

**At a Meeting of the DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (SOUTH SUNDERLAND) SUB-COMMITTEE held in the CIVIC CENTRE on TUESDAY 22<sup>nd</sup> NOVEMBER, 2016 at 4.45 p.m.**

**Present:-**

Councillor Porthouse in the Chair

Councillors M. Dixon, English, I. Galbraith, Hunt, Hodson, Jackson, Mordey and P. Smith

**Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

**Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Ball, Bell, D. Dixon, Kay, Scaplehorn, P. Watson and S. Watson

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

The Executive Director of Economy and Place submitted a report and supplementary report (copies circulated) relating to the South Sunderland area, copies of which had been forwarded to each Member of the Council, upon applications made under the Town and Country Planning Acts and Regulations made thereunder.

(For copy reports – see original minutes).

**16/00748/FU4 – Erection of new six storey building comprising 54 studio, 1, 2 and 3 bed apartments with commercial units on the ground floor (A1, B1 or D1 Use Class). (amended plans received on 21.09.2016)  
42-45 Nile Street, Sunderland, SR1 1ES**

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

It was recommended that the proposed condition 11 be removed from any consent granted as it was not considered necessary to restrict occupancy to students only.

Councillor M. Dixon queried the separation standards as Biscop House was very close to the proposed building. He was advised by the representative of the Executive Director of Economy and Place that the separation standards were

guidelines and as such were flexible; within a city centre location such as this it was acknowledged that requiring the spacing standards to be met could lead to sites being undevelopable as there was not the space within city centres to enable the required separation between buildings. A large number of the existing buildings within the city centre did not meet the separation standards.

The Chairman referred to the neighbouring St Georges Presbyterian Chapel and commented that it had been surrounded by developments of varying quality; he felt that the proposed development was of a high quality and that it would not have a detrimental impact on the chapel. He also commented that some residents would likely own cars and queried the bin storage arrangements. The representative of the Executive Director of Economy and Place advised that there was an enclosed bin storage area within the curtilage of the building and that there was also cycle storage included. Councillor M. Dixon added that there was a lot of parking available in the area, especially in the evenings.

Members discussed the application and it was:-

1. RESOLVED that the application be approved under regulation 4 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations Order 1992 for the reasons set out in the report subject to the signing of a Section 106 agreement in respect of play provision and subject to the conditions set out in the report with condition number 11 being removed.

### **Change in the Order of Business**

The Chairman advised that applications 2 and 4 would be considered together as they both related to the same proposed development.

**16/01556/FUL – Conversion of Existing Bedsits (Use Class Sui Generis) into 14 self-contained apartments (Use Class C3)**

**18/19 Murton Street, Sunderland, SR1 2QY**

**16/01719/LBC – Internal alterations to facilitate conversion of existing bedsits (Use Class Sui Generis) into 14 self-contained apartments (Use Class C3).**

**18/19 Murton Street, Sunderland, SR1 2QY**

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

There were concerns over residential amenity as there would be no window in the bedroom of the rear basement flat in number 18; the living room/kitchen in the basement flat in number 19 had a doorway but no window; and the flat in the roof space of number 19 would only have roof lights. The applicant had been made aware of these issues and had submitted a new layout plan however as this had only just been received it had not yet been assessed to ensure that the revised layout was acceptable in residential amenity terms. Members were recommended to approve the applications subject to the amended plans being acceptable.

Councillor Mordey welcomed the plans to change the use of the property however he was concerned that the proposal represented an overly intensive use given that some of the rooms did not have any windows and that studios were simply bedsits

with a different name. He felt that the application should be brought back to Members once the amended plans had been considered by the Planning Officers.

Councillor Hodson agreed with Councillor Mordey's concerns and added that he was concerned about the parking arrangements; the rear yard was intended for use for bin and cycle storage and as there was only parking for up to 8 vehicles at the front it was possible that vehicles would be parked on the pavements.

Councillor M. Dixon referred to the fact that not all of the flats would have access into the rear yard; he was concerned by the impact this could have on fire safety. The representative of the Executive Director of Economy and Place advised that this was a Building Regulations matter and would be controlled by Building Control; it was not possible to refuse the Planning application because it did not comply with Building Regulations.

Councillor English expressed concerns that the Committee was being asked to determine the applications without having all of the necessary information available.

The Chairman, seconded by Councillor Mordey, moved that both of the applications should be deferred until a future meeting so that the Committee could be provided with all of the necessary information to make an informed decision. Councillor Mordey also stated that the applicant should be informed of Members concerns over the excessive number of units proposed.

With all Members being in agreement it was:-

2. RESOLVED that the applications be deferred in order to allow further information to be provided on the proposed layout of the units.

**16/01562/FUL – Erection of a public house and restaurant facility (use class A4) with associated car parking, landscaping and access.  
Former Dewhirst Factory, Pennywell Industrial Estate, Sunderland, SR4 9EP**

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

The site was allocated for industrial use and the proposed use did not fit into this category. There had however been an employment land review undertaken which had identified an oversupply of industrial/employment land in the South Sunderland area and given that this site had been vacant for a number of years there was no justification for retaining the site for industrial purposes.

The proposed use was a town centre use and as it was being proposed for an out of centre location there had been a sequential test undertaken to identify whether there were any other more suitable sites for the development; a number of other sites had been considered however they had been deemed to be less suitable for this development than the application site or they did not fit into the business model for the applicant.

Councillor M. Dixon referred to the parking arrangements and queried whether two disabled parking spaces would be sufficient given that the applicant proposed to

target and older clientele. The representative of the Executive Director of Economy and Place advised that the minimum requirement was for two disabled parking spaces however if the operator wanted to provide more spaces then they could.

Councillor Hodson referred to the new pedestrian links and stated that the nearest residential areas were across busy main roads and he queried whether there were sufficient links between the site and the residential areas as the nearest crossing point over Chester Road was a subway which was a significant distance along the road. The representative of the Executive director of Economy and Place advised that there had been pedestrian links through the site approved as part of the previously approved plans for the KFC drive through adjacent to the application site. The pedestrian links beyond the site were outside of the applicant's control and was the responsibility of the Highways department. Highways had raised no concerns over the pedestrian links.

The Chairman then introduced the applicant's agent Mr Michael Robson who addressed the Committee in support of the application. He advised that Marston's were a brewery which had a programme of building new public houses and there had been similar developments completed recently in Ashington and at Dalton Park. The site had stood empty for a number of years and it was intended that work would start as soon as possible and it was hoped that the premises would be open within the next 12 months. There had been consultation with the local community and the responses had been positive. The application would provide 30 full and part time jobs for local people and there would be accommodation above the pub for the manager and their family. The business model was for food lead premises and there would not be live or amplified music. The access arrangements had already been approved as part of the application for the KFC on the adjacent site. Two disabled spaces was normally sufficient to meet demand however it would not be a problem to increase the number of disabled spaces should the need arise.

Councillor Hodson commented that the proposal would improve the appearance of an important gateway into the city and queried what name the pub would be given. Mr Robson stated that a name had not yet been chosen however local cues were used when deciding on the name; he also advised that the signage was normally understated and not illuminated however the exact details of the signage would be set by the advertising consent which would be dealt with by way of a separate application.

3. RESOLVED that the application be approved for the reasons set out in the report and supplementary report subject to the 18 conditions set out within the supplementary report.

**16/01640/VAR – Variation of condition 2 of planning approval 15/01267/FU4 (Change of use from offices (class B1(a)) to 111no. studio apartments (Class C3) for the student letting market. External alterations to form new window openings at high level, part new glazing and external decorations). Reduce studio apartments from 111no. to 105no. and internal alterations to existing layouts.**

**Upper Floors, Cassaton House, 43-49 Fawcett Street, Sunderland, SR1 1RR**

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

4. RESOLVED that consent be granted for the reasons set out in the report subject to the 4 conditions set out therein.

#### **Items for Information**

5. RESOLVED that the following site visits be undertaken:-
  - a. 16/02081/SU4 – Land at Nookside, Sunderland at the request of the Chairman.

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

(Signed) S. PORTHOUSE,  
Chairman.