

PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE

AGENDA

**Meeting to be held in COMMITTEE ROOM 2, CIVIC CENTRE on
Tuesday 13th June, 2017 at 5.30 p.m.**

ITEM		PAGE
1.	Receipt of Declarations of Interest (if any)	
2.	Apologies for Absence	
3.	Minutes of the last meeting of the Committee held on 12th April, 2017. (copies attached)	1
4.	Report of the meeting of the Development Control (North Sunderland) Sub Committee held on 25th April, 2017. (copy attached)	5
5.	Report of the meeting of the Development Control (South Sunderland) Sub Committee held on 27th April, 2017 (copy attached)	10

6. **Report of the meetings of the Development Control (Hetton, Houghton and Washington) Sub Committee held on 25th April and the extraordinary meeting held on 8th May, 2017** 16

(copies attached)

7. **Objections to Traffic Regulation Order for Proposed Phase 4 Community Parking Management Scheme in the Sunderland Royal Hospital Area (Barnes, Pallion and Millfield Wards)** 23

Report of the Executive Director of Economy and Place

(copy attached)

Elaine Waugh,
Head of Law and Governance,
Civic Centre
SUNDERLAND

5th June, 2017

Item 3

At a meeting of the PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE held in COMMITTEE ROOM 2 on WEDNESDAY, 12th APRIL, 2017 at 5.30 p.m.

Present:-

Councillor Bell in the Chair

Councillors Beck, M. Dixon, Francis, Hodson, Jackson, Lauchlan, Mordey, Porthouse, Scaplehorn, Taylor, W. Turton, P. Walker and D. Wilson.

Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Ball, Chequer, Cummings, I. Galbraith, Kay, Middleton, P. Smith, M. Turton, G. Walker and P. Watson.

Minutes of the last meeting of the Committee held on 15th March, 2017 and the extraordinary meeting held on 1st February, 2017.

1. RESOLVED that the minutes of the last meeting held on 15th March, 2017 and the extraordinary meeting held on 1st February 2017 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

Report of the Meeting of the Development Control (North Sunderland) Sub Committee held on 23rd March, 2017

The report of the meeting of the Development Control (North Sunderland) Sub-Committee held on 23rd March, 2017 (copy circulated) was submitted.

(For copy report – see original minutes)

2. RESOLVED that the report be received and noted.

Report of the meeting of the Development Control (South Sunderland) Sub Committee held on 21st March, 2017

The report of the meeting of the Development Control (South Sunderland) Sub-Committee held on 21st March, 2017 (copy circulated) was submitted.

(For copy report – see original minutes)

3. RESOLVED that the report be received and noted.

Report of the meetings of the Development Control (Hetton, Houghton and Washington) Sub Committee held on 23rd March and the extraordinary meeting held on 28th March, 2017

The report of the meetings of the Development Control (Hetton, Houghton and Washington) Sub-Committee held on 23rd March and the extraordinary meeting held on 28th March, 2017 (copies circulated) were submitted.

(For copy reports – see original minutes)

4. RESOLVED that the report be received and noted.

Minster Quarter Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document

The Chief Operating Officer -Place submitted a report (copy circulated) to advise and Consult with the Committee on the responses received following public consultation on the Draft Minster Quarter Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

(For copy report – see original minutes)

Idris Balarabe, Senior Urban Designer, presented the report and advised that a total of 10 responses had been received and although the majority of responses supported the proposals set out in the Minster Quarter masterplan, it was possible to identify a number of key areas of concern amongst those consulted. Those issues were dealt with in more detail within the report.

Councillor Hodson commented that he was broadly a fan of the masterplan however he was uncomfortable with some of the changes made in particular to para 4.5 questioning whether a bend and flex approach was strong enough as he did not believe this had been the case on a recently approved application.

Councillor Hodson queried the point of having a masterplan if its function could be altered at the request of a Developer.

The Chairman reminded Members that any planning application submitted in parallel to the Masterplan being worked on would have had to be considered pursuant to the approved Development Plan and NPPF, the masterplan being afforded relevant weight considerations according to the status of the masterplan until approved in final form.

The representative from Legal Services advised that the status of the Masterplan was that of an aspirational document at that time and Officers would have had to bear in mind the applicants rights to appeal for non-

determination and on-going costs should their application be delayed pending the masterplan process

Mr Balarabe commented that the proposals were prescriptive enough to look for schemes we wanted as a city whilst also being able to flex and bend when needed. The plan hadn't changed in principal only the wording so that we could offer flexibility going forward.

Councillor Porthouse referred to the idea of pedestrianizing High Street West and commented that he did not agree with this and felt that more needed to be done to enhance the ways that people could come into the city and to deal with convoluted traffic issues.

Councillor Mordey wished to clarify that this plan dealt with a lot more than just the one developer that had been mentioned and that the plan had not changed significantly with only small changes in language. Councillor Mordey commented that this document was long overdue and would help enhance that part of the city. The Council was often criticised for lacking aspirations and he believed this document would help to reverse these perceptions and he asked Members to bear this in mind.

Councillor Jackson enquired if any plans had been made for the rerouting of buses to the St Mary's route.

Councillor Mordey advised of discussion with the bus companies over the past 12 months in relation to routes and had some success in the interim at removing those stopping at Fawcett Street and they were now using St Mary's boulevard.

Councillor Mordey also advised that they had commissioned a report from TASK to look at rerouting buses around the area and that plans for improving bus connectivity was a work in progress.

Councillor M. Dixon wished to stress that he was very supportive of Sunderland and believed a lot of the schemes were first class however he did share the concerns of Councillor Porthouse in relation to High Street West and also enquired about plans at Chester Road.

Mr Balarabe advised that Chester Road was an area of concern due to the amount of traffic on the road and the large number of students that would be moving east to west. Under the proposals they needed to look at making a more direct/safer route but details on this were yet to emerge. In relation to High Street West element, this would be addressed as part of the Investment Corridor Phase 2 to create a stronger cleaner more pedestrian prioritised route.

Councillor Francis commented that he was very much in favour of developing the quarter and wished to praise the introduction of Keel Square. In relation to the Court and Police Station schemes Councillor Francis believed that the

Court was in a dreadful state and would cost a great deal to put right and also that the Police Station would involve issues over asbestos.

Dan Hattle, Planning Implementation Manager commented on the national decline of retail centres, with the likes of Newcastle and the Metrocentre taking up most of the offer, so other areas were having to move fast just to keep up. In reference to Councillor Hodson's concerns Mr Hattle advised that Officers had worked hard in ensuring they achieved something fit for purpose and on balance had achieved a good scheme that didn't compromise our aspirations.

Mr Hattle also commented that this was one area of the city where we could really change the offer available.

Councillor Porthouse suggested that we should be looking at the success of other cities and that in his opinion pedestrianizing of so much of city centres had always failed.

Mr Balarabe commented that they would achieve public realm improvements around the area whilst balancing the needs for vehicular access and officers felt they had struck the right balance on this.

The Chairman suggested that the aspiration of the plan was to build upon the success of the Empire as this was a magnet for the area with successful results being seen from other venues and restaurants surrounding it.

5. RESOLVED that

- a) The Committee noted and commented on the amendments made to the Draft Minster Quarter Masterplan in light of responses received during the public consultation on the document and other consideration;
- b) That the comments of the Committee be referred to the Cabinet when it considered the adoption of the amended Minster Quarter Masterplan as a Supplementary Planning Document

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

(Signed) R. BELL
(Chairman)

Item 4

At a meeting of the DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (NORTH SUNDERLAND) SUB-COMMITTEE held in the CIVIC CENTRE on TUESDAY 25TH APRIL, 2017 at 4.45 p.m.

Present:-

Councillor Jackson in the Chair

Councillors Beck, Bell, Foster, Francis, Mordey, Scaplehorn and D. Wilson.

Declarations of Interest

Item 3 – 17/00215/VAR – Dominos Pizza, 112 Sea Road, Sunderland, SR6 9EQ

Councillor Jackson made an open declaration that she was an acquaintance of an objector to the application but still retained an open mind to the proposals.

Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted by Councillors Chequer and Porthouse.

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

The Executive Director of Economy and Place submitted a report and circulatory report (copies circulated) relating to the North Sunderland area, copies of which had also been forwarded to each Member of the Council upon applications made thereunder.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

15/02379/FUL – Demolition of existing building and erection of five storey student accommodation, to 68 student bedrooms – Former Speedings Sailworks, 15 Whickham Street, Monkwearmouth, Sunderland, SR6 0ED

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.

1. RESOLVED that the application be approved for the reason set out in the report and subject to the 18 conditions contained therein.

16/01828/SUB – Demolition of existing building and erection of four storey student accommodation comprising 11no. apartments and associated works (AMENDED PLANS RECEIVED 03.03.2017) – 15 North Bridge Street, Sunderland, SR5 1AB

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 Chairman then introduced the applicants architect, Mr Clinton Mysleyko, who wished to speak in favour of the development and to express his disappointment with the officer recommendation to refuse the application.

Mr Mysleyko advised that whilst working on the original application, Officers had not made comments on the design of the scheme and only on scale and massing. As conflicting comments had been received from the Heritage Officers and the Design Officer it was felt that it was difficult to come up with a design that all officers would be happy with.

In terms of design, this was subjective and they felt it was suitable for the area and the impact of the building was negligible with alterations to the road on North Bridge Street helping to regenerate the area.

Mr Mysleyko wished to clarify that there would be two lifts as part of the proposal so the whole building would be accessible for disabled people.

Paul McDonald, Senior Planning Officer informed the committee that any procedural issues mentioned would not have affected the overall Officer recommendation as there had been outstanding information from the outset, whilst some additional information was submitted and addressed, not all had been covered and Officers were looking for significant adjustments to the scheme which the applicant was not willing to make.

Councillor Francis commented on the existing building being currently vacant and hoped that something could be done to maintain the structure and keep it water tight as we had lost a number of historic buildings over the years and he would hate to see this one lost too.

Councillor D. Wilson commented that he felt the Committee needed to raise the bar in terms of determining applications on design otherwise Sunderland would have the same uninspiring developments throughout the City.

Danielle Pearson, Development Control Manager commented that the original submission had been deficient in supporting documents in terms of structural details and therefore officers did not advise any further in terms of design etc. Officers do

seek to work with individuals during the planning process but this does not guarantee a positive recommendation as it is the role of the team to assess all comments to make an overall recommendation based on Policy decisions.

2. RESOLVED that the application be refused for the 4 reasons as set out in the report

17/00215/VAR – Variation of condition 3 of planning approval 15/00755/VAR (Change of use from Bank (A2) to hot food takeaway/home delivery (A5) including ventilation extract system, external compressors and associated highway/car park works (RESUBMISSION) to allow extended operating hours to 10:00 to 23:00 in addition to a hot food delivery-only service between the hours of 23:00 and 05:00 daily (AMENDED DESCRIPTION) – Dominos Pizza, 112 Sea Road, Sunderland, SR5 9EQ

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 Chairman advised the Committee that Paragraphs two and three on Page 40 were an error and were to be deleted and that the recommendation was to refuse the application.

3. RESOLVED that the application be refused for the reason as set out in the report

17/00427/FU4 – Demolition of existing library building and erection of 9 no. three bedroomed residential dwellings with associated landscaping and access (amended description 27/03/2017). – Former Hylton Castle Library, Cranleigh Road, Sunderland, SR5 3PQ

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 Chairman introduced Ms Sue Hellens who wished to speak in objection to the proposal. Ms Hellens commented that all residents in the area felt this was an overdevelopment of the site with properties overlooking one another there would be no privacy. There would be loss of light as the existing library building was only one storey whereas this development was proposed to be two storeys.

Ms Hellens commented that there were a number of old people and children who lived in the area and would be affected by the noise from a building site and the parking was a major issue as there was nowhere at all to park around the library at present and events at Hylton Castle produced parking problems in the street.

Ms Hellens also commented that many of the neighbours did not receive notification letters about the proposed development.

Andrew Browning, Senior Planning Officer referred to the claim of overdevelopment and clarified that they had to be able to identify there being significant concerns from amount of development proposed and officers had concluded the relationship between the site was acceptable as was the parking provision proposed.

Mr Browning commented that nine dwellings could be accommodated on the site and the distancing between the houses was fully compliant with the standards the Council would expect with most actually exceeding the distances expected.

In relation to noise during the development, a condition was to be imposed that the developer submits a site management plan and means of ensuring dust etc. was suppressed also.

Paul Muir, Group Engineer advised that there would be nine parking spaces provided with a further three visitor spaces also proposed in the scheme which would allow emergency vehicles to access the site if required.

In response to Councillor Mordey's enquiry, Mr Muir advised that the width of Cranleigh Road was the standard width of a typical residential street.

Councillor Beck expressed concern that most households typically have more than one car now.

Mr Muir advised that the level of parking provision included within the scheme was acceptable for the scale of this development.

Councillor D. Wilson expressed concerns over the quality of life for the residents who already lived there and expressed disbelief that nine homes were to be built here as most people did have more than one car in each home therefore we were creating a problem in a Ward that already suffered from parking issues.

Councillor Francis commented that he would like to see the corners of the development protected by double yellow lines and also expressed concern over the parking provision.

Councillor Foster advised that during a recent site visit he felt the area was looking built up as it currently stood and the development was going to intrude upon the neighbouring dwellings. Councillor Foster also referred to the petition received by residents and that he was also concerned with the claim that people hadn't received notification of the proposals.

Mr Browning advised that the level of consultation carried out was fully in line with the statutory obligations required of the Council and the parking provision also met terms of our adopted parking policies so we could not ask for over and above what was required.

Councillor Mordey enquired if additional parking could be provided on the current grass verges on the site.

Mr Muir advised that that this would be possible but it would be at the gift of the developer in order for this to occur.

The Chairman introduced Mr McCoy as the applicant to speak in favour of the proposals. Mr McCoy requested that Members bear in mind that this was a redundant/empty site that they were trying to bring back into a positive use.

In relation to noise and disruption, they would do their utmost to keep the disruption to a minimum and they were interested in listening to the residents but he wished to stress that this was something positive for the area.

Councillor Mordey commented that as the proposals complied with our policies on parking and the proposal would bring much needed three bedroomed houses to the city he asked that Members support the application.

Councillor Wilson commented that he did not feel that he could support the proposal as it stood.

Councillor Foster commented that 165 signatures on the petition against the proposal suggested that the residents had not been consulted.

Mr Browning confirmed that the Council had carried out the level of consultation that was statutorily required and this was backed up with the fact that representations had been received from residents.

Having been put to the vote, with Seven Members voting in favour, two Members voting against and one Member abstaining, it was:-

4. RESOLVED that Members grant consent under Regulation 4 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 (as amended), subject to the 15 conditions contained within the circulatory report

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

(Signed) J. JACKSON,
Chairman

Item 5

At a Meeting of the DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (SOUTH SUNDERLAND) SUB-COMMITTEE held in the CIVIC CENTRE on THURSDAY 27th APRIL, 2017 at 4.45 p.m.

Present:-

Councillor Porthouse in the Chair

Councillors Ball, Bell, D. Dixon, M. Dixon, I. Galbraith, Hunt, Hodson, Jackson, Mordey and Scaplehorn.

Declarations of Interest

17/00298/VAR – Lidl Ryhope Road, Sunderland, SR2 9TB

Councillor Mordey declared that a close personal friend worked at the store in question and withdrew from the meeting during consideration of this matter.

Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors English, Kay, Smith, Waller, 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 (copy 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 report – see original minutes).

16/02130/VAR – Variation of condition 3 of previously approved application 99/00084/OUT to allow: The Class A1 development hereby permitted shall not be used for the retailing of any of the following goods without the prior consent of the local planning authority: (a) food and drink (excluding the sale of food and drink for consumption on the premises); (b) fashion clothing (excluding gardening/DIY overalls and protective clothing); (c) fashion accessories; (d) footwear (excluding gardening/DIY protective footwear); (e) jewellery; (f) cosmetics and toiletries; (g) pharmaceutical products; (h) books and magazines (excluding gardening/DIY books and magazines); (i) toys (excluding garden toys and play equipment); (j) sports goods (including walking and climbing equipment) and (k) camping equipment, in order that the

local planning authority may retain control over the development. However, the area indicated pink on drawing no.15165-SK05 with a gross internal area of no more than 5,162 sq.m shall be used for the sale of any non-food goods and up to 30% (1,549 sq.m) of food and drink goods.

B&Q Warehouse, Trimdon Street, Sunderland, SR4 6DW

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.

1. RESOLVED that Members be minded to approve the application for the reasons set out in the report and that the application be referred to the Secretary of State in accordance with the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) Direction 2009 (Circular 2/09)

Change in the order of business

The Chairman advised that the application number 17/00558/FU4 would be considered at this point.

17/00558/FU4 – Erection of single storey extension to 3no. existing classrooms to front elevation and installation of new concrete path (amended description 04.04.2016)

East Herrington Primary Academy, Balmoral Terrace, East Herrington, Sunderland, SR3 3PR

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.

2. RESOLVED that consent be granted in accordance with Regulation 4 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 (as amended) for the reasons set out in the report subject to the 5 conditions set out therein.

17/00298/VAR – Variation of Condition 4 (Number and times of deliveries) of planning approval 16/02018/VAR to allow for maximum of two deliveries per day to be taken at, or despatched from, the approved store, with one delivery to take place between the hours of 08:00 and 13:00 and one delivery to take place between the hours of 12:00 and 18:00, Monday to Sunday (including Bank Holidays) (Additional consultation, amended proposals and additional supporting information received)

Lidl, Ryhope Road, Sunderland, SR2 9TB

The Chairman advised that a site visit had been undertaken on 19th April from 7:50am and that a delivery to the store at 8am had been observed by Members during this visit.

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 proposed variation would allow for an increase in the number of deliveries per day from one to two however it would reduce the permitted hours for receiving deliveries so that deliveries would not be able to be taken before 8am when currently deliveries could arrive at 6am. It was considered that although there would be an extra delivery there would be a betterment to the existing situation due to the reduction in permitted hours on the morning. If members were minded to approve the application the other conditions on the existing planning permission would remain in place and if the application was refused then the existing arrangements would remain in place. It was not considered that a refusal would be sustainable on the basis of noise or disturbance.

Whether there would be a significant adverse impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring houses due to noise created by the additional delivery was in question. There had been a noise assessment carried out which was more reliable than the previous assessment as actual real information was used rather than predicted noise levels. It had been shown that the noise levels at the nearest noise sensitive property would be 2db over the background noise levels and as such it was considered that there would not be a significant adverse impact on the neighbouring residential properties. Additional mitigation had been implemented including the installation of an acoustic fence; the installation of noise resilient matting and the use of a pallet truck with a silent operation mode.

Within the report for circulation was a revision to condition 4 and also a proposed additional condition, condition 19, which would require the mitigation measures to be retained in working order for perpetuity in order to ensure that no significant adverse impact would be caused.

There had been a temporary stop notice and a breach of condition notice issued in respect of noise levels in order to prevent this breach of condition from continuing.

Councillor Scaplehorn referred to the allegations that Lidl had been carrying out deliveries outside of the approved hours and asked whether enforcement action would be taken if they breached this condition in future. The Representative of the Executive Director of Economy and Place advised that if there was a breach then enforcement action would be taken and that the nature of the enforcement action would depend on the nature and severity of the breach and the harm caused by it.

Councillor Hunt referred to the noise assessment and queried why the assessment had been carried out at ground level when people's bedrooms were upstairs and it was the bedrooms which were most sensitive to noise early in the morning. The Environmental Health representative advised that the noise assessment had been carried out in accordance with the requirements of the British Standard.

The Chairman then welcomed to the meeting local resident Mr Tindle who was in attendance to speak in objection to the application.

Mr Tindle advised that as well as raising his own objections he was also speaking on behalf of fellow resident Mr Lambert who was also in attendance. He stated that the current noise level was intolerable and that the banging and crashing noises that occurred during the deliveries was the issue. The deliveries took around one hour and there was intermittent noise during that time. The level of noise changed depending on what type of trailer was used with the refrigerated trailers being

quietest due to the insulation; it was asserted that the noise assessment had been done during one of the quieter deliveries. It was also asserted that the site visit had also taken place on a day when the quieter trailer had been used and the truck had also parked in a different position to usual on that day. The noise increased as the trailer was emptied as the noise echoed through the trailer and also there was a greater distance for the trollies to be moved. He stated that he was not against the store or deliveries taking place but that he did object to the noise created during the deliveries. There had always been two or three deliveries a day taking place. He had been shown the acoustic matting and this was already damaged and worn and was clearly not fit for purpose. The acoustic fence had also caused issues as due to the concrete construction of the store and the location of the fence the sound was now being funnelled towards residents. Customers and staff did not hear the noise so he did not see why residents should have to put up with it. He was happy to work with Lidl and had attended a meeting with Rapleys, the representatives of the applicant, to find a solution to the issues but did not feel that he should have to put up with an extra hour of noise each day.

The representative of the Executive Director of Economy and Place acknowledged that there were issues caused by different types of noise and that this was why condition 19 would be added to ensure that mitigation measures were put in place. The noise assessment had been considered by Environmental Health and was considered to be representative of the typical noise from a typical delivery; it had taken into account that different vehicles were used and actual information had been used for this assessment rather than the predicted data that had been used in the previous assessment.

Councillor Ball commented that she had attended the site visit and had spent around an hour and a half on site and had heard the noise from the delivery from multiple places including from Rydale Park.

Councillor Hodson queried whether the acoustic matting had made any difference before it had been damaged; he also queried whether the change in hours would represent an improvement. Mr Tindale stated that it had made a marginal difference however most of the noise came from within the trailer. Mr Lambert added that the delivery at the weekend had woken him up at 6:50am and that the deliveries regularly woke up his children; the change in hours would not alleviate this problem at weekends.

The Chairman then introduced Mr Huteson who was in attendance to speak in support of the application on behalf of planning consultant Rapleys; he was joined by Mr Murphy who was representing Lidl. Mr Huteson stated that he had met with residents on Monday and that work was being done to address the concerns raised. Steps had been taken including the installation of rubber acoustic matting and an acoustic fence. There were now two dedicated drivers for this store who were aware of the sensitivity of the site and this would help to reduce the impact of the deliveries.

Mr Murphy stated that he had only been made aware of the issue after the temporary stop notice had been issued and that if he had been aware of the issue sooner then steps could have been taken to mitigate against the issue sooner. There was a desire for the store to be a good neighbour. The rubber matting was a short term fix and work was being done to design a bespoke long term solution using composite panels rather than steel in the construction of the loading dock however the design,

manufacture and installation would take time. The matting would be maintained until the long term solution could be implemented. The acoustic fence would also be upgraded. He provided residents with an assurance that he was committed to addressing their concerns. He also agreed that 8am was too early for deliveries in this location and stated that he was formally amending the variation application to provide two deliveries to the store between 10am and 6pm.

Discussions then took place around the suggestion that deliveries only be taken to the store between 10am and 6pm. Mr Huteson confirmed that the site was only big enough to accommodate one delivery truck at a time so the deliveries would not be taken at the same time as each other. Mr Murphy stated that it would be implemented as soon as possible and the amended delivery hours would be in place within a few days.

Councillor D. Dixon expressed concerns that condition 19 was drafted to take account of temporary arrangements and suggested that the wording be changed to state that the rubber matting would remain until replaced with a more suitable form of mitigation. The representative of the Executive Director of Economy and Place agreed that the condition could be redrafted to reflect this.

Councillor Ball, seconded by Councillor Hunt, moved that the proposal to allow two deliveries between the hours of 10am and 6pm be approved pursuant to the revision to the application offered by the applicant. With all Members being in agreement it was:-

3. RESOLVED that the application be approved for the reasons set out in the report and circulatory report subject to the conditions set out therein with condition 4 amended to allow two deliveries to the store per day within the hours of 10am and 6pm and condition 19 amended to require the acoustic matting to remain in place until such time that a more suitable permanent solution be installed.

**17/00335/LP3 – Change of use from open space to allotments including the erection of new boundary fence, stripping of contaminated land, importation of 350mm topsoil and provision of hardstanding
Ford Quarry Allotments, Pallion Trading Estate, Sunderland**

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 Members be minded to grant consent under Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 for the reasons set out in the report subject to the 9 conditions set out therein.

**17/00344/LP3 – Erection of Electricity Sub-Station with associated access
Land at Alexandra Business Park off Woodbine Terrace/European Way,
Sunderland, SR4 6UG**

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.

5. RESOLVED that planning permission be granted in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 for the reasons set out in the report subject to the 2 conditions set out therein.

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

(Signed) S. PORTHOUSE,
Chairman.

Item 6

At a meeting of the DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (HETTON, HOUGHTON AND WASHINGTON) SUB-COMMITTEE held in the CIVIC CENTRE on TUESDAY, 25th APRIL, 2017 at 5.45 p.m.

Present:-

Councillor Scaplehorn in the Chair

Councillors Bell, Dixon, M., Jackson, Lauchlan, Mordey, Taylor, Walker, G. and Walker, P.

Declarations of Interest

16/02308/VAR – Land North of Station Road, Barmston Road, Washington

Councillor Taylor made an open declaration in the above application as a resident of the Teal Farm Estate and advised that he could consider the application with an open mind and with no pre-determination of the matter.

16/01973/VAR – Smither Oasis UK Ltd, Crowther Road, Crowther, Washington

Councillor Scaplehorn made an open declaration in the above application as he had previously received correspondence from the applicant in relation to the proposals of the application and advised that he could consider the application with an open mind and without predetermination of the matter.

Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted to the meeting on behalf of Councillors Cummings, Middleton and Porthouse

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

The Executive Director of Economy and Place submitted a report (copies circulated), which related to Hetton, Houghton and Washington areas, 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 report – see original minutes)

At this juncture the Chairman proposed a change in the order of business to allow Officers to be able to present their reports and accordingly the applications would now be submitted to the Committee in the following order:-

- 17/00045/VAR – ADC Electrical Company Limited;
- 16/02308/VAR – Land North of Station Road;
- 16/01644/FUL – Faurecia, Staithes Road;
- 16/01973/VAR – Smithers Oasis, Crowther Road;
- 17/00597/CAA – Land at White Rose, Follingsby Park; and
- 16/01341/HE4 – Land North of Nissan

17/00045/VAR – Removal of condition 3 of planning permission ref. 79/0142 (Erection of building for use as workshop, offices and storage and sale of leisure associated accessories. Use of land for the display, storage and sale of caravans and camping equipment with associated car parking facilities). To allow use as B8 storage at ADC Electrical Company Limited, Brindley Road, Hertburn, Washington, NE37 2SF

The Planning Officer presented the application advising of the implications of the premises being used for a use other than caravans and associated activities; the impact of the western yard as a storage area; and the impact upon the local highway network.

Councillor Lauchlan asked if the Officers were happy and assured that there would be no flammable liquids stored on site as it was within close proximity to houses and the Officer advised that if they wished to store hazardous materials then they would require environmental permits to cover this as it was not an issue covered by the planning conditions. The Planning Officer advised that he was only aware that the site was to be used to store small, mini diggers, small plant machinery and other items of that nature.

When asked about the hours of operating, the Committee were advised that it was anticipated that machinery would be picked up for hire anytime from 7:00am / 8:00am and then returned in the early evening, not after 7:00pm. When asked if further restrictions could be put onto the application through a condition to guarantee hours of operation as it was in close vicinity to houses, the Planning Officer advised that they were only being asked to consider the removal of a condition on the original planning permission and that it would not be appropriate to place a more onerous condition onto the planning permission.

Members having fully considered the report, it was:-

1. RESOLVED that the application be approved for the removal of condition no. 3 of planning permission ref SD142/79 for the reasons as set out in the report and subject to the condition detailed therein.

16/02308/VAR – Variation of condition 2 of planning permission ref. 15/00259/FUL (substitution of house types within approved residential development at Teal Park Farm Phase 4 [Area D] (ref. 12/00333/FUL)) comprising substitution of house type of Plots 244, 246, 248, 249, 251, 252, 286-295, 299, 306, 308, 309, 317-328 and 332 at land North of Station Road, Barmston Road, Washington

The Planning Officer presented the report advising that the application was as set out in the report and consent was sought out to make a minor material amendment.

The Committee were informed that for the reasons as set out in the report it was considered that the proposed amendments were in keeping with the character and appearance of the development, and it was:-

2. RESOLVED that the application be approved for the reasons as set out in the report and subject to the nineteen conditions detailed therein.

16/01644/FUL – Erection of a modular industrial building to rear of existing factory, to be connected via 2 enclosed links to provide additional storage space for raw components and manufacture parts, serving the main factory at Faurecia, Staithes Road, Washington, NE38 8NW

Councillor Taylor advised that he was aware that there had been complaints from local residents around vehicle noise accessing the site, although from his personal experience he did not feel it was from this facility.

When asked, the Highways Officer advised that they had initially asked the applicant if the development would give rise to any additional vehicular journeys to or from the site and the applicant's agent had advised that were not any additional journeys anticipated as a result of the development given that the new building would simply provide storage facilities.

Members having fully considered the report, it was:-

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

16/01973/VAR – Variation of condition 7 (hours of operation) and condition 8 (delivery/loading/unloading) attached to planning application 09/2803/VAR (Variation of condition 5 of planning permission 07/01286/FUL to allow operating of warehousing and logistics Monday to Friday to operated 0600 – 2200 with vehicle loading restricted to 0745 – 2000 Monday to Friday with no change required for Saturday, Sunday and Bank Holidays as per the original planning permission (Amended Description)) to allow 24 hour loading/operation Monday to Sunday at Smithers Oasis UK Ltd, Crowther Road, Crowther, Washington, NE38 0AQ

The Planning Officer presented the report advising the Committee of the impact upon existing levels of residential amenity; the impact on the local highway network and the previous Planning Inspectorate decision.

Members having fully considered the report, it was:-

4. RESOLVED that the application be refused for the reason as set out in the report.

17/00597/CAA – Hazardous substance consent: Storage of 18,000 tonnes of flammable liquid (P5c) and 1,500 tonnes of flammable aerosols (P3a) at land at White Rose, Follingsby Park, Follingsby Lane, Felling

Members were taken through the report and advised that it was unlikely, for the reasons as set out in the report, that the proposal would prejudice the interests of Sunderland City Council, and therefore it was advised that Gateshead Council be informed that the Council did not have any comments or observation to make with regards to the proposal; and it was:-

5. RESOLVED that the Committee agreed the above comments, which are to then be sent to Gateshead Council in relation to application DC/17/00227/HAZ.

16/01341/HE4 – Hybrid planning application comprising: Full planning permission for the erection of 2no manufacturing warehouse (Unit A 27,870sqm and Unit B 46,451sqm_ (use class B2), associated car parking, SuDs, detail access from A1290, internal road structure and footpaths, turning circles, utilities provision and associated landscaping. Outline planning permission for the erection of 1no manufacturing warehouse (Unit C 28,863sqm) (use class B2 and/or B8) and 8,805sqm of commercial development comprising of a Hotel (use class C1), retail (use class A1) and car showroom (use class Sui Generis), including details of access, infrastructure, car parking, SuDs provision and associated landscaping at land north of Nissan, agricultural land west of the A19, east of A1290 and north of Washington Road, Sunderland, SR5 3HX, SR5 3HU

The Committee were provided with the WSP response to updated highway consultation response to the planning application which had been provided by the applicant and the Committee were given time to read through and consider the information prior to the Planning Officer presenting the main report.

The Planning Officer advised that this application was located within the Council designated National Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) area and draft Area Action Plan (AAP) / Development Consent Area (DCO) and as such the authority were required to notify the nation planning casework unit who had confirmed that the local planning authority should determine the planning application.

The Planning Officer presented the detailed report advising Members of the representation responses that had been received to the application and highlighting the several key areas which needed to be considered as part of the determination of the hybrid application.

The Chairman welcomed Mr. Sean Hedley, Director, Hedley Planning Services Ltd who was in attendance to speak on behalf of the applicant and in support of the application.

Mr. Hedley thanked Members for the opportunity to speak in support of the application and raised the following points in relation to the application.

He advised the Committee that the scheme was live and required a decision making upon its own merit and that it would be a development that would see the land brought into use without cost to the 'public purse'. He explained to Members that the project had funding in place to bring the development as soon as it was granted planning permission and that the development would look to deliver a good deal to the local area which the IAMP could not.

He explained to Members that the proposed development would see that it could be delivered without public money, providing at least 1,300 jobs in total and creating 260 years worth of construction related employment and that it would provide a level of certainty to the development of the site and take away any concerns over future development on that site. In addition it would generate on-going GVA of just over £65 million within the NELEP area of which nearly £24 million would be generated within Sunderland.

In closing Mr Hedley commented that the planning application presented to Members needed action today and provided a viable development and delivery of jobs and economic benefits for the city and that the only decision that could be made was to approve.

Members having no further questions, and having fully considered the report, it was:-

6. RESOLVED that the application be refused under the Town and Country General Regulation 1992, for the three reasons as set out in the report.

Items for Information

7. RESOLVED that the items for information contained within the matrix be received and noted.

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

(Signed) B. SCAPLEHORN,
Chairman.

At an extraordinary meeting of the DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (HETTON, HOUGHTON AND WASHINGTON) SUB-COMMITTEE held in the CIVIC CENTRE on MONDAY, 8th MAY, 2017 at 5.00 p.m

Present:-

Councillor Scaplehorn in the Chair

Councillors Dixon, M., Jackson, Mordey, Taylor, Turton, M., Turton, W., Walker, G. and Walker, P.

Also in Attendance:-

Councillor Turner – Hetton Ward Councillor

Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest made.

Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted to the meeting on behalf of Councillors Bell, Cummings, Lauchlan and Porthouse

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

The Executive Director of Commercial Development submitted a report (copy circulated), which related to Hetton, Houghton and Washington areas, 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 report – see original minutes)

16/02302/FUL- Erection of 2 no residential dwellings at land to the rear of Station Road, Hetton le Hole, Houghton le Spring

The Planning Officer presented the report advising of the principle of the proposal, the scale and massing of the proposed development, highways and environmental factors.

Councillor Turner addressed the Committee, advising that she was speaking in objection to the proposed development on behalf of residents within the ward who had made complaints regarding the development of two residential houses in what was previously a garden area. She advised that the back street was already very congested with cars parked and that there was also a repair garage and coach hire on that road which attracted further vehicles. She also informed the Committee that the back street was used as a 'rat run' to avoid the more congested streets during the hours of 3:30pm – 5:00pm.

The proposed properties were both four bedroom houses which it could be estimated would bring at least another two vehicles into an already over congested area without taking into account any visitors they may have which would create extra traffic. Councillor Turner also referred to the construction traffic which would need to have access during the building of the development should the application be approved and asked that the Committee agree with the Officer recommendation as set out in the report and refuse the application.

Councillor Mordey referred to the conclusion of the report and asked if any form of development would be refused on the grounds as set out or was it particularly in relation to residential properties and was advised that Officers would have serious concerns over any development at that site due to the intensification of on-street parking and the detriment of highway safety and access.

Having fully considered the report, it was:-

1. RESOLVED that the application be refused for the three reasons as set out in the report.

17/00492/FU4 – Erection of a portable classroom to west elevation at Columbia Grange School, Oxclose Road, Washington, NE38 7NY

Members having fully considered the report, it was:-

2. RESOLVED that the application be granted consent in accordance with Regulation 4 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 (as amended) for the reasons as set out in the report and subject to the two conditions detailed therein.

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

(Signed) B. SCAPLEHORN,
Chairman.

REPORT TO PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE

OBJECTIONS TO TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER FOR PROPOSED COMMUNITY PARKING MANAGEMENT SCHEME IN THE SUNDERLAND ROYAL HOSPITAL AREA (BARNES, PALLION AND MILLFIELD WARDS)

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To advise the Committee regarding two objections that have been received, by the Council, in respect of the proposed Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for Phase 4 of the Community Parking Management Scheme (CPMS) that is intended for the area of Sunderland Royal Hospital (SRH), and to request the Committee to not uphold those objections that cannot be resolved within the constraints of the scheme, as set out below.

2.0 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Committee will be aware that the Council introduced a permit-based CPMS in the area of SRH, known as CPMS Phase 1, Phase 2 and Phase 3 (CPMS1, CPMS3). Following the success of CPMS1, 2 & 3, and in accordance with the Council's commitment to the area, the Council intends to introduce CPMS Phase 4 (CPMS4). CPMS4 has been designed following extensive consultation and partnership working with elected Members, a local residents association, businesses and other stakeholders including SRH management, in the Hospital area, and is intended to reduce the amount of commuter parking, principally by hospital staff and commuters, on the streets within the scheme.
- 2.2 On 11th May 2017 the CPMS4 Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) was advertised both on site and in the local press. The 21-days advertisement period gives persons and organisations who may object to the scheme the opportunity to raise their objections formally with the Council.
- 2.3 In response to the TRO advertisement the Council received two objections. The location of each objector is shown on a plan of the area in Appendix A, with a summary of the objections in Appendix B and copy of the full objections in Appendix C.

3.0 CONCLUSION

- 3.1 The Council has a duty under Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984; "to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway" and "the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises"
- 3.2 The indiscriminate and obstructive parking at junctions causes difficulty and reduces visibility for pedestrian and vehicular traffic attempting to negotiate the congested streets, thereby increasing danger for said road users to the detriment of highway safety.

- 3.3 Access to premises is affected by commuter parking making it difficult for residents to park their vehicles in the vicinity of their homes, causing people to walk greater distances, often carrying goods and supervising children. Trading levels for local shops and services are considered to be adversely affected, because passing customers cannot easily park in the vicinity and are more likely to shop elsewhere. Commercial and to a lesser extent residential premises experience difficulty receiving deliveries or servicing the premises due to indiscriminate and obstructive parking.
- 3.4 It is therefore considered necessary to introduce permit based parking areas, designed to deter long stay commuter parking whilst allowing residents and visitors to the area more opportunity to park within said areas. It is also proposed to introduce a number of additional restrictions, including; limited waiting, no waiting at any time and no waiting no loading at any time. These restrictions are considered necessary in order to compliment the permit parking areas.
- 4.0 RECOMMENDATION
- 4.1 It is RECOMMENDED that:
- (i) The objections to the Traffic Regulation Order, for the proposed Phase 4 Community Parking Management Scheme in the area of Sunderland Royal Hospital not be upheld.
 - (ii) The Council continues to monitor the parking situation within vicinity of Sunderland Royal Hospital and seek to address displacement and any other identified issue within a future phase.
 - (iii) All objectors be advised accordingly of the decision.
 - (iv) The Head of Streetscene instruct the Head of Law and Governance to take all necessary steps to make and bring into effect the associated Traffic Regulation Order.
 - (v) The Head of Streetscene take all necessary action to implement the physical works associated with Sunderland Royal Hospital Community Parking Management Scheme Phase 4.

APPENDIX A

CPMS4 Proposals and Location of Objectors

Times of Operation

Previously proposed changes to operational times are not required as the reduced extent can be adequately enforced within the existing times.

Key:

- Proposed extent of Permit Areas, Eligible Properties & Permit Identifier - Permit Holders Only Mon to Fri, 10am to 11am and 2pm to 3pm
- Existing scheme extent & Permit Identifier - Permit Holders Only Mon to Fri, 10am to 11am and 2pm to 3pm
- Existing Waiting Restrictions
- Reduce Length of Existing Waiting Restrictions
- Proposed No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellows)
- Proposed No Waiting Mon to Fri, 8am to 9am and 4pm to 6pm, (subject to separate Order)
- Existing Permit Holders Only Parking Bays - Mon to Fri 10am to 11am and 2pm to 3pm
- Proposed Permit Holders Only Parking Bays - Mon to Fri, 10am to 11am, 2pm to 3pm
- Convert existing Limited Waiting to Pay & Display, 60p per hour All Days, 8am to 6pm (subject to separate Order)
- Existing Bays to remain unchanged
- Proposed Limited Waiting - Mon to Fri, 8am to 6pm, 1 Hour, No Return Within 1 Hour
- Proposed Limited Waiting Mon to Sat, 8am to 6pm, 2 Hours, No Return Within 2 Hours
- Proposed Gateway Sign OR Existing Gateway Sign to Remain
- Existing Gateway Sign to be removed

OBJECTOR 2
Arlington Street

Majority Petition for inclusion
of Ingleby Terrace

OBJECTOR 3
West Mount

Majority Petition for inclusion
of Hawarden Crescent

OBJECTOR 1
Hawarden Crescent

Limited waiting bays
to be removed.

PROJECT	DATE	REVISION	DATE
Sunderland City Council			
Economy and Place Directorate Jack Crawford House Commercial Road Sunderland SR2 8DR			
Telephone: 0191 520 5555 Fax: 0191 553 1460 Web: www.sunderland.gov.uk			
PROJECT: Royal Hospital Community Parking Management Scheme Phase 4			
TITLE: Traffic Regulation Order Scheme Detail			
PROJECT OFFICER: P.J. Graham	CONTACT OFFICE: 0191 5611621		
DRAWN BY: PJG	DATE: May 2016	SHEET NO: A2	
CHECKED BY: KH	DATE: Nov 2016	SCALE: NTS	
APPROVED BY: PJG	DATE: Nov 2016	DATE: Nov 2016	
PROJECT NO: TRS/14/000675/003	REVISION:		

APPENDIX B – Objection Summary and Consideration of Objection

	Objector	Nature of Objection	Consideration of Objection
1.	<p>██████████ ██████████ Hawarden Crescent High Barnes Sunderland SR4 7NL</p>	<p>1) The lady is strongly opposed to the inclusion of Hawarden Crescent, the street originally voted against inclusion in the 'official poll' but the decision was later overturned due to a majority petition, even though the lead petitioner does not live in Hawarden Crescent.</p> <p>2) It is claimed that the lead petitioner was bullying and coercing residents into signing the petition.</p>	<p>1) Hawarden Crescent did originally voted against inclusion (50.7% against based on a 67.4% return), however following the announcement of the results and on reflection, residents of Hawarden Crescent submitted a majority petition (58 of 113 properties or 51.3% of all properties) wishing to overturn the original vote and have their street included. The submission of this petition, and another from Ingleby Terrace, was discussed with Barnes Ward Councillors and later the Working Group, made up of elected ward members and representatives from the Barnes, Pallion and Millfield Residents Association, the decision was to uphold the petitions and extend the scheme to include Hawarden Crescent and Ingleby Terrace. The lead petitioners address is Ewing Road, however their property has equal frontage onto Hawarden Crescent, accounting for this the petition would be 59 of 114 properties or 51.8% of all properties.</p> <p>2) All 114 affected properties were written to, advising of the decision to uphold the petition. Whilst the objector may have perceived the manner of the lead petitioner to be 'bullying and coercing' no other resident has made this claim.</p> <p>For clarity the objector's</p>

		<p>3) The lady wouldn't object to inclusion if free permits were house specific rather than vehicle specific. It does not seem fair residents who are unable to drive, for sight reasons, are expected to pay £40.00 per annum to have visitors or trades appointments.</p>	<p>signature is not contained within the petition</p> <p>3) The scheme is specifically designed to only target long stay commuter parking, whilst avoiding the most common visiting times for residents, requiring vehicles to display a permit 10am to 11am and 2pm to 3pm, Monday to Friday, therefore visitors on a lunchtime, evenings or weekends would not need to display a permit. Due to this many residents have found that the scratch card option (at £10 per book of 10) to be a more cost effective option.</p> <p>The annual charge of £40.00 per annum for a Visitors Permit, and this cost has remained the same since the introduction of the first scheme in 2009. Being non registration specific there is an increased value for this type of permit and therefore it is priced at twice that of a second vehicle registered at a residential address. Residents with a Blue Badge or a care requirements are however entitled to a free Visitors Permit. There are also exemptions for certain construction activities within the permit area.</p> <p>4)</p>
2.	<p>████████████████████</p> <p>Arlington Street Pallion</p>	<p>1) Residents of Arlington Street voted against the scheme. There is no logic to split the street up</p>	<p>1) When assessing the voting results, particularly towards the edge of a scheme, we look at the voting patterns for particular streets as well as trying to achieve a logical boundary and where we can physically fit gateway signs. In this instance Fordland</p>

			<p>Place voted in favour, with support dropping off at the northernmost properties, whilst the majority of Arlington Street voted against it was evident that the eastern half of the street was predominantly in favour of inclusion, the result being that we needed to locate gateway signs prior to the junction of Arlington Street/Fordland Place.</p> <p>In determining gateway locations we must take account of physical constraints; footway width, location of utilities etc. location of windows, as well as neighbouring trees/foliage that may block visibility of the signs. When assessing this particular location it was observed that there were a number of utilities at the junction itself and relatively dense foliage along the northern boundary, it was therefore concluded that the boundary of 46 Fordland Place & 21 Arlington Street / 48 Fordland Place & 20 Arlington Street was the most appropriate location for gateway signs.</p>
		<p>2) Including this part of the street means that this part of the street would be Arlington Street in Fordland Place, would the gable ends of other streets name need changing?</p>	<p>2) It is quite common for properties to have boundaries on multiple streets, in this instance the gables of Fordland Place are onto Arlington Street but the postal address remains Fordland Place. There would be no need for a change of street name, simply that the relevant section of Arlington Street is properly referenced within the required legal Order. To clarify; the frontage of the</p>

		3) As the street objected and you are boundary tampering we will take this further (ombudsman / MP/ Councillors etc.)	gentleman's property would not be within the permit area, but the gable of Fordland Place would be. 3) See 1 & 2 above. Subject to the resolution of committee, the next level of challenge would be to the High Court, challenges do however be made on matters of procedure and propriety i.e. that the Council has failed to follow proper procedure.
3.	<p>Westmount Dental Surgery 1 West Mount Chester Road Sunderland SR4 8PY</p> <p>The objection is accompanied by a 1024 signature petition, as well as staff and patients surveys, and signatures from 26 nearby residents opposed to the scheme.</p>	<p>1) The plans seem to show that only two spaces have been made available for visitors to the dentists. This is not sufficient to allow the business to function, there are 5 surgeries within the practice, serving 7,000 patients.</p> <p>2) Residents in the street deliberately park their cars on street each morning,</p>	<p>1) The proposals are intended to balance competing parking demands within a relatively small cul-de-sac. A large proportion of the parking that currently occurs could not be accommodated in a formal manner.</p> <p>West Mount itself has a theoretical parking capacity (where vehicles are parked not causing an obstruction) for a maximum 10 cars. At 15.5metres in length the area designated as limited waiting is capable of accommodating 2 to 3 cars, representing 30% of the overall capacity. Comparably the Dental Practice accounts for only 7% of the street frontage and number of properties.</p> <p>The dentists would also be able to purchase Scratch Card Permits (£10 per book of 10, single day), which would enable their customers to park within the permit holders bays. These permits are non-registration specific and could therefore be re-used within the same day.</p> <p>2) Parking surveys would confirm that some residents do move their cars onto the</p>

		<p>moving them from private driveways to do so, reducing the capacity and exacerbating the parking issues. Residents also place 'illegal' traffic cones on the highway to deter customer parking.</p> <p>It is anticipated that residents will continue their existing behaviour and park their vehicles in the permit bays, leaving no additional space for dental customers. The proposed changes will make the situation worse.</p>	<p>street on a morning, which they freely admit to. The residents state that moving their car onto the street is the only way they can ensure they can get off their driveway, as people regularly park in a manner that makes egress/access from/to a driveway impossible. Residents state that they would much prefer to park on their drive.</p> <p>The proposals are designed to regularise parking within the street, creating parking where it would not cause an obstruction (see 1 above), residents should be able to freely use their own drives.</p> <p>There is no evidence to suggest that residents will continue their existing parking behaviour, the majority of residents have clearly stated that they would prefer to park on their own drive.</p>
		<p>3) The surgery has actively tried to resolve the parking issues, specifically regarding long stay staff parking. Arrangements have been made to secure off street parking for 10 staff vehicles from September 2017, at a cost of several thousand pounds per annum. This off street solution alleviates the issue so the merits of the permit scheme are questioned.</p>	<p>3) The proposed addition of off-street parking for staff is welcomed. Removal of 10 vehicles from West Mount and nearby streets would without doubt help to alleviate the issues, but it would not fully address the balance within the street.</p> <p>It is suggested that the combination of off-street staff parking, with limited waiting and permit bays on street, would significantly improve the situation for residents and patients alike.</p>
		<p>4) The practice has been established for over sixty years and respects the rights of the residents,</p>	<p>4) For balance; residents have shared similar accounts of abuse from patients and staff. The matter of anti-</p>

		<p>parking has never proven an issue until recently. Several homeowners have been verbally abusive to staff and patients, which has been referred to the Police.</p>	<p>social behaviour is not strictly a highway matter, however we understand that parking can be a highly emotive issue, particularly in situations such as this.</p> <p>The scheme itself is designed to try and better balance the competing highway needs within a very limited space.</p>
--	--	--	--

APPENDIX C
Objections in Full

Tel: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Hawarden Crescent

High Barnes

SUNDERLAND

Tyne & Wear SR4 7NL

12th May, 2017.

Mr E. Waugh
Head of Law and Governance
P.O. Box 100
Civic Centre, Burdon Road
SUNDERLAND SR2 7DN

Dear Sir,

With reference to the notice in the Sunderland Echo of Thursday May 11 regarding the Sunderland Royal Hospital parking scheme, I wish to register my strongest possible objection to the inclusion of Hawarden Crescent under Schedule 23.63.

There was an official, properly conducted, poll in this area, as a result of which residents rejected inclusion in the scheme. Subsequently, one individual who does not even live in Hawarden Crescent hand-delivered letters through each door indicating in strongly worded terms that we should support his request for a new petition. I did not sign, and shortly afterward received another letter, the tone of which concerned me sufficiently for me to contact my three local councillors.

Councillor Galbraith visited me, read the letter and noted its tone, and assured me that no further action would be taken in view of local response to the official poll. I was therefore astonished to receive a notice that we were to be included after all, and I emailed Julie Elliott, MP, and the three councillors. As a result of Julie Elliott's follow-up, I received a copy of a letter from Mark Jackson to someone called Rachael, stating that 'residents of Hawarden Crescent and Ingleby Terrace took it upon themselves to gather support...'.

This is not the case. One bullying individual coerced residents into a fresh petition – his personal petition, not the official Council one which was impartial and unthreatening. It is entirely possible that people signing felt under a certain amount of duress: Councillor Galbraith can confirm the nature of the wording.

I would not object if each household were to receive a free, house-specific rather than vehicle-specific, permit. As it is, the charge for a visitor permit appears no more than a revenue-raising gambit for the Council, in an area where most residents are on modest or low incomes, and with a high proportion of retired people. As a single person who is unable to drive for optical reasons, am I to tell my visitors that they cannot spend a day with me and must move their cars? Or am I to turn down visits or trades appointments unless I can pay £40 a year in case someone wants to call during certain times?

This is still a very quiet road, and any reconsideration of the parking scheme should be left for at least a further year. My objections, however, are on grounds of cost, discrimination, and, most of all, because the Council, breaking a promise, has condoned giving in to bullying when an official decision had already been made.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

Peter Graham

From: Peter Graham
Sent: 30 May 2017 09:50
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Jenifer Clifford
Subject: RE: Arlington Street - Royal Hospital Area CPMS4 Objection
Attachments: __Hospital CPMS4 Final TRO.pdf

Mr [REDACTED]

Apologies, please see if the attached works. If not you may need to download a PDF viewer onto the device that you are attempting to view the attachment. Please also accept this email as formal receipt of your objection.

In response to your objection I would offer the following comments:

When assessing the voting results, particularly towards the edge of a scheme, we look at the voting patterns for particular streets as well as trying to achieve a logical boundary and where we can physically fit gateway signs. In this instance Fordland Place voted in favour, with support dropping off at the northernmost properties, whilst the majority of Arlington Street voted against it was evident that the eastern half of the street was predominantly in favour of inclusion, the result being that we needed to locate gateway signs prior to the junction of Arlington Street/Fordland Place.

In determining gateway locations we must take account of physical constraints; footway width, location of utilities etc. location of windows, as well as neighbouring trees/foliage that may block visibility of the signs. When assessing this particular location it was observed that there were a number of utilities at the junction itself and relatively dense foliage along the northern boundary, it was therefore concluded that the boundary of 46 Fordland Place & 21 Arlington Street / 48 Fordland Place & 20 Arlington Street was the most appropriate location for gateway signs.

It is quite common for properties to have boundaries on multiple streets, in this instance the gables of Fordland Place are onto Arlington Street but the postal address remains Fordland Place. There would be no need for a change of street name, simply that the relevant section of Arlington Street is properly referenced within the required legal Order. To clarify; the frontage of your property would not be within the permit area, but the gable of Fordland Place would be.

With reference to your objection; I can advise that objections to the scheme are to be considered by Sunderland City Council's Planning and Highways Committee on the evening of 13th June 2017, scheduled to be held at 17:30 in Committee Room 2, Civic Centre, Burdon Road, SR2 7DN. Members of the public are permitted to attend committee, whilst as an objector you are entitled to address the committee to present your objection, should you so wish.

In any instance you will be advised of the resolution of the committee in due course. In the event that you intend to speak at committee I would be grateful if you could let me know, so that we can allow sufficient time within the agenda for the evening.

Regards,

Peter

Peter Graham
Engineer
Economy and Place Directorate
Sunderland City Council
www.sunderland.gov.uk

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 May 2017 15:03
To: Peter Graham
Subject: Re: Arlington Street

*****This message originates from outside your organisation. Do not provide login or password details. Do not click on links or attachments unless you are sure of their authenticity. If in doubt, email 'Ask.ICT@Sunderland.gov.uk' or call 561 5000 *****

I cant open attachments to your E-mail. We wish to object to the Council (obviously to suit their own agenda)using Arlington Street for your street parking scheme. Especially as tennant's of Arlington Street voted against the scheme for their street. There seems to be no logic to split a street up and call it another name for 25metres(aprox). So the gable end of the western end of the eastern section of Arlington Street would become Arlington Street in Fordland Place and so every cross street would have a gable end in the other street and so would the name have to be changed as well ?? As our street has objected to the parking scheme and if you carry on with this boundary tampering we will take this further (ombudsman/MP/Councillors etc.)

From: Peter Graham <Peter.Graham@sunderland.gov.uk>
Sent: 25 May 2017 09:31
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Arlington Street

Mr Avery,

As discussed, please find attached a copy of the scheme and site notice. The address for objections is towards the bottom of the Notice.

Regards,

Peter

Peter Graham
Engineer
Economy and Place Directorate
Sunderland City Council
www.sunderland.gov.uk



[Sunderland City Council: Sunderland Home Page](http://www.sunderland.gov.uk)

www.sunderland.gov.uk

The Sunderland City Council website is for anyone living, working, visiting or wanting to invest in Sunderland - a great city by the sea with a balanced way of life ...

Westmount Dental Surgery
1 West Mount
Chester Road
Sunderland
SR4 8PY

30th May 2017

Elaine Waugh
Head of Law and Governance
Sunderland City Council
PO Box 100
Civic Centre
Burdon Road
Sunderland
SR2 7DN

Dear Ms. Waugh,

RE: WESTMOUNT – OPPOSING THE PERMIT PARKING CONSULTATION

I am in receipt of the above letter to ascertain whether there is community support to progress a Community Parking Management Scheme (CPMS).

In your letter it states that CPMS within the city do not provide 'resident only parking' but are designed to deter long stay commuter parking, give some preference to residential parking and improve the turnover of space for visitors.

The letter gave two options for consideration:

- Option A is to convert all of West Mount into a permit area;
- Option B is to section the street into the mentioned sections, with limited waiting parking bays for patients of the practice.

My immediate response is that Option A is not a viable option for Westmount Dental Surgery and Option B places so much limitation on the amount of spaces available for visitors to the practice that it will have a detrimental effect on the practice. On looking at the plan of the proposal, it seems that there will be a maximum of two spaces made available to visitors of the practice. This is simply not satisfactory to allow business continuity. We have five fully operational surgeries within the building and I feel this action will severely affect our Dental Practice and our 7000 patients.

It is my understanding that Sunderland Council have received complaints from the residents of West Mount in relation to the parking in the street. If there are any parking issues within the street, they would be greatly alleviated by residents of the street utilising their own personal drive ways to full effect. I have previously mentioned that the residents of the street

deliberately move their cars from their driveways first thing in the morning to park on the street. There is also illegal positioning of traffic cones on the pavements to act as deterrents for people parking. The last time I checked, West Mount is a public road. I feel that our business is being targeted as the source of the problem, when I feel the residents are contributing greatly to the congestion of the street.

We have actively tried to relieve the parking issues within the street and as a practice have secured some private local off street parking for the staff of the practice, which will commence in September 2017. This means that Westmount Dental Surgery will have ten allocated private parking spaces away from the practice. This will reduce the number of cars parked on a long stay basis in the street Monday through to Friday. Details of this parking arrangement can be made available at your request. This arrangement has cost the practice near £10,000 per annum but we are committed to try and alleviate this problem and have procured this off our own back. It is a cost which will have a serious impact on the business, but it is a worthwhile investment to allow us to continue to provide services for dental health to our patients.

The implementation of two 'permit holding only' times seems very illogical and appears to be a deterrent only to the Westmount Dental Surgery. It seems to be specifically targeting long stay parkers and I feel only the Practice is affected. Our Off Street Parking arrangement alleviates this issue, so I question its merit. The introduction of double yellow lines on the west side of the street means that there will be insufficient parking to allow everyone adequate parking space. Given the attitude and behaviour of the neighbours, I can anticipate that they will park in the permit only areas, first thing every morning, to prevent patients parking there. The national average of cars per household is two, as there are fourteen houses in the street, there should be a provision of twenty eight spaces to provide adequate parking space. As the residents fail to utilise their own drive ways for personal use, the proposed changes are actually going to worsen the current parking situation.

Many residents of the street will not be affected by any changes implemented as part of the proposed changes, however, the access to a much needed dental care services is going to be impacted greatly. Access to all healthcare services should be made as easy as possible to promote health monitoring for all. The parking limitation is likely to hinder patients from attending the practice.

Although we respect the rights of the residents, the dental practice has been established for over sixty years and parking has never proven an issue until recently. I would like to use this opportunity to highlight that several home owners within the street have repeatedly verbally abused our staff and patients, which is highly unacceptable. This matter has been addressed with the police, however I do feel it is important that you are made aware of the abusive and racist behaviour of the residents.

Since my last letter, I have spoken with you in relation to the survey which took place on Westmount over a series of days. You highlighted that it showed the majority of cars parking on the street were in fact cars belonging to the residents of the street. With this in mind, I

must reinforce that if the residents utilised their personal drive ways, there would be a lot less congestion on the street.

I strongly feel that with our new parking arrangements and residents using their drive ways that the only people parking in the street will be patients of the practice, who usually have a turnaround of one hour. I believe that the implementation of a 'two hours, no return in 1 hour' zoning for the entire street would be more appropriate, or something similar. The residents would be able to utilise their drive space for personal use, some of which are able to house up to three vehicles and the practice staff will use the allocated off street parking arranged and hopefully the limited time for parking would prevent people from hogging the street parking. I feel this is very reasonable and think it should be considered.

We have completed research into the topic and have engaged with staff, patients, visitors and neighbours, with the results in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2.

In the attached petition of signatures, we have 1024 respondents who would like to oppose the changes in parking within the West Mount area.

We also have signatures from twenty-six neighbours who would also like to oppose the proposed changes in parking within the West Mount area.

I have included all of the evidence as part of this letter.

I look forward to your response.

Yours Sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Nicola Dunnett', written in a cursive style.

Miss Nicola Dunnett
Practice Manager

Appendix 1 - Staff Survey

QUESTION	ANSWER	AMOUNT	COMMENTS	AMOUNT
Do you currently drive to work?	Yes	18		0
	No	3		0
Do you feel that your health and safety would be compromised if you had to park elsewhere?	Yes	19	Late nights walking to car Wouldn't want to walk far in the dark Wouldn't feel safe walking to car late at night	4 2 1
	No	2		
Will this affect your daily routine?	Yes	17	Childcare routine will be affected Leaving earlier and getting home later will affect family Would be late for work due to nursery opening times Leaving home earlier and arriving home later Would be difficult to fulfil contracted hours Additional child care costs	2 3 1 2 2 1
	No	4		0
Could the change in parking arrangements make you consider seeking alternative employment	Yes	18	Unable to go home at lunch to look after elderly grandparents Would feel unsafe Wouldn't be able to fulfil contracted hours Couldn't guarantee parking, public transport from Gateshead Couldn't guarantee parking, public transport from Sunderland Don't want to pay for parking Stressful trying to find parking in rush hour Leaving home earlier and arriving home later	1 1 1 1 2 1 1 1
	No	3		0

Appendix 2 - Patient Questionnaire – Core Question Results

QUESTION	ANSWER	AMOUNT
Would walking from alternative parking areas cause you concern?	Yes	15
	No	2
If yes [to above] what kind? [one person ticked medical and safety]	Medical	4
	Safety	12
	N/A	2
Would this make attending the practice difficult?	Yes	16
	No	1
Would you be forced to seek alternative dental care?	Yes	13
	No	14
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS		AMOUNT
Difficulty in walking distance and rely on being able to park close to practice		1
Wife has mobility issues, walking is near impossible		1
Father suffers from mental illness and relies on close parking		1
Mother has physical impairment and relies on close parking		1
I feel safe parking outside the practice		1
I don't know the area well		1
I suffer from panic/anxiety attacks when in unfamiliar areas		1
I am vulnerable to feeling threatened in unfamiliar situations and around strangers		1
I would feel threatened walking from another car parking area		1
I don't want to have this care taken away from me		1
I am a nervous patient and struggle to gain rapport with dentists		1
I struggle to walk long distances and inclines		1