At a Meeting of the DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (SOUTH SUNDERLAND) SUB-COMMITTEE held in the CIVIC CENTRE on TUESDAY, 2<sup>nd</sup> JUNE, 2009 AT 4.30 p.m.

#### Present:-

Councillor E. Gibson in the Chair

Councillors Ball, Copeland, M. Dixon, Ellis, Fletcher, M. Forbes, T. Martin, Morrissey, O'Connor, Scaplehorn, P. Watson, Wood and A. Wright

### **Declarations of Interest**

09/00997/FUL – Demolition of existing Kayll Road block, Transport block, Health and Safety/Fire block and partial demolition of Catering block. Erection of 138 bed ward block and connecting lift block, conversion and extension to staff residence blocks (3,7 and 8) to office, conversion and extension of mortuary to treatment centre with additional car parking, link road and associated works.

Councillor Wood declared a Personal and Prejudicial interest in the application as the Chair of Compass Community Transport Group and left the room prior to the application being discussed.

## **Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Charlton and Miller.

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

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

(For copy report – see original minutes)

09/00997/FUL – Demolition of existing Kayll Road block, Transport block, Health and Safety/Fire block and partial demolition of Catering block. Erection of 138 bed ward block and connecting lift block, conversion and extension to staff residence blocks (3,7 and 8) to office, conversion and extension of mortuary to treatment centre with additional car parking, link road and associated works.

Councillor O'Connor expressed concerns regarding the parking around the hospital. He felt that the application should be refused unless the NHS Trust agreed to build a multi storey car park.

The representative of the Director of Development and Regeneration advised that the scheme more than satisfied the Council's standard requirements for parking and as such the scheme should not exacerbate the existing problems.

Councillor P. Watson commented that it was not within the committee's remit to look for a solution to the parking problems and this application complied with the parking standards set by the authority. He asked whether all local authorities adopt the same parking standards.

The representative of the Director of Development and Regeneration advised that the standards could potentially differ between authorities as it was the responsibility of each authority to define its own standards; however there tended to be uniformity.

Councillor A. Wright expressed concerns that while this development may satisfy the criteria it was possible that the previous developments had not as if these standards had been applied previously then there would not be problems with parking.

The representative of the Director of Development and Regeneration advised that the Hospital had developed in phases over a long time and each phase had been assessed in accordance with the planning policies in existence at the relevant time.

Councillor Morrissey advised that using the ratio of parking spaces per 100 square metres of floor space the Royal Hospital was 6<sup>th</sup> worst out of 8 regional hospitals. Similarly, using the spaces per bed ratio only the RVI was in a worse position.

The representative of the Director of Development and Regeneration advised that there was a wide range of ratios in the table contained in the report and the Royal Hospital was only slightly below the average.

Councillor M. Forbes asked whether the change of use from residential to office space had been taken into account when calculating the required parking.

The representative of the Director of Development and Regeneration advised that there was not a change of use as the site was remaining as hospital use and the parking requirement had been calculated based on hospital use.

Ms. Kate Wilson, a local resident, spoke against the application. She stated that she was not against the Hospital being improved to improve healthcare but she did object to the parking problems. She made the following points:-

- Staff numbers at the hospital had increased steadily since 2005
- Outpatient attendances had increased resulting in an increase in parking requirements
- There would be significant cost implications of any parking management scheme. If the development was permitted there could be a Section 106 agreement so that the hospital contributes to the costs.
- It had been reported that the trust needed to provide an extra 900 spaces as the car park was currently operating at 190 percent of its capacity.
- While the RVI had less parking per bed than the Royal Hospital it was important to consider that the RVI was based in a central location and there was a large amount of City Centre car parking within a short distance of that hospital.
- The Traffic Issues Task and Finish group had recommended that a multi storey car park be built.
- The proposed development should be refused until adequate parking was provided.

Mr George Hood spoke in support of the application on behalf of the NHS Trust. He stated that:-

- The hospital was a flagship site.
- There were major pressures on the hospital especially during busy periods such as when there were outbreaks of winter flu.
- There were no spare wards unlike in other hospitals and this caused problems when redecorating etc.
- The new wards would be state of the art and would provide more space and would be more fit for purpose than the old wards. The Kayll road block was no longer fit for purpose.
- The Trust recognised the impact on residents and would continue to attempt to reduce the demand on the car parks by promoting alternate modes of transport.

Councillor T. Martin asked whether it would be possible for the Trust to buy additional land near the hospital to use for parking.

Mr Hood advised that attempts had previously been made to lease land to use as parking.

Councillor Copeland asked where the Park and Ride schemes were operated from.

Mr Hood stated that in addition to the current scheme based at Sainsbury's supermarket in Silksworth there was also a site identified in the North of the city at Sunderland Forge and this facility was ready to begin operating.

Councillor Morrissey suggested that the Pyrex site could be used. Mr Hood replied that nothing had been looked at regarding the Pyrex factory site however the old Dewhirst factory at Pennywell Industrial Estate was being considered.

Councillor O' Connor suggested that nurses be given free parking permits to reduce the demand for on street parking.

In response to questions from Councillor P. Watson, Mr Hood advised that the park and ride scheme was working and that it was currently being used by approximately 80 people per day. It was part of a long term plan to reduce the amount of demand for parking at the hospital.

Moving the administration departments away from the site had been considered and there were plans to introduce opportunities for administrative staff to work from home.

The Trust was providing funding for improvements to transport and the expansion of the park and ride scheme and as such Mr Hood felt that a Section 106 agreement would be unnecessary.

Councillor Morrissey advised that he had seen figures for construction of a multi-storey car park and in his opinion these costs were not prohibitive. He also suggested a Section 106 agreement be requested so that the hospital was required to contribute to the costs of any parking management scheme as local residents should not be required to cover the costs.

The representative of the Director of Development and Regeneration advised that if an on-street parking permit scheme was introduced then it would need to accommodate some hospital parking and there could be a charge for these permits.

In response to a question from Councillor M. Forbes, Mr Hood advised that there was no long term agreement in place regarding the park and ride facility however there was no threat that the service would be withdrawn as Sainsbury's Supermarket also benefited from the service.

Councillor M. Forbes moved that the application be deferred until there was clarity regarding the proposals for on-street parking provision in the area surrounding the hospital.

This motion was put to the vote and with:
5 Members voting for the deferral of the decision
No Members voting against; and
8 Members abstaining
The motion to defer was passed.

### 1. RESOLVED that:

(i). 09/00997/FUL – Demolition of existing Kayll Road block, transport bloc, Health and Safety/Fire block and partial demolition of Catering block. Erection of 138 bed ward block and connecting lift block, conversion and extension to staff residence blocks (3, 7 & 8) to office, conversion and extension of mortuary to treatment centre with additional car parking, link road and associated works.

The application be deferred.

(ii). 09/01225/LAP – Erection of a new day care facility.

The application be approved for the reasons set out in the report and subject to the 14 conditions set out therein.

(iii). 08/04434/LAP – Provision of 4 No. external infra red heaters to the front elevation. (Retrospective)

That Members be minded to approve the application for the reasons set out in the report and subject to the three conditions therein and subject to no new objections being received prior to expiry of the consultation period.

(iv). 09/00957/OUT – Outline application for the erection of a hotel with associated parking.

The application be approved for the reasons set out in the report and subject to the 24 conditions contained therein.

## **Town and Country Planning Act 1990 – Appeals**

The Director of Development and Regeneration submitted a report (copy circulated) concerning the above for the period 1<sup>st</sup> May, 2009 to 31<sup>st</sup> May, 2009.

(For copy report – see original minutes)

2. RESOLVED that the report be received and noted.

(Signed) E. GIBSON, Chairman.