# At a meeting of the PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE held in COMMITTEE ROOM 2 on WEDNESDAY, 12<sup>TH</sup> OCTOBER, 2016 at 5.30 p.m.

#### Present:-

Councillor Bell in the Chair

Councillors Allen, Ball, Beck, M. Dixon, English, Jackson, Kay, Lauchlan, Middleton, Mordey, Porthouse, Scaplehorn, Taylor, M. Turton, W. Turton and D. Wilson.

#### **Declarations of Interest**

Item 9 – Objections to TRO in the vicinity of East Herrington Primary Academy

Councillor Mordey and Porthouse both made open declarations that they had contact with both the objectors and Council officers regarding these proposals during an earlier stage in the process but they had retained an open mind on the proposals and would be considering the item based on the evidence to be presented to the committee.

#### **Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Chequer, Cummings, Francis, I. Galbraith, P. Smith, G. Walker, P. Walker and P. Watson.

## Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 10<sup>th</sup> August, 2016.

1. RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> August, 2016 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

#### Report of the Meetings of the Development Control (North Sunderland) Sub Committee held on 9<sup>th</sup> August, 6<sup>th</sup> September and 20<sup>th</sup> September (extraordinary) 2016.

The report of the meetings of the Development Control (North Sunderland) Sub-Committee held on 9<sup>th</sup> August, 6<sup>th</sup> September and 20<sup>th</sup> September (extraordinary), 2016 (copies circulated) were submitted.

#### (For copy report – see original minutes)

#### 2. RESOLVED that the report be received and noted.

#### Report of the meetings of the Development Control (South Sunderland) Sub Committee held on 9<sup>th</sup> August and 20<sup>th</sup> September, 2016.

The report of the meetings of the Development Control (South Sunderland) Sub-Committee held on 9<sup>th</sup> August and 20<sup>th</sup> September, 2016 (copies circulated) were submitted.

(For copy report – see original minutes)

#### 3. RESOLVED that the report be received and noted.

#### Report of the meeting of the Development Control (Hetton, Houghton and Washington) Sub Committee held on 13<sup>th</sup> July, 9<sup>th</sup> August, 6<sup>th</sup> September and 20<sup>th</sup> September (Extraordinary), 2016.

The report of the meetings of the Development Control (Hetton, Houghton and Washington) Sub-Committee held on 13<sup>th</sup> July, 9<sup>th</sup> August, 6<sup>th</sup> September and 20<sup>th</sup> September (Extraordinary), 2016 (copies circulated) were submitted.

(For copy report – see original minutes)

4. RESOLVED that the report be received and noted.

#### Change in order of business

The Chairman proposed to the Committee that Item 9 – Objections to the TRO at East Herrington Primary Academy should be considered first as there were members of the public in attendance for this item. The other Members of the Committee agreed to this course of action.

#### Objections to Traffic Regulation Order for Proposed Waiting, Loading and Parking Place Restrictions in the vicinity of East Herrington Primary Academy, Part of the proposed City of Sunderland (Various Locations)(Waiting, Loading and Parking Places) General Order

The Chief Executive submitted a report (copy circulated) to advise the Committee regarding objections that had been received by the Council in respect of the proposed Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for the introduction of waiting, loading and parking restrictions in the vicinity of East Herrington Primary Academy, as part of the proposed City of Sunderland (Various Locations) (Waiting, Loading and Parking Places) General Order. Officers recommended that the Committee do not uphold the objections as they cannot be resolved within the constraints of the scheme as set out in the report. (For copy report – see original minutes)

Paul Robinson, Group Engineer, presented the report and the scheme proposals and was on hand to answer any Member's queries.

Councillor Porthouse commented that he welcomed the report but wished to add that the report did not make reference to the two informal public consultation meetings had also taken place with residents as part of the initial development of the scheme proposals, and felt this should be noted for the record.

Councillor Porthouse also commented that a great deal of consideration had been given by officers as part of the development of the proposals and it was unfortunate that such measures had to be introduced but he felt this outcome was the best solution in the circumstances.

The Chairman commented that parking outside of schools throughout the city was a major problem.

The Chairman introduced Mr Ian Walker, a local resident who wished to speak in objection to the proposals. Mr Walker advised that the double yellow lines proposed on Silksworth Road would have a great impact upon residents, the report stated that this was a dangerous road yet in 30 years he had never seen an accident and these proposals would result in him having to reverse his cars off the drive which would impact upon the road traffic and deliveries to his property would also be impacted by the scheme.

Mr Walker commented that the in his view the parking issues only occur during school times and for 15 minute periods on a morning and an afternoon and to implement these conditions for 24 hours a day was in his opinion a very heavy handed approach.

Mr Robinson advised that the double yellow lines on this road would not prohibit deliveries to these properties and Council officers would always advise residents to reverse onto driveways. Mr Robison noted the comments in relation to the school times but unfortunately, parked cars on this section of Silksworth Road were causing obstructions for the bus operators and they had provided representations that they supported the need for the scheme. If the proposals were to be modified by limiting the proposed prohibition of waiting on this section of Silksworth Road to school opening and closing times only then it would be appropriate for the Council to consult the interested parties on the proposed modification. In the circumstances, it was likley that the bus operators would object to the modification given their current position and this could trigger a public inquiry.

Councillor D. Wilson commented that the problem of parking around schools was happening in all wards and in general this appeared in his opinion to only be a problem for 15 minutes on a morning and 15 minutes on an afternoon. He therefore questioned whether a modification should be considered to limit the operation of the restrictions.

The Chair repeated the advice received from officers that the current proposals had the support of the local transport providers and the 24 hours operation was a main part of this scheme, should this be removed, it would be appropriate to re-consult and it was likely that the bus operators would object and could trigger a public inquiry into the revised proposals.

Councillor Porthouse commented that it was an unfortunate situation and he could see both sides of the argument. Councillor Porthouse also queried whether in future the option of parking permits for residents could be investigated.

Councillor Mordey advised the Committee that the implementation of parking schemes were to stop long term commuter parking in specific hotspot locations and he was not sure that this scenario would fit the criteria required but he was more than happy to sit down with ward councillors to look into this issue further at a future date.

Councillor D. Wilson commented that parking problems were only going to get worse in the city and we shouldn't just be restricted to one or two options, therefore he felt there was a need for further discussions for more ways forward.

Councillor Kay raised concerns that if more parking management schemes were to be introduced that these would need to be enforced with the finite resources available.

Councillor Mordey also informed the Committee that any potential Parking Management Schemes would come at a cost to those residents that had more than one car therefore may not be welcomed by those in the area.

The Chairman commented that the situation may in the future warrant a potential reduction in speed limits from 30mph to 20 mph, plus warning signs.

Mr Robinson advised that certain criteria was needed to meet the implementation of Parking Management Schemes and unfortunately in this instance they were trying to prevent vehicles from parking on the relevant stretch of carriageway as they were causing an obstruction.

Mr Robinson also advised that recommendations (iii) and (iv) on page 179 of the agenda report was to be amended from The Executive Director of Commercial Development to The Chief Executive.

Having been put the officer's recommendation to the vote, with 12 Members voting in favour and 2 Members voting against, it was:-

#### 5. RESOLVED that

(i) The objections received to the Traffic Regulation Order, for the proposed City of Sunderland (Various Locations) (Waiting, Loading and Parking Places) General Order not be upheld.

- (ii) All objectors be advised accordingly of the decision.
- (iii) The Chief Executive instruct the Head of Law and Governance to take all necessary steps to bring into effect the associated Traffic Regulation Order.
- (iv) The Chief Executive take all necessary action to implement the physical works associated with City of Sunderland (Various Locations) (Waiting, Loading and Parking Places) General Order.

# Draft Minster Quarter Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

The Chief Executive submitted a report (copy circulated) for the Committee to offer advice and consideration of the Cabinet report considered on 21 September 2016 seeking approval of the Draft Minster Quarter Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

(for copy report – see original minutes)

Dan Hattle, Planning Implementation Manager and Idris Balarabe, Senior Urban Designer presented the report and provided a powerpoint presentation (for copy see original minutes) and were on hand to answer member queries.

Councillor Kay commented that he was broadly in favour of the draft masterplan but he also had some misgivings about the proposals. The works around High Street West and the Dunn Cow were welcome but turning some of the buildings around in the area would be very expensive and beyond the Bridges, we have had very little success in attracting footfall here and there was a need for greater results on this.

Councillor Kay queried the impact this was going to have on the residents who already lived in the area as the plan as it stood almost indicated that there were no residents there at present and it was critical as a planning authority that they were aware of the dust/noise and interruptions that they would be encountering with a development of this scale.

Councillor Kay enquired as to how this linked up with plans for the rest of the city such as the Vaux site as he believed if we dealt with this in isolation we would miss the opportunities for synergy and he did not see any flow or pattern at present. Councillor Kay also queried how we would manage the bus routes/stops etc as they were few and far between.

Councillor Porthouse commented that he had difficulty in determining where the heart of our city centre was and queried if this would now be Keel Square. Councillor Porthouse also queried the transportation and the effect this would have on Sunniside and the need to balance the two projects. Mr Hattle advised that this was a huge opportunity at the Minster Quarter and it was not the intention for this to be at the expense of Sunniside with the Council awaiting a Heritage Lottery Fund decision to enable residential developments to be brought up to scratch.

In response to Councillor D. Wilson's enquiry over where coaches visiting the Empire could park, Mr Hattle advised that this falls within the investment corridor programme and there was investment being made into High Street West and also the capital programme was looking at a link road through St Mary's Way into the Minster area to improve traffic flows throughout, including coaches. There were ongoing investigations to find a better solution to tackle the issue.

Councillor Mordey commented that Sunniside had not progressed at the pace that it should have due to being caught up in the financial crash yet they had acquired land and plans were ongoing therefore he did not see the Minster Quarter development being at the detriment of Sunniside. Discussions were taking place over transport, alleviating the problems at Holmeside and the need to get bus companies to use the Park Lane Interchange so there were numerous things being worked on in the background to hopefully bring all the plans together.

Councillor M. Dixon commented that he felt the scheme for the Minster Quarter was excellent and queried if the residential part of the plans were integral or if it was intended to see how things turned out.

Mr Balarabe advised that yes there was the opportunity for residential elements but this would be limited and market led. The Vaux site masterplan also has residential developments planned as part of its scheme.

Councillor M. Dixon referred to earlier comments in relation to the heart of the city centre and believed that this was the opportunity to create that.

Councillor English commented that he welcomed the plan and anything that attracted redevelopment was fantastic but he did have concerns over transport and the use of public services as we did not have the sufficient network at present unlike Newcastle and the Metro services.

Mr Hattle advised that they were looking for a balance between public transport and parking for the scheme as they also wanted to create a pedestrian environment in the area.

Members having fully considered the report, it was:-

6. RESOLVED that the Committees comments be noted and reported back to the Cabinet at a future date for further consideration.

### **Revised Guidance on the Validation of Planning Applications**

The Commercial Development Directorate submitted a report (copy circulated) for the Committee to consider the revised guidance on the new Validation of Planning Applications list which would be brought into use with immediate effect from 13<sup>th</sup> October 2016.

(for copy report – See original minutes)

Toni Sambridge, Principal Development Management Planner presented the report and was on hand to answer Members queries.

7. RESOLVED that the Committee noted and endorsed the contents of the report and noted that the new Sunderland Validation List would be brought into use immediately from 13<sup>th</sup> October, 2016.

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

(Signed) R. BELL (Chairman)