of City Development in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Dynamic City to make any minor modifications to the Scoping Report prior to the consultation.

3. Background

Local Plan

- 3.1 Sunderland's Local Plan consists of three parts:
- the Core Strategy and Development Plan (CSDP);
 - the Allocations and Designations Plan (hereafter referred to as the Draft A&D Plan); and
 - the International Advanced Manufacturing Park Area Action Plan (IAMP AAP).
- 3.2 The Draft A&D Plan identifies, in Policy SP12, North East Washington as an area for regeneration and new development. The policy states that the Council working with its partners will:
- create a new sustainable residential community at Land East of Washington (hereafter referred to as Washington Meadows);
 - work to secure regeneration and renewal at Sulgrave; and
 - work toward re-opening the Leamside Line.
- 3.3 Policy SS9 of the Draft A&D Plan allocates Washington Meadows as a sustainable urban extension to Washington. The site was previously safeguarded by the CSDP. The Draft A&D Plan requires that development of the site should be comprehensive and coordinated and in accordance with the Land East of Washington (Washington Meadows) SPD.

- 3.4 The purpose of an SPD is to expand policy or provide further detail and support of policies in a Development Plan. An SPD does not have Development Plan status, but it can be accorded significant weight as a material planning consideration in the determination of planning applications.

North East Washington Context

- 3.5 Washington Meadows is within an area referred to in the Draft A&D Plan as North East Washington. North East Washington is an area of the city with a significant amount of development potential including IAMP, which is the premier location for advanced manufacturing and automotive technology, Washington Meadows for new housing growth, and the Leamside Line which offers an opportunity to connect into the Metro/rail network. It is important that, alongside developing new homes and jobs, the Council and its partners invest in and regenerate existing communities where there is a recognised need for intervention.
- 3.6 It is anticipated that Washington Meadows and IAMP will be a catalyst for the regeneration of the wider North East Washington area. To ensure the area's potential and the council's and community's aspirations are realised, a comprehensive approach to its development is necessary. This will ensure that new housing, employment, regeneration and infrastructure are delivered in a timely manner. The Council is currently preparing a Regeneration Strategy for North East Washington.

Washington Meadows Site

- 3.7 The site will form a natural extension to Washington. The site is located on the north eastern edge of Washington close to Nissan and west of IAMP. To the north of the site is agricultural land, to the east IAMP, to the south Nissan and Elm Tree Farm Garden Nursery & Tearoom, and to the west of the site is the former Leamside Railway Line. The site is approximately 98 hectares in size.
- 3.8 Washington Meadows will become an example of a low carbon, sustainable development and a destination of choice for families wishing to live in the city. The development will achieve high standards of sustainability, design and provide a range of supporting facilities to help foster a strong sense of community. The creation of well connected, integrated and sustainable transport links will be essential to making this a sustainable neighbourhood.

Washington Meadows Policy Context

- 3.9 The adopted CSDP sets out the Council's long-term plan for development across the city to 2033. It sought to address the lack of development potential in the area to ensure Washington could continue to thrive as a sustainable community. The CSDP designated the site as safeguarded for long term development needs. The CSDP states that consideration will be given to an early release of the safeguarded land through the A&D Plan, if required. In preparation of the Draft A&D Plan and its supporting evidence base, it has become clear that in order to ensure a sufficient supply of deliverable and developable housing sites within the city throughout the plan period and beyond (including a buffer of approximately 10% to ensure deliverability), it would be necessary to release the site early.

- 3.10 The Draft A&D Plan, therefore, includes a policy which allocates Washington Meadows as an Urban Extension. To ensure the site delivers the necessary infrastructure requirements and creates a sustainable community, Policy SS9 identifies a number of policy constraints which must be addressed at the planning application stage. It also requires development to be in accordance with the Land East of Washington (Washington Meadows) SPD.
- 3.11 In addition, Policy SS9 safeguards land for a new railway station and associated car parking. This is to ensure that land is protected for a station if the Leamside Line is reopened.

4. Current Position

- 4.1 It is the intention of the Council to produce and formally adopt the Land East of Washington (Washington Meadows) SPD. This SPD will give further detailed advice on how policies SP12 and SS9 will be applied.
- 4.2 The purpose of the SPD is to:
- detail the Council's visions and aspirations for Washington Meadows;
 - facilitate the delivery of Washington Meadows to ensure that the site is delivered in a comprehensive and coordinated manner; and
 - provide a basis for informed and transparent decision making on planning applications.
- 4.3 The Land East of Washington (Washington Meadows) SPD Scoping Report (Appendix 1) acts as an opening consultation paper to discuss the relevant issues, themes and potential format that the SPD will cover.
- 4.4 The Scoping Report (Appendix 1) details that the SPD will:
- provide a vision and strategic objectives for the area;
 - define key development principles and concepts to enable a strategic approach to delivery;
 - provide a masterplan framework, incorporating design parameters and principles to ensure a high standard of design and sustainability;
 - identify requirements and provide a broad strategy to deliver supporting infrastructure; and
 - form part of the evidence base for the emerging A&D Plan, by demonstrating the site's suitability and deliverability.
- 4.5 The SPD will comprehensively cover the following key strategic issues including: Natural Environment, Built Environment, Social Infrastructure, Access & Connectivity, Utilities, Pollution, Flood Risk & Drainage, Contamination, Infrastructure Requirements and Costs and Phasing.

Next Steps

- 4.6 In accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, an SPD must be consulted on, for a minimum of four weeks. Consultation on SPDs must be carried out in line with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). Due to the exceptional circumstances

regarding Covid 19, arrangements have been put in place to ensure consultation on the SPD Scoping Report can be carried out in line with Government guidance and social distancing requirements. As normal, the consultation will include sending letters/emails to all contacts on the Local Plan database, informing all statutory bodies and Duty to Cooperate partners and making the relevant material available in accessible locations including online and in paper format.

- 4.7 Following consultation on the SPD Scoping Report (Appendix 1), the Council will take into consideration the outcomes of the consultation and will prepare a Land East of Washington (Washington Meadows) Draft SPD. The draft SPD will be consulted on alongside the revised draft of the A&D Plan in 2021.

5. Reasons for the Decision

- 5.1 The decision is required to allow public consultation to be undertaken on the Land East of Washington (Washington Meadows) SPD Scoping Report in accordance with Regulations 12 & 13 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

6. Alternative Options

- 6.1 The option to proceed without developing an SPD for Land East of Washington (Washington Meadows) was considered. However, the Council considers it necessary to ensure the comprehensive and coordinated development of the area.

7. Impact Analysis

- (a) **Equalities** – An Equalities Impact Assessment has been undertaken for the SPD Scoping Report (Appendix 2).
- (b) **Sustainability** – As part of the preparation of the Draft A&D Plan a Sustainability Appraisal has been undertaken. This assesses the sustainability of the approach to Land East of Washington (Washington Meadows).
- (c) **Reduction of Crime and Disorder – Community Cohesion/Social Inclusion** – The SPD will seek to provide further guidance development for Land East of Washington (Washington Meadows) which will have positive benefits in terms of community cohesion.

8. Other Relevant Considerations/Consultations

- (i) **Financial Implications** – The costs associated with the SPD consultation will be met through existing Planning Policy budgets.
- (ii) **Risk Analysis** – It is not considered that a risk analysis is necessary.

- (iii) **Legal Implications** – The applicable legislation, as referenced in the report, will be adhered to throughout the process.
- (iv) **Policy Implications** – The SPD will provide new planning policy guidance which will be a material planning consideration in the determination of planning applications within Washington Meadows.
- (v) **Implications for Other Services** – The SPD will be used in the determination of planning applications and therefore will not have any direct implications for other Services.
- (vi) **The Public/External Bodies** – The Council will be consulting on the SPD.

9. List of Appendices

- Appendix 1 Land East of Washington (Washington Meadows) SPD Scoping Report.
- Appendix 2 Land East of Washington (Washington Meadows) SPD Scoping Report Equalities Impact Assessment.

Copies are available in the Members' Rooms and online at
<https://www.sunderland.gov.uk/article/12733/Supplementary-Planning-Documents-SPDs->

CABINET MEETING – 8 DECEMBER 2020

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY SHEET – PART I

Title of Report:

Draft Development Management Supplementary Planning Document.

Author(s):

Executive Director of City Development

Purpose of Report:

The purpose of this report is to seek Cabinet approval to consult on the Draft Development Management (DM) Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

Description of Decision:

It is recommended that Cabinet:

- approves public consultation on the Draft Development Management SPD attached at Appendix 1; and
- delegates authority to the Executive Director of City Development in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Dynamic City to make any minor modifications to the draft DM SPD prior to the consultation.

Is the decision consistent with the Budget/Policy Framework? Yes

If not, council approval is required to change the Budget/Policy Framework

Suggested reason(s) for Decision:

The decision is required to allow public consultation to be undertaken on the draft Development Management SPD in accordance with Regulations 12 & 13 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

Alternative options to be considered and recommended to be rejected:

The option to proceed without developing an SPD for Development Management purposes was considered. However, the Council considers it necessary to provide additional guidance to support decision making on planning applications and replace the Interim Development Management Planning Guidance.

Impacts analysed:

Equality ☐ Y **Privacy** ☐ x **Sustainability** ☐ x **Crime and Disorder** ☐ x

The SPD will support and provide guidance on a range of planning matters, which will be of benefit to a wide range of interested groups.

An Equalities Impact Assessment has been undertaken for the Draft Development Management SPD. In addition, as part of the preparation of the Core Strategy and

Development Plan, which this document supplements, an Equalities Impact Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal was also undertaken.	
Is the Decision consistent with the council's co-operative values?	Yes
Is this a "Key Decision" as defined in the Constitution?	Yes
Is it included in the 28-day Notice of Decisions?	Yes

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Executive Director of City Development

1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek Cabinet approval to consult on the Draft Development Management (DM) Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

2. Description of Decision (Recommendations)

- 2.1 It is recommended that Cabinet:
- approves public consultation on the Draft Development Management SPD attached at Appendix 1; and
 - delegates authority to the Executive Director of City Development in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Dynamic City to make any minor modifications to the draft DM SPD prior to the consultation.

3. Background

Development Plan

- 3.1 On 29 January 2020, the Council approved the Core Strategy and Development Plan (CSDP) for adoption. The CSDP was subsequently adopted by the Council on 30 January 2020 and now forms part of the adopted Development Plan for the city.
- 3.2 Following the adoption of the CSDP, most of the Council's existing SPDs were revoked as they either were no longer necessary due to the detail included within the CSDP itself, or as they expanded upon guidance contained within Unitary Development Plan (UDP) policies which had been deleted.
- 3.3 To provide further detailed planning guidance on policies within the adopted Development Plan, a number of SPDs are being prepared including a Development Management SPD. These SPDs will be a material planning consideration when determining relevant planning applications.

Development Management Interim Guidance

- 3.4 To ensure the Council has some Development Management guidance in place to supplement the CSDP, Cabinet approved an Interim Development Management Planning Guidance note on 11 February 2020. This guidance note is a material planning consideration in the determination of planning applications on a temporary basis.

3.5 The interim guidance comprises 3 sections covering the following topic areas:

- Section 1 - Residential Design Guide;
- Section 2 – Householder Alterations and Extensions; and
- Section 3 – Car and Cycle Parking Standards.

3.6 The guidance note was to remain a material consideration until such time as the Council could develop and adopt a Development Management SPD.

The Development Management SPD

3.7 To support the delivery of the Development Management policies contained in the CSDP and to provide additional guidance and clarity, it is considered appropriate to prepare a Development Management SPD. The Development Management SPD once adopted will supersede the interim guidance note and be a material consideration when determining planning applications.

3.8 The purpose of the Draft DM SPD is to:

- Provide additional planning guidance to decision makers on specific Development Management issues, building upon the policies contained within the adopted CSDP;
- Assist applicants to bring forward good quality developments which are policy compliant; and
- Refresh and update the Council's parking standards.

3.9 The Draft DM SPD (Appendix 1) includes 5 main sections;

- **Section 1** – Includes an introduction and overview of policy context.
- **Section 2** - Provides planning and design guidance for those who wish to extend or alter a dwellinghouse. It seeks to ensure that such development is of good design, is visually attractive, respects its surroundings as well as the local environment and does not unacceptably harm the living conditions of neighbouring properties.
- **Section 3** – has been prepared to assist developers, their design professionals and agents, in preparing proposals for residential developments. It provides criteria which planning applications for new residential development will be assessed, illustrating a preferred design approach, streamlining the planning process and ensuring the delivery of high quality, sustainable places within Sunderland.
- **Section 4** - Sets out new parking standards. The revised car and cycle parking guidance including Residential Parking Standards and Non-Residential Parking Standards
- **Section 5** – Includes guidance on advertisements including digital advertisements

3.10 In September, Cabinet approved consultation on the Development Management SPD Scoping Report. Consultation on the SPD was carried out in line with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). It began on 21 September for 4 weeks until 19 October. Due to the exceptional

circumstances regarding Covid 19, arrangements were put into place to ensure consultation on the SPD was carried out in line with Government guidance and social distancing requirements. The consultation included sending letters or emails to all contacts on the Local Plan database, informing all statutory bodies and Duty to Cooperate partners, making the relevant material available in accessible locations including online and in paper format.

4. Current Position

4.1 In total, 4 consultees made representations to the Scoping Report. The Consultation Statement (Appendix 2) summarises representations received and the Council's response. In summary the following comments were made in relation to the draft SPD:

- Concern over the sewage network and Hendon Treatment Works having the capacity to manage sewage flows from developments within the Urban Core; and
- The Coal Authority, Historic England and Highways England have no substantive comments to make at this stage.

4.2 The Council has taken into consideration all representations and where possible has included suggestions into the draft DM SPD (Appendix 1). The Consultation Statement (Appendix 2) details the representations received and the Council's response.

Next Steps

4.3 In accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, an SPD must be consulted on for four weeks. Following this consultation, a Consultation Statement needs to be prepared and consulted on alongside the revised SPD.

4.4 Consultation on the draft DM SPD will be carried out in line with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). Due to the exceptional circumstances regarding Covid 19, arrangements have been put in place to ensure consultation on the SPD can be carried out in line with Government guidance and social distancing requirements. As normal, the consultation will include sending letters or emails to all contacts on the Local Plan database, informing all statutory bodies and Duty to Cooperate partners, and making the relevant material available in accessible locations including online and in paper format.

4.5 Following consultation on the draft DM SPD, the Council will take into consideration the outcomes of the consultation and will prepare the final SPD for adoption next year.

5. Reasons for the Decision

- 5.1 The decision is required to allow public consultation to be undertaken on the DM SPD Scoping Report in accordance with Regulations 12 & 13 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

6. Alternative Options

- 6.1 The option to proceed without developing an SPD for Development Management purposes was considered. However, the Council considers it necessary to provide additional guidance to support decision making on planning applications and replace the Interim Development Management Planning Guidance.

7. Impact Analysis

- (a) **Equalities** – An Equalities Impact Assessment has been undertaken for the Draft DM SPD (Appendix 3).
- (b) **Sustainability** – As part of the preparation of the CSDP a Sustainability Appraisal was undertaken at all stages.
- (c) **Reduction of Crime and Disorder – Community Cohesion/Social Inclusion** – The SPD will seek to provide further guidance on good design which will have positive benefits in terms of community cohesion.

8. Other Relevant Considerations/Consultations

- (i) **Financial Implications** – The costs associated with the SPD consultation will be met through existing Planning Policy budgets.
- (ii) **Risk Analysis** – It is not considered that a risk analysis is necessary.
- (iii) **Legal Implications** – The applicable legislation will be adhered to throughout the process.
- (iv) **Policy Implications** – The SPD would provide new planning policy guidance which would be a material planning consideration in the determination of planning applications within the city.
- (v) **Implications for Other Services** – The SPD would be used in the determination of planning applications and therefore would not have any direct implications for Other Services.
- (vi) **The Public/External Bodies** – The Council will be consulting on the SPD.
- (vii) **Project Management Methodology** – N/A.

(viii) Procurement – N/A.

9. Background Papers

9.1 N/A

10. List of Appendices

Appendix 1 Development Management Draft SPD

Appendix 2 Development Management Draft SPD Consultation Statement

Appendix 3 Development Management SPD Equalities Impact Assessment

Copies are available in the Members' Rooms and online at

<https://www.sunderland.gov.uk/article/12733/Supplementary-Planning-Documents-SPDs->

<https://committees.sunderland.gov.uk/committees/cm5/Meetings/tabid/73/ctl/ViewMeetingPublic/mid/410/Meeting/10397/Committee/1953/Default.aspx>

Planning and Highways West Committee

2nd February 2021

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. 20/02413/TP3
Washington Cemetery The Avenue Washington Village Washington

COMMITTEE ROLE

The Sub 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 Sub Committee Chairperson or the Development Control Manager (019 561 8755) or email 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/

Peter McIntyre

Executive Director City Development

Reference No.: 20/02413/TP3 Tree Preservation order LAP Reg 3

Proposal: **Felling of 4no. mature willow trees**

Location: Washington Cemetery The Avenue Washington Village Washington

Ward: Washington Central

Applicant: Sunderland City Council

Date Valid: 22 December 2020

Target Date: 16 February 2021

PROPOSAL:

Consent is sought to remove four willow trees on council Land located in the Washington Cemetery in The Avenue, Washington Village. The site is sited within the Washington Village Conservation Area and is subject to the Washington Village Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Strategy (CAMS) which states that the council will encourage the retention of trees which make a valuable contribution to the character of an area by making tree preservation orders and replacing trees in highways and other public areas which will help maintain the character of the area.

TYPE OF PUBLICITY:

Site Notice Posted

CONSULTEES:

Washington Central - Ward Councillor Consultation

Final Date for Receipt of Representations: **04.02.2021**

REPRESENTATIONS:

None received

POLICIES:

In the Unitary Development Plan and Core Strategy and Development Plan the site is subject to the following policies;

NE3

COMMENTS:

The proposal involves the removal of four willow trees which are causing lifting to the edge of the footway within the cemetery.

The main issue is whether or not the proposed works would have an impact upon the contribution the tree offers to the character of the area.

NE3 of the Core Strategy and development Plan is applicable which states that the City Council will encourage the retention of trees which make a valuable contribution to the character of an area by the making of Tree Preservation Orders and replacing trees in highways and other public areas, with species that help maintain the character of the locality. The retention of trees, hedges and landscape features in all new development will be required where possible. Furthermore, that the City Council will retain, protect and improve woodland, trees subject to Tree Preservation Orders, trees within Conservation Areas, and 'important' hedgerows as defined by the Hedgerows Regulations 1997, as well as giving consideration to them on individual merit as well as their contribution to amenity and interaction as part of a group within the broader landscape setting.

In this case the trees are spread out within the cemetery and Council's Arboricultural Officer has recommended the removal of the trees to protect the public from raised pavement and dropping branches. There are many other trees within the vicinity, and they are in the centre away from the street scene. It is therefore considered that the removal of the trees would not affect the character of the surrounding area would be maintained, in accordance with policy NE3 above.

RECOMMENDATION

For the reasons set out above, the proposed tree works are considered to be acceptable and compliant with the requirements of policy NE3 of the Core Strategy and Development Plan.

It is therefore recommended that Members be Mindful to Grant Consent under Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Regulations) 1992 (as amended) for the proposed works subject to the expiry of the consultation period on 4th February and no objections being received.

RECOMMENDATION:

Conditions:

- 1 No tree shown to be retained on the approved plans shall be cut down, uprooted or destroyed, nor shall any retained tree be topped or lopped other than in accordance with the approved plans and particulars, without the written approval of the Local Planning Authority. Any topping or lopping approved shall be carried out in accordance with British Standard 3998 "Tree Work", in the interests of visual amenity and to comply with policy NE3 of the CSDP.

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
21/00059/FUL	Ajay Brickworks	Equestrian use of land, formation of horse track through partial re-levelling, fencing, and planting.	12/01/2021	13/04/2021
Copt Hill	Land South Of High Lane (North/West Of A690) StoneygateNewbottle Houghton-le-SpringDH4 4NH			
19/01319/OUT	Gladman Developments Ltd	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 FarmNorth RoadHetton-le-HoleHoughton-le-Spring			

Application Ref and Ward	Applicant and Address	Proposal	Date Valid	Determination Date
20/00134/LP3	City Development	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 CentreCygnet WayRainton Bridge SouthHoughton-le- SpringDH4 5QY			
14/01371/OUT	Mr Colin Ford	Outline application for erection of 82 dwellings (all matters reserved) (reconsultation on amended scheme).	17/11/2014	16/02/2015
Hetton	Coal Bank FarmHetton- le-HoleHoughton-le- SpringDH5 0DX			
20/01591/FU4	Hellens Land Ltd	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 CollieryNewbottle StreetHoughton-le- Spring			

Application Ref and Ward	Applicant and Address	Proposal	Date Valid	Determination Date
19/01743/MAW	The Durham Company Ltd	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 Sedgeleth Industrial Estate Houghton-le-			
19/01446/FUL	Karbon Homes	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			

Application Ref and Ward	Applicant and Address	Proposal	Date Valid	Determination Date
17/02445/FUL	Persimmon Homes Durham	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 Lane Houghton Le Spring Newbottle			
17/00589/FUL	Persimmon Homes Durham	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
Houghton	Land At Lambton Lane Houghton-le-Spring			

Application Ref and Ward	Applicant and Address	Proposal	Date Valid	Determination Date
20/02048/MAW	Bramble Environmental Limited	Application for the installation of soil washing plant within the existing building.	15/01/2021	16/04/2021
Shiney Row	Grab And Deliver Limited Freezemoor Road New Herrington Industrial Estate Tyne & Wear Houghton Le Spring DH4 7BG			
20/02027/HE4	Taylor Wimpey North East	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
Shiney Row	Land South West Of Herrington Country Park Chester Road Penshaw Sunderland			

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			
20/01309/FUL	Windsor Engineering LTD	Erection of 2no. commercial units including new vehicular access and associated parking /service areas.	11/08/2020	10/11/2020
Washington North	4 Turbine WaySunderlandSR5 3NZ			

Application Ref and Ward	Applicant and Address	Proposal	Date Valid	Determination Date
20/01754/FUL	Homes By Esh And Hellens Group	.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 (amended plans and revised drainage strategy submitted).	23/09/2020	23/12/2020
Washington West	Land To The North Of Mount LaneSpringwellNE9 7UQ			
20/02278/FUL	Velocity 194 - Buccleuch Property & Argon Properties	Construction of logistics warehouse, with associated earthworks, landscaping, parking and access proposals.	03/12/2020	04/03/2021
Washington West	Land AtArmstrong RoadArmstrong Industrial EstateWashington			