

**At a meeting of the PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS (EAST) COMMITTEE  
held in the CIVIC CENTRE COUNCIL CHAMBER on MONDAY 1<sup>st</sup>  
NOVEMBER 2021 at 5.30 p.m.**

**Present:-**

Councillor Butler in the Chair.

Councillors Dixon, Doyle, Foster, Morrissey, Noble, Peacock, Reed, Scanlan, P. Smith, Stewart and D. Wilson.

**Declarations of Interest**

Declarations of interest were made by Members in respect of the following items of business:-

Item 4, Applications made under the Town and Country Planning Acts and Regulations made thereunder – Planning Application 20/02296/LP3 - Hendon Sidings Enterprise Zone Adjacent to Prospect Row

Councillor Stewart declared an interest in the Item as a member of the Port Board and left the meeting at the appropriate point on the agenda taking no part in any discussion or decision thereon.

Councillor Dixon made an open declaration that he had been approached by two residents as their ward Councillor who were seeking procedural advice regarding how they would be able to make representations at the Committee however, he was satisfied that he was able to consider the application with an open mind.

Councillor Wilson made an open declaration in the application as an occasional patron of the Welcome Tavern in the past, however he was satisfied that he was able to consider the application with an open mind.

Item 4, Applications made under the Town and Country Planning Acts and Regulations made thereunder.

- i). Planning Application 18/00640/FUL - Burdon Lane, Burdon, Sunderland
- ii). Planning Application 21/00451/LP3 - Land Between Highclere Drive and Cherry Knowle
- iii). Planning Application 21/01544/FU4 - Land at Burdon Lane Burdon Lane Burdon Sunderland

Councillor Doyle declared a pecuniary interest in Items (i) and (iii) above and an interest in Item (ii) above due to the related nature of that application to

Items (i) and (iii) and the potential perception of bias and left the meeting at the appropriate point on the agenda taking no part in any discussions or decisions thereon.

Item 4 Applications made under the Town and Country Planning Acts and Regulations made thereunder, Planning Application 21/01542/LP3 - Former Vaux Site Land North of Saint Mary's Boulevard

Councillor Dixon made an open declaration that he had undertaken discussions on the matter with members of the Durham Bird Club however he was satisfied that he was able to consider the application with an open mind.

### **Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted to the meeting on behalf of Councillors E. Gibson and Hodson.

### **Minutes of the last meeting of the Planning and Highways (East) Committee held on 4<sup>th</sup> October 2021**

2. RESOLVED that the minutes of the last meeting of the Planning and Highways (East) Committee held on 4<sup>th</sup> October 2021 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

### **Planning Application Reference 18/00640/FUL – 60 dwellings with Access from Burdon Lane and Associated Open Space, Landscaping, Infrastructure and Earthworks- Burdon Lane, Burdon, Sunderland**

The Executive Director of City Development submitted a report (copy circulated) in respect of the above matter.

(for copy report – see original minutes)

The representative of the Executive Director of City Development presented the report advising the Committee of the key issues to consider in determining the application.

Members were informed that an application to erect 60 dwellings with access from Burdon Road and associated open space, landscaping, infrastructure and earthworks was approved at the Planning and Highways (East) Committee meeting held on 29<sup>th</sup> March 2021. Since that decision was made, the previous developer (Persimmon – Charles Church) had been replaced by Barratt David Wilson Homes (BDW) who now owned the site. As a consequence of the change in house builders, agreement had been reached between parties that all of the associated technical documents and plans have been transferred to BDW to enable them to substitute the previous agreed house types with their own designs. As the majority of the plans listed in draft

condition 2 reflected the scheme previously submitted, there was a need to update this condition.

In concluding the Officer informed the Committee that the proposed updated house types were considered to provide an acceptable form of design and were characteristic of the aspirations of the SSGA SPD in terms of overall housing mix and size. The scale, massing and appearance were all considered to provide a positive form of development and the selected materials provide an acceptable visual built form. The Committee was recommended to approve the application subject to the 29 conditions previously agreed by committee together with the modification to condition 2, as detailed in the report

There being no questions or comments on the application, and the Officer recommendation having been put to the Committee it was:-

3. RESOLVED that approval be granted to the application subject to the signing of the Section 106 Agreement and the draft conditions listed in the report, including the updated condition 2.

**Planning Application Reference 20/02296/LP3 – Engineering works including the creation of a new vehicular access from Barrack Street, alterations to the vehicular access from Extension Road and the re-profiling of the site - Hendon Sidings Enterprise Zone, adjacent to Prospect Row, Port of Sunderland**

The Executive Director of City Development submitted a report (copy circulated) in respect of the above matter.

(for copy report – see original minutes)

The representative of the Executive Director of City Development presented the report and the additional information contained in the circulated late sheet, advising the Committee of the key issues to consider in determining the application.

Members were informed that the site covered approximately 5.5ha and was historically occupied by railway sidings. It was bordered by Prospect Row and the remains of the Town Moor to the west, Barrack Street to the north, Extension Road to the south and the rail line serving the nearby Port of Sunderland to the east. The site was faced by dwellings on the opposite side of Prospect Row and the Welcome Tavern public house stood in isolation at the junction of Prospect Row and Barrack Street. Together with land within the Port, the site formed part of the Port of Sunderland Enterprise Zone, a status which offered enhanced capital allowances for businesses investing in the Zone and included funding for remediation and infrastructure works to accelerate and stimulate the development and delivery of the sites within the Zone.

The application essentially sought to make the Hendon Sidings site primed and readily available for developer/investment interest.

In conclusion, the Officer advised the meeting that it was considered that the proposed development was acceptable in land use terms given that the site preparation works were intended to support the redevelopment of a key brownfield site which was allocated for commercial and industrial development in the Council's adopted Core Strategy. He reiterated that the current application was for site preparation works only and any future development would be subject to further planning applications. For the reasons outlined in the main report, the current proposals were not considered to give rise to any significant concerns in relation to visual and residential amenity, the setting of the Old Sunderland Conservation Area and other nearby heritage assets, archaeology, highway and pedestrian safety, ecology, flood risk and drainage and land contamination.

It was therefore recommended that consent was granted for the development subject to the recommended conditions detailed in the report and the additional conditions relating to ecology highlighted in the supplemental report.

The Chairman thanked the Officer for his report and invited questions from Members.

Councillor Morrissey stated that the application seemed purely speculative in the hope of attracting industry to the site. He questioned how could it be the case, that residents amenity in the future would not be affected and asked what would the site look like in the future if fully developed. The Officer replied that the site was allocated for industry in the Council's Core Strategy and was also part of the Port of Sunderland Enterprise Zone. It was not known what developments would be created on the site, but all would be subject to the statutory planning process.

Councillor Wilson questioned the cost of the development to the Council and expressed concern that the further development of the site for industry would only increase the number of HGVs travelling down High Street West and past the Welcome Tavern which was currently situated in a fairly quiet street. The Officer replied that the application was not intended to create a through route but to provide access in order to support the potential future development of the site. Councillor Wilson replied that as that development was intended to be industrial rather than housing it would inevitably lead to an increase of HGVs in the area of Extension Road.

In response to an enquiry from Councillor Scanlan, the Officer stated that he was unable to confirm whether or not any expressions of interest had been received regarding the future development of the site.

Councillor Scanlan stated that the proposed road and associated vehicles would be right on residents' front doors, and suggested that a site visit should

be arranged so the Committee could fully appreciate how close the road would actually be.

Councillor Doyle stated that he was aware of guidance in relation to the proximity of electricity sub stations to buildings and queried the location of proposed sub-station in the application. The Officer advised that a sub-station would be erected adjacent to the proposed northern access at Barrack Street not far from the Welcome Tavern.

In response to an enquiry from Councillor Doyle, the Officer briefed the Committee on the measures to be taken to ensure that the required bio-diversity net gain would be achieved and confirmed that there would be a condition attached to any permission to ensure that this was monitored.

In response to a further enquiry from Councillor Doyle, the Officer confirmed that any future developments on the site would also be required to show the same level of bio-diversity net gain.

Councillor Doyle referred to the request for a site visit and asked if the application had previously been included in the matrix documents submitted to the Committee. The Officer confirmed that this was the case with the application having been submitted in December 2020.

Councillor Foster stated that he knew the area reasonably well. He shared the concerns expressed by Councillor Scanlan and supported her request for a site visit. Councillor Dixon added that he would also like to see consideration of the application deferred to a future meeting to allow a site visit to be undertaken.

In response to an enquiry from Councillor Dixon, the Officer confirmed that he had no concerns regarding the proximity of the sub-station and it was believed that it would not raise any issues in terms of amenity.

Councillor Dixon referred to his discussions with Mr Moon and Mr Mordey. He stated that Mr Mordey had expressed concerns that the consultation process had not been good and that he had not received any notification of the application. Councillor Dixon asked if the Council was satisfied that everyone who needed to know about the application had received notification. The Officer replied that he was satisfied that the public consultation met with Council requirements. This had included letters to nearby residents, site notices and public notices in the Sunderland Echo.

(As a point of clarification Councillor Scanlan informed the Committee that the Mr Michael Mordey referred to by Councillor Dixon was not the former Councillor Michael Mordey.)

Councillor Dixon stated that he was not sure whether it was relevant, but he asked if the Officer was able to inform the Committee why previous plans for the Council to purchase the Welcome Tavern had not proceeded. The Officer confirmed that the issue was not materially relevant to consideration of the

planning application. Any proposed land deals were a private matter for the parties concerned.

Councillor Dixon referred to the objections raised by the licensee of the Welcome Tavern detailed on page 58 of the agenda papers and in particular his worries over the effect of the development on the structural integrity of the whole building. Councillor Dixon suggested that it might be in the best interests of the Port, and all concerned if the property was structurally surveyed and suggested that this could be added as a condition to any approval.

The Officer advised that any works undertaken on a development granted planning consent needed to be carried out in a manner that did not impact on the structural integrity of neighbouring properties, however this was something that was the responsibility of the Developer and sat outside the planning process. It was not something that could be enforced through a condition attached to the grant of planning approval. Councillor Dixon reiterated that he believed it was still in the best interests of the Port that they carried out a structural survey of the property. The Officer advised that the Port could undertake a survey if it saw fit however it was not something that could be enforced as part of the planning process. In response to an enquiry from Councillor Doyle, the Officer confirmed that because it lay outside the planning process, the imposition of such a condition was likely to be deemed as indefensible and liable to be overturned on appeal.

In response to an enquiry from Councillor Noble, the Officer briefed the Committee on the implications of the development relative to archaeology and the likely impact of archaeological assessments on any future development of the site.

Councillor Reed referred to the Officer's belief that the Council had met its obligations and asked how many letters had been sent to residents. The Officer advised that a single letter of consultation had been sent to 115 residents in the vicinity of the proposed development. Councillor Reed expressed concern that because people lived busy lives, perhaps one letter was not enough. The Officer replied that the consultation with residents was wider than that required by statute. The Council was under no obligation to reconsult unless substantial amendments were made to the scheme originally submitted. He confirmed that only 4 responses had been received as a result of the consultation.

There being no further questions for the Officer, the Chairman welcomed and introduced Mr Geoff Moon, who had requested the opportunity to address the Committee and speak in objection to the application. The Chairman advised that he would have 5 minutes to do so.

Mr Moon stated that he had listened with interest to the presentation and Members questions. He advised that his objection was based purely on the disruption that would be caused to the lives of local residents and their businesses. He informed the Committee that the Welcome Tavern was a

delicate building built in 1830 and the new road would come within 12 feet of it providing a barrier to people wishing to visit. The surrounding area housed a lot of young families with children who liked to play in the street. The new road would make this very dangerous with the likelihood of accidents as well as an increase in exhaust fumes being detrimental to residents' health. Health concerns had also been raised in respect of electromagnetic emissions from the planned substation. The residents opposite the development were also concerned regarding the stopping up of the existing road which would prevent them from parking.

Mr Moon also believed that the consultation had been inadequate. The letter had been sent to residents on 22<sup>nd</sup> December during the run up to Christmas in the middle of a pandemic. He felt that the consultation should have taken the form of a face to face public meeting. He welcomed that efforts were being made to attract industry to the city but believed that it should not be done in a way that was detrimental to local residents and businesses.

The Chair thanked Mr Moon for his presentation and invited questions from Members.

In response to enquiries from Councillor Scanlan, Mr Moon confirmed that The Welcome Tavern had a 15ft cellar that ran the length of the building. Whilst not being fully covered by the proposed road, part of it would protrude under it and he was worried that the increase in traffic could collapse the cellar wall.

The Chairman referred to the requests made by members during the debate to defer further consideration for a site visit and asked if this was still the case? In response it was moved by Councillor Scanlan and duly seconded by Councillor Foster that consideration of the application was deferred to a future meeting to allow a Member's site visit to be undertaken.

In response to an enquiry from the Solicitor as to why a site visit was required, Councillor Scanlan stated that the issues raised could not be fully appreciated unless you were on the ground as it was difficult to grasp from the drawings and plans included in the presentation.

Councillor Doyle placed on record that he was uncomfortable with the proposal to defer consideration for a site visit as he believed ample opportunity had been given for this to have been requested while the application was present on the matrix.

Upon being put to the vote, the motion was carried with 9 Members voting in favour, 1 voting against and 1 abstention. Accordingly it was:-

4. RESOLVED that consideration of the application be deferred to a future meeting of the Committee to allow a Members' Site Visit to be undertaken.

**Planning Application 21/00154/FUL – Erection of 4no. bed detached dwelling house - Land at 145 The Broadway, Grindon, Sunderland**

The Executive Director of City Development submitted a report (copy circulated) in respect of the above matter.

(for copy report – see original minutes)

The representative of the Executive Director of City Development presented the report advising the Committee of the key issues to consider in determining the application in relation to the Principle of development, Design and amenity, Tandem and backland development, Contamination, Natural Heritage and Highway safety.

In conclusion the Committee was advised that the proposed development was considered an acceptable form of development which retained the character and design of other properties within the street scene. It provided sufficient amenity to the future occupants and was acceptable in terms of highway safety. Members were therefore recommended to approve the application.

The Chairman thanked the Officer for his presentation and invited questions from the Committee.

In response to an enquiry from Councillor Doyle, the Officer advised that the contribution of £557.14 that the applicant had undertaken to pay following the Habitat Regulations Assessment would be budgeted towards the funding of the Warden to patrol protected coastal wildlife sites.

Councillor Dixon having stated that it was rare for an application of this type to appear on a Committee agenda and asked if it represented a change in policy, the officer explained that normally such applications were delegated to Officers to determine. In this case the application had been referred to the Committee by Local Ward Councillors. There had been no change in policy.

Council Morrissey stated that there had been a similar application in the area that the Council had turned down because it didn't want to set a precedent and yet it was recommending approval for this one. In reply the Officer stated that he believed the Councillor was referring to Mill House. In that case approval had been given for an application to build an annexe to a host property. Subsequently an application was made for the annexe to be considered a stand-alone property in its own right. This was refused because it was considered to be tied to the donor property. The application in respect of 145 The Broadway was different because it was a detached property with its own access and own garden separate from the donor property.

There being no further questions for the Officer, the Chairman welcomed the following speakers who had registered to speak in objection to the application



- i) Cllr Paul Edgeworth
- ii) Mrs Margaret Pells
- iii) Mr David Pells
- iv) Mr Patrick Sutherland
- v) Mr Brian Garbutt

Each were given 5 minutes to address the Committee and cited the following grounds of objection:-

- A loss of privacy and light
- The proposed building would look directly into the living rooms and bedrooms of a neighbouring property
- It did not comply with policy H7 with regard to distances
- The trees which would have screened the property had been removed
- The overshadowing would impact on the amenity of neighbours to enjoy their own homes
- The garden was too small in which to build a property of this size
- The disruption that would be caused during construct in terms of noise and air pollution would reduce the quality of life for neighbours. The street was already experiencing dust pollution from work at the Pennywell sites
- The proposed development was out of character with the rest of the street. The Broadway had been constructed during the 1950s, 60s and 70s, the planned addition would be detrimental to the street scene and 'stick out like a sore thumb'
- The belief that the street had already reached its maximum occupancy. It was a one exit, one entrance street.
- It would impact on highway safety. The road was extremely narrow with cars often having to mount the pavement to pass each other
- It would have a negative impact on the pre-existing parking problem in the street as a number of properties had no off-street parking. The applicant currently on occasions had to ask neighbours to move cars so he could drive off his property

The Chairman then invited questions from Members for the objectors.

Councillor Doyle asked Councillor Edgeworth why he felt there would be a loss of amenity for neighbours and why objections were being made on the grounds of separation when the Planning Officers had confirmed that the proposed dwelling conformed with Policy in this regard. Councillor Edgeworth replied that he had spoken as Ward Councillor on behalf of residents who felt their amenity was being negatively impacted by the overshadowing causing a loss of privacy and light and believed that the 1-2 metre separation was too small.

In response to an enquiry from Councillor Morrissey as to whether he believed that the loss of amenity could also be caused through an increase in noise, Councillor Edgeworth confirmed that he did.

Councillor Peacock asked Mrs Pells if her concerns lay more with issues that would arise during the construction process rather than with the outcome of that process? Mrs Pells replied that her concerns lay with both. For example once the new property was built it would be impossible for vehicles to depart from it without hitting cars parked in the street.

Councillor Foster asked if he had heard correctly that the applicant ran a business from his home? Mrs Pells confirmed that he did. This was not an issue for her in itself as everyone had to make a living however the coming and going of the work vans especially in the morning contributed to the traffic issues faced by the street.

Councillor Morrissey noted the concerns raised by Mrs Pells regarding the disruption that would be caused during the construction process but asked her to expand on the loss of amenity the proposed property would cause. Mrs Pells advised that when they were looking for their 'forever home' they knew they wouldn't be able to afford one in the countryside but would like one where they could see trees and certainly not one that would be overlooked. Now the trees were gone and the bedrooms of her two teenage daughters would be overlooked. It would be like living in a prison.

Councillor Reed asked Mrs Pells to describe how daily life in the street would be impacted during the construction process. Mrs Pells replied that the amount of construction vehicles coming and going would prevent the children who currently played in the street from doing so. There was not only the issue of road safety, but the air pollution and dust caused by the construction process would also prevent the children playing outside.

There being no further questions for the objectors the Chairman asked the Committee to comment on and consider the application.

Councillor P. Smith criticised the changes to national planning guidelines that had permitted application like this to come forward resulting in hotch potch developments that had blighted areas like Silksworth.

Councillor Wilson stated that just because there was enough space to build a house didn't mean that that we should build one.

Councillor Doyle stated that he was happy that the proposed development met the required space standards and that each application needed to be considered on its own merits. As a point of clarification, he asked if the Planning Officer was able to outline how it was intended that any disruption during the construction process would be mitigated if the application was approved? The Officer informed the Committee that the host property was a former Doctor's surgery which had a large hard standing which would allow the delivery and off-street storage of building materials. Issues such as dust and noise would be controlled by environmental health via restrictions on the time of day, and days of the week when construction activity would be allowed to take place.

Councillor Reed stated that he agreed with the issues raised by the speakers. He believed that the development would have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of its neighbours, it was a narrow road which was suffering from parking issues and facing over development. He also believed that the design of the new building was out of character with the rest of the street.

Councillor Dixon stated that his main concern was the narrowness of the street. He questioned whether it was capable of being able to accommodate an additional house and believed that it was not. He highlighted the already existing traffic and parking problems and felt it was not a suitable street on which to build another house.

Councillor Peacock stated that his main concern would centre on getting vehicles on and off the property once it was built and questioned whether there would be room to do so.

The Chairman stated that from the debate it was becoming clear that a number of Members may be minded not to support the Officer's recommendation to approve the application. At the invitation of the Chairman the Planning Officer advised the Committee of the implications of a potential contrary decision which included the risk of appeal and the award of costs against the Council. If the Committee were minded to refuse the application they were under a duty to provide reasons for doing so.

The Chairman then moved the Officer recommendation detailed on page 89 of the agenda that Members approve the application subject to the conditions listed in the report.

Upon being put to the vote the motion was defeated with 2 members voting in favour, 9 voting against and 1 abstention.

The Solicitor then advised Members that the Committee now needed to move an alternative motion and provide reasons for any decision.

Consideration having been given to the matter, it was moved by Councillor Morrissey and duly seconded by Councillor Peacock that the application be refused on the grounds of the concerns raised by residents and local Councillors regarding its negative impact on the character of the street.

Upon being put to the vote the motion was carried with 6 members voting in favour, 5 voting against and 1 abstention.

Accordingly it was:-

5. RESOLVED that the application be refused on the grounds of the concerns raised by residents and local councillors regarding its negative impact on the character of the street.

**Planning Application Reference No. 21/00451/LP3 – Earthworks to facilitate the construction of Ryhope Road Doxford Link Road (Phase 4) between Highclere Drive and Cherry Knowle Site; to include a non-motorised user bridge; associated infrastructure/landscaping and stopping up of associated public highway - Land between Highclere Drive and Cherry Knowle, Sunderland**

The Executive Director of City Development submitted a report (copy circulated) in respect of the above matter.

(for copy report – see original minutes)

Prior to asking the Officer to present the report, Chairman advised that Councillor Bewick had wished to speak in opposition to the application but had been unable to attend the meeting. He had therefore agreed that his written representations could be circulated instead.

The Committee having been given time to read the representations, the representative of the Executive Director of City Development presented the report, advising the Committee of the key issues to consider in determining the application.

In conclusion the Committee was informed that no technical constraints had been identified that could not be suitably overcome through the implementation of mitigation measures (which could be secured through conditions). The proposed development accorded with the Development Plan and would have no long-term detrimental impacts upon the site and surrounding area. The development would deliver a wide range of long-lasting economic, social, and environmental benefits and there were no adverse impacts identified which would significantly and demonstrably outweigh these benefits. In the absence of a material consideration to the contrary Members were therefore recommended to approve the application.

The Chairman thanked the Planning Officer for his presentation and invited questions from Members

The Planning Officer addressed an enquiry from Councillor Peacock regarding the weight given to the level of representation resulting from the public consultation process and there being no further questions or comments the Chairman moved the Officer recommendation, and it was:-

6. RESOLVED that consent be granted for the development in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 as amended for the reasons set out in the report and subject to the draft conditions in the report.

**Planning Application Reference No. 21/01544/FU4 – Erection of 60 dwellings with access, landscaping, SuDS, SANGS and associated infrastructure on land at Burdon Lane, Ryhope, Sunderland.**

The Executive Director of City Development submitted a report (copy circulated) in respect of the above matter.

(for copy report – see original minutes)

The representative of the Executive Director of City Development presented the report, advising the Committee of the key issues to consider in determining the application. In addition, Members' attention was drawn to an error in the report (page 152 of the agenda papers) and advised that the reference to '950 units' in respect of the section 106 agreement should be amended to read '60 units'.

In conclusion Members were advised that the proposal was considered to be policy compliant, both nationally and locally and was therefore recommended for approval, subject to the expiry of the consultation period dated 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2021 and the receipt of no further representations material to the determination of the application and subject to the signing of the S106 and the draft conditions listed in the report.

There being no questions for the Officer, the Chairman welcomed and introduced the applicant, Mr Shaun Cuggy, who was afforded 5 mins to speak in support of his application.

There being no questions for Mr Cuggy and no further comments from Members on the application, the Chairman moved the Officer recommendation, and it was:-

7. RESOLVED that consent be granted for the development in accordance with Regulation 4 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 as amended, for the reasons set out in the report and subject to the draft conditions in the report, the signing of the S106 Agreement and subject to the expiry of the consultation period and no further representations material to the determination being received.

**Planning Application Reference No. 21/01542/LP3 – Erection of Eye Infirmary (Class E(e)) with energy centre buildings, cycle hub building, site access, parking, landscaping and associated utilities infrastructure. Former Vaux Site Land North of Saint Mary's Boulevard, Sunderland**

The Executive Director of City Development submitted a report (copy circulated) in respect of the above matter.

(for copy report – see original minutes)

The representative of the Executive Director of City Development presented the report advising the Committee of the key issues to consider in determining the application.

Members were informed that the site occupied the south-western most Plot on former Vaux site. It was adjacent to the recently approved Vaux housing development with Galley's Gill located to the north and Livingstone Road immediately to the south.

The Committee was advised that the key matters and considerations considered relevant to the development were acceptable. National Highways and the Council's Ecology advisors had also confirmed the proposal to be acceptable. No letters of representation or objection were received during the public consultation process.

Members' attention was drawn to Condition 16 (page 192 of the agenda papers) which proposed a secured by design condition. The Committee was informed however, that the Agent had requested that this be included as an 'informative' instead. The proposed Eye Infirmary was operated by Sunderland NHS Foundation Trust who had well established and clear policies and procedures in place to provide a secure and safe environment. The Trust's Security Policy emphasised and demonstrated its commitment to ensuring the personal safety of patients, staff and visitors whilst also ensuring an environment that was neither oppressive nor interfered with the delivery of health care.

Specific requirements for the management of security were also embedded in the Health and Social Care Act and that in meeting those requirements security would form part of the care commissioning contract for the facility. The contract required the Trust to put in place and maintain the appropriate security management processes, which in part involved close working with the Police.

Therefore, it was considered that security would be a key aspect of the development and operation of the facility, and as such, it was not considered necessary to impose what was effectively an additional regulatory process via the proposed planning condition.

In conclusion it was considered that the planning submission has successfully demonstrated a scheme that was set to make a significant and positive contribution to townscape character and represented another key element of the re-development of Vaux.

The Officer therefore recommended that consent was granted in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 as amended and in accordance with the draft conditions listed in the report save for Condition 16 which was now proposed to be included as an informative, and Condition 18, which was effectively controlled via Condition 17 and its requirement to adhere to the accepted Section 7 of the submitted Ecological Impact Assessment.

The Chairman thanked the Officer for his presentation and invited questions from Members.

Councillor Dixon stated that he would be supporting the application however he had concerns regarding the proposed parking provision and asked if a patient pick up / drop off area had been included in the design? The Officer confirmed that this was the case.

Councillor Dixon referred to the reduction in parking spaces from 120 to 90 and asked the reason? The Highways Officer advised that the figure of 120 was based on the provision for the existing building on Queen Alexandra Road. The applicant had undertaken a Parking Needs Assessment to assist with justifying the need for parking directly associated with specialist healthcare provision. The Applicant's figure of 90 had the aim of encouraging sustainable travel by staff given the move to a more central location in the City Centre. Additional car parking capacity was provided at St Mary's Multi-storey, other car parks in the city centre and the new Multi-storey to be built at Farringdon Row.

Councillor Dixon contended that the issue with encouraging staff to use this parking provision was that it was costly and would result in people looking to park in the surrounding streets as was currently the case at the Queen Alexandra Road site.

The Planning Officer advised that there were strict restrictions on parking provision on the Vaux site because it was constrained by its topography and in answer to a further enquiry from Councillor Dixon confirmed that while a housing development was also planned for the site, the associated parking space was extremely limited.

Councillor Reed referred to the condition requiring the submission of a full Travel Plan and asked why it was not required until 12 months after the occupancy of the building? The Highways Officer advised that an initial Transport Assessment and Travel Plan has been submitted in support of the planning application. This had been thoroughly reviewed by Network Management and deemed acceptable. The timescale for the provision of a Full Travel Plan would allow staff surveys to be undertaken within the 12 months of occupancy once their new commuting patterns had become established.

Councillor Dixon referred to his discussions with the Durham Bird Club, which concerned a request from the Club that Swift bricks / boxes were incorporated into the building or a Swift tower in the grounds. The Planning Officer replied that the application already satisfied the 10% bio-diversity net gain requirements, however he would feed-back Councillor Dixon's comments to Siglion for consideration in respect of the wider development of the Vaux site.

There being no further questions, the Chairman invited the Committee to consider the application.

Councillor Doyle stated that he supported the application. He had no concern regarding the parking provision and welcomed the attempt to encourage the uptake of sustainable transport.

Councillor Reed stated that he believed that on balance, the concerns expressed were outweighed by the benefits. He did note however that he had not been consulted as a resident in respect of the Parking Needs Assessment.

There being no further comments, it was:-

8. RESOLVED that approval be given to the application under Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 as amended, subject to the conditions detailed in the report and as amended at the meeting with the deletion of conditions 16 and 18.

**Planning Application Reference No. 21/01833/LP3 – Change of use from dwelling house to supported living accommodation, comprising 2no. 1 bedroom studio apartments and no.1 bedroom staff accommodation/facilities. Including associated elevational alterations to windows and doors Pallion Primary School House, Waverley Terrace, Sunderland**

The Executive Director of City Development submitted a report (copy circulated) in respect of the above matter.

(for copy report – see original minutes)

The representative of the Executive Director of City Development presented the report advising the Committee of the key issues to consider in determining the application.

In response to an enquiry from Councillor Noble, the Officer confirmed that the recipients of the support would be adults in need of care.

Consideration having been given to the application and the Officer recommendation having been put to the Committee, it was:-

9. RESOLVED that the application be granted approval under Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 as amended subject to the conditions detailed in the report.

**Planning Application Reference No. 21/02092/LP3 – Installation of ‘dray and horses’ sculpture and associated ground works at Keel Square - Keel Square, Sunderland**



The Executive Director of City Development submitted a report (copy circulated) in respect of the above matter.  
(for copy report – see original minutes)

The representative of the Executive Director of City Development presented the report advising the Committee of the key issues to consider in determining the application.

In response to an enquiry from Councillor Peacock, the Officer advised that there were no specific plans within the application to provide protection from vandalism and it was hoped that the dray and horses would become a well-loved addition to Sunderland's street-scene. The sculpture would be maintained and looked after by the City Council.

Members having welcomed the application and praised the design of the sculpture, the Chairman put the Officer recommendation to the Committee, and it was:-

10. RESOLVED that the application be granted consent under Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 as amended subject to the conditions detailed in the report.

### **Items for Information**

Members gave consideration to the items for information contained within the matrix (agenda pages 206-212).

The Councillors as indicated requested that site visits were undertaken in respect of the following applications,

- i) 21/01825/FU4 Princess of Wales Centre Demolition of existing building and erection of 19no bungalows for the over 55's. (Councillors Noble and Dixon)
- ii) 17/02430/OU4 Former Groves Cranes Site, Woodbine Terrace, Pallion Sunderland – Redevelopment of Site for Residential use. (Councillor Doyle)
- ii) 21/01952/FUL Former Ford and Hylton Social Club Poole Road Sunderland - Proposed two storey 30 Bed Residential Care home with associated landscaping and parking. (Councillor Doyle)

Councillor Scanlan advised that prior to the Committee she had raised some questions regarding items on the matrix. She thanked the Planning Officer for the responses she had received to date and he confirmed that he would chase replies from the case Officers concerned in respect of her outstanding queries.

She informed the Committee that with regard to the removal of the roof top seating relating to the Bay Shelter application, she had been advised that the

seating had been removed to allow their restoration and works to the building to be carried out. The seating would be returned upon completion of the building works. Councillor Doyle thanked Councillor Scanlan for her update and advised that he had previously asked the same question and was yet to receive an answer.

11. RESOLVED that the items for information as set out in the matrix be received and noted and that site visits be undertaken in respect of the applications as detailed above.

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

(Signed) M. BUTLER  
(Chairman)