

## **DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that “where in making any determination under the planning Acts, regard is to be had to the development plan, the determination shall be made in accordance with the plan unless material consideration indicates otherwise.

### **Unitary Development Plan - current status**

The Unitary Development Plan for Sunderland was adopted on 7th September 1998. In the report on each application specific reference will be made to those policies and proposals, which are particularly relevant to the application site and proposal. The UDP also includes a number of city wide and strategic policies and objectives, which when appropriate will be identified.

## **STANDARD CONDITIONS**

Sections 91 and 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 require that any planning application which is granted either full or outline planning permission shall include a condition, which limits its duration.

## **SITE PLANS**

The site plans included in each report are illustrative only.

## **PUBLICITY/CONSULTATIONS**

The reports identify if site notices, press notices and/or neighbour notification have been undertaken. In all cases the consultations and publicity have been carried out in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2010

## **LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 – ACCESS TO INFORMATION**

The background papers material to the reports included on this agenda are:

- The application and supporting reports and information;
- Responses from consultees;
- Representations received;
- Correspondence between the applicant and/or their agent and the Local Planning Authority;
- Correspondence between objectors and the Local Planning Authority;
- Minutes of relevant meetings between interested parties and the Local Planning Authority;
- Reports and advice by specialist consultants employed by the Local Planning Authority;
- Other relevant reports.

Please note that not all of the reports will include background papers in every category and that the background papers will exclude any documents containing exempt or confidential information as defined by the Act.

These reports are held on the relevant application file and are available for inspection during normal office hours at the Office of the Chief Executive in the Civic Centre or via the internet at [www.sunderland.gov.uk/online-applications/](http://www.sunderland.gov.uk/online-applications/)

Janet Johnson  
Deputy Chief Executive

---

**Reference No.:** 14/00703/FUL Full Application

**Proposal:** **Provision of car park comprising 161no. spaces and new access with gate.**

**Location:** Land At Campground Springwell Road Springwell  
Gateshead NE9 7XW

**Ward:** Washington West

**Applicant:** Mr David Pegg

**Date Valid:** 10 April 2014

**Target Date:** 10 July 2014

---

## **PROPOSAL:**

Planning permission is sought by Wrekenton Nou Camp Youth Football Club to provide a 161-space car park on an area of grassland which is used occasionally for informal parking in association with the adjacent football pitches as well as for daily visitors such as dog walkers and runners who use the fields. The site is owned by Gateshead Council but is wholly within the administrative boundary of the City of Sunderland.

The proposed car park has an area of approximately 4300sq. m and would be surfaced with Bodpave 85 (a porous paving grid system) or a similar material. The car park would be afforded vehicular access from the road to the Campground Refuse Disposal Works which runs along the south of the site, the existing vehicular access to the north would be terminated and a new pedestrian access would be provided to the northeast from Springwell Road which would be linked to the football pitches by a new dedicated footway. Of the proposed 161no. parking spaces, 4no. would be dedicated for people with disabilities / limited mobility. A single coach parking space would be incorporated and a covered Sheffield cycle stand which could accommodate up to 10no. bicycles would be provided within the curtilage of the site to the northeast. The submitted plans indicate that a total of 7no. trees would be removed and new trees would be provided within a buffer on the periphery of the site within the fence line to comprise a mix of Golden Willow, English Oak and Copper Beech, in addition to Hawthorn hedging.

Members may recall that an application (ref. 11/01066/SUB) to provide a tarmac car park on this site was referred to the Sub-Committee meeting of 08 January 2014 wherein it was resolved to refuse planning permission for the following reasons.

1. The proposal, by means of its design and use of materials, would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the area and the openness of the Green Belt and would constitute an unsympathetic encroachment into the countryside, contrary to policies B2, B3, L7, CN2, CN4, CN5 and WA19.1 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan and paragraphs 79, 80, 87, 88 and 89 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The proposal, by means of its design and use of materials, would unacceptably increase the risk of flooding locally, contrary to policy EN12 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan and paragraph 100 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. The proposal, by means of the proposed means of access, number of car parking spaces and lack of promotion of alternative sustainable modes of transport is detrimental to highway safety and the free passage of traffic along the road leading to the Campground Refuse Disposal Works, contrary to policies T14 and T22 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan and paragraphs 32 and 75 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The site exists as an area of grassed open space and is situated within the Tyne and Wear Green Belt. The area on which the proposed car park to be provided is generally well maintained, although evidence of vehicular use is apparent. Relatively mature trees exist within the site in addition to numerous trees and shrubbery along its periphery. The site generally has a gradual upward east to west gradient which becomes steeper at its western side. The site is set higher than the B1288 Springwell Road, which runs along the northeast of the site and slopes downward from north to south, and the unadopted access the road to the Campground Refuse Disposal Works which runs along its southern boundary. Access to the site is currently afforded from the north via a hard paved track which also provides access to GL Ford and Co. Ltd. vehicle body repair centre off which visitor parking for this business is afforded to the north, beyond which exists the Springwell Inn public house. The majority of the site is bound by green paladin fencing, although steel palisade fencing and panelling exists along a significant proportion of the northern boundary of the site. Residential properties exist to the north beyond this steel palisade fencing and to the southeast, namely Low Mount Farm, on the opposite side of Springwell Road.

The following documentation has been submitted in support of the application.

- Design and Access Statement (which includes a Statement of Community Involvement)
- Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy
- Transport Statement

#### **TYPE OF PUBLICITY:**

Press Notice Advertised  
Site Notice Posted  
Neighbour Notifications

#### **CONSULTEES:**

Northumbrian Water  
Network Management  
County Archaeologist  
Environmental Health  
Sport England  
Gateshead MBC  
Environment Agency  
Washington West - Ward Councillor Consultation

Final Date for Receipt of Representations: **16.05.2014**

## **REPRESENTATIONS:**

The application has been publicised by means of site and press notices and letters to neighbouring properties and no resultant representations have been received.

The County Archaeologist confirmed that no archaeological work is required in this instance.

The Environment Agency initially based its comments upon the assumption that the run-off water would be discharged to the public sewer and, when advised that this would not be the case, confirmed that it has no further comments to offer.

Gateshead Council's planning section has provided a response as an adjacent authority and, whilst not objecting, raised concerns in respect of the appropriateness and impact of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt, visual impact, the necessity of the number of spaces proposed, highway/pedestrian implications and drainage. These issues will be elaborated upon subsequently in this report.

Northumbrian Water confirmed that it offers no comments in this instance.

Sport England advised that, upon consultation with the Football Association, the proposed development is ancillary to the principal use of the site as a playing field of playing fields, and does not affect the quantity or quality of pitches or adversely affect their use, so offers no objection.

The Council's Environmental Health section confirmed that no comments are offered in this instance.

The Council's Network Management section noted that the proposal has the potential to exacerbate the use of the access road to the refuse facilities given that the peak operational times of the two facilities would likely coincide and advised that the applicant agree the scope of traffic survey and modelling work, which should be submitted for consideration prior to a decision being made. Alternatively, the continued use of the existing access would negate the need for a traffic survey and modelling work to be carried out.

## **POLICIES:**

In the Unitary Development Plan the site is subject to the following policies;

- B\_2\_Scale, massing layout and setting of new developments
- B\_3\_Protection of public/ private open space (urban green space)
- CN\_2\_Purpose of the Green Belt in Sunderland
- CN\_4\_Control of other operations in the Green Belt
- CN\_5\_Safeguarding the visual amenity of the Green Belt
- EN\_12\_Conflicts between new development and flood risk / water resources
- L\_7\_Protection of recreational and amenity land
- T\_8\_The needs of pedestrians will be given a high priority throughout the city.

T\_9\_Specific provision will be made for cyclists on existing/new roads and off road

T\_10\_Protect footpaths; identify new ones & adapt some as multi-user routes

T\_14\_Accessibility of new developments, need to avoid congestion and safety problems arising

T\_22\_Parking standards in new developments

WA\_19\_Maintenance of a Green Belt

## **COMMENTS:**

The main issues to consider in the assessment of this application are set out as follows:

Principle of Proposed Development;  
Impact on Openness and Visual Amenity of Green Belt;  
Flood Risk and Drainage;  
Highway Implications and  
Residential Amenity

### Principle of Proposed Development

The site is situated within the Tyne and Wear Green Belt and, as such, policy WA19.1 of the Council's adopted Unitary Development Plan (UDP) is applicable, which dictates that this particular section of the Green Belt shall be retained. Paragraph 80 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out five purposes of including land in Green Belts, which are reflective of policy CN2 of the UDP, namely to:

- check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Paragraph 81 of the NPPF goes on to advise that, 'once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land'.

The essential characteristic of Green Belts is their permanence and their protection must be maintained as far as can be seen ahead. In order to safeguard the Green Belt, paragraph 87 of the NPPF considers 'inappropriate development' to be, by definition, harmful and should therefore not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 88 goes on to state that, 'when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by

reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations'.

Within this context, paragraph 89 of the NPPF indicates that the construction of new buildings inside the Green Belt is inappropriate unless for one of the following purposes:

- agriculture and forestry;
- appropriate facilities for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, and for cemeteries, as long as it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;
- the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;
- the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;
- limited infilling in villages, and limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the Local Plan; or
- limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development.

Whilst the current proposal does not constitute the construction of a new building, the proposed car park would be directly associated with the football pitches which exist within the site, to be used by Wrekenton Nou Camp Youth Football Club, who are a Charter Standard club, and its patrons and supporters. Therefore, it is considered that the proposal constitutes an appropriate facility for outdoor sport.

During the course of the previous refused application for a car park on this site, Sport England, upon consultation with the Football Association, advised that the Football Club has grown dramatically in recent years and a car park would therefore be of benefit, particularly given that the club has raised issues about parking on the access road to the disposal works. Although the proposal would result in the loss of part of the playing field, the current area is not suitable for a pitch.

For such reasons, the provision of a car park to serve the Football Club is considered to constitute appropriate development within the Green Belt and is therefore considered to be broadly acceptable, in principle. However, the development can only be considered to be appropriate within the Green Belt on the proviso that it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it (as set out by paragraph 80 of the NPPF) and notwithstanding the other issues set out below.

#### Impact on Openness and Visual Amenity of Green Belt

Policy B2 of the UDP reflects the above, stating that the scale, massing, layout and/or setting of new developments should respect and enhance the best qualities of nearby properties and the locality whilst large scale schemes, creating their own individual character, should relate harmoniously to adjoining areas' whilst policy B3 states that 'public and private open space will be protected from development which would have a serious adverse effect on its amenity, recreational or nature conservation value; proposals will be considered in the

light of their contribution to urban regeneration and to the importance of such space to the established character of the area'.

As set out above, (paragraph 89 of the NPPF) development can only be considered to be appropriate within the Green Belt on the proviso that it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. Reflective of paragraph 89, UDP policy CN5 sets out that care will be taken to ensure that the visual amenities of the Green Belt will not be injured by proposal for development within, or conspicuous from, the Green Belt.

One of the core principles of the NPPF, as set out by paragraph 17, is that planning should 'always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings'. Paragraphs 56 and 57 expand upon this principle, highlighting the importance Central Government place on the design of the built environment, including individual buildings, public and private spaces and wider area development schemes. Paragraph 64 of the NPPF goes on to state that 'permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions'. One of the purposes of including land within the Green Belt, as set out by paragraph 80 of the NPPF (see above) is to 'assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment'.

The proposal would benefit the football club by providing a formalised car park, which has been identified by the Football Association as a requirement for the club. Accordingly, as set out above, there is no objection to the principle of providing a football pitch on the area of land in question, provided that it is designed in an appropriate manner. Indeed, it is noted that site is currently used informally for parking, although only occasionally (mainly on weekends) and no formal consent has been given for such.

The application site is situated in a prominent location and is highly visible from Springwell Road to the southeast and north and Leam Lane to the northeast. The site exists as an area of grassland which is generally well maintained and situated within the Tyne and Wear Green Belt which extends to the south and part of the north of the site and to the west beyond the Campground Refuse Disposal Works. The site abuts the northern extent of the Green Belt so, whilst there exists built development immediately to the north, this is not situated within the Green Belt.

The previous refused application comprised the provision of a significant expanse of tarmac which would have been almost entirely unbroken. This was considered to be wholly inappropriate within a semi-rural setting and compounded by the Green Belt allocation of the site and its surroundings.

The current proposal comprises the use of a Bodpave 85 or similar system, which comprises a cellular porous plastic paving grid which can be installed with either a grass or gravel surface. The majority of the surface of the proposed car park would be filled with angular gravel fill, however a significant proportion (approximately 1200 square metres) to the centre of the site would remain grassed. This is considered to constitute a significant improvement in terms of the visual impact of the proposal through the breaking-up of the surface with soft landscaping whilst utilising less visually obtrusive gravel as opposed to tarmac.

In addition, proposed site levels have been included which indicate that levels would not be significantly altered (with the exception of the proposed new access point), hedging would be provided along the border and numerous trees would be incorporated on the periphery and within the curtilage of the site. Further details of the trees and their planted size have now been provided, typically 10-12cm in girth and 12-14cm for the Golden Willow as opposed to the whips as proposed by the previous application.

Whilst such planting would not completely screen the proposed car park from view, particularly taking into account the levels of the western section of the site and the rise of Springwell Road to the south, it is considered that it, together with the level of grass to be incorporated and use of gravel, would adequately maintain the essential green nature of the site. The proposal is therefore considered to be sympathetic to the nature of its surroundings and, as such, it is not considered that the development would be harmful to the visual amenity of the locality, nor would it constitute an encroachment into the countryside or an erosion of the Green Belt.

For such reasons, it is not considered that the proposed development 'would have a significant impact on the openness of the Green Belt'. As such, having regard to paragraph 4 of The Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) Direction 2009: Circular 02/2009, as referred to by the current NPPF Planning Practice Guidance, it is not considered that this application must be referred to the Secretary of State should Members be minded to approve.

#### Flood Risk and Drainage

Policy EN12 of the UDP dictates that the Council, in conjunction with the Environment Agency (EA) and other interested parties, will seek to ensure that proposals would not be likely to impede materially the flow of flood water, or increase the risk of flooding elsewhere, or increase the number of people or properties at risk from flooding (including coastal flooding) or adversely affect the quality or availability of ground or surface water, including rivers and other waters, or adversely affect fisheries or other water-based wildlife habitats.

In addition, paragraph 100 of the NPPF states that 'inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk, but where development is necessary, making it safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere. For these purposes, paragraph 2 of the Technical Guidance to the NPPF sets out that:

"areas at risk of flooding" means land within Flood Zones 2 and 3; or land within Flood Zone 1 which has critical drainage problems and which has been notified to the local planning authority by the Environment Agency;

"flood risk" means risk from all sources of flooding - including from rivers and the sea, directly from rainfall on the ground surface and rising groundwater, overwhelmed sewers and drainage systems, and from reservoirs, canals and lakes and other artificial sources'.

As summarised in the main report to the Sub-Committee, the EA made no specific comments in respect of surface water drainage, noting its standing advice regarding general surface water drainage issues. Northumbrian Water



raised no objection on the basis that the development is not proposed to affect its apparatus, given that it is proposed to dispose of surface water via an infiltration method and not the public sewer.

The site is situated within Flood Zone 1, so is at a low risk of flooding, Gateshead Council has confirmed that it has received complaints in respect of flooding deriving from surface water discharge and photographing evidence has previously been provided by a local resident of a large gathering of water on the adjacent field to the south.

The submitted Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy sets out that the proposed cellular paving system would be drained via underlying filter pipes and outfall into a cellular infiltration system at the eastern end of the car park underneath parking bays. This document estimates that surface water run-off would increase from a greenfield rate for a 100 year event, 6 hour design storm duration of 124.8 cubic metres to a rate of 100 cubic metres, so runoff from the site would be reduced by approximately 20% as a result of the proposal.

It is noted that no intrusive ground investigation has been carried out, which would determine the infiltration rate of the site. Rather, the assessment has been carried out under the assumption that the underling soil (which is presumably clay) has poor infiltration characteristics and the infiltration rate has been based accordingly in the calculations of the report. However, given that the proposal would represent a betterment in terms of the natural drainage of the site, the risk of local flooding would not be increased.

#### Highway Implications

Paragraph 32 of the NPPF states that consideration should be given to:

- the opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development. Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.

Paragraph 75 of the NPPF states that, 'planning policies should protect and enhance public rights of way and access. Local authorities should seek opportunities to provide better facilities for users, for example by adding links to existing rights of way networks including National Trails'.

Policies T8, T9 and T10 of the UDP promote the facilitation of mobility for pedestrians and cyclists whilst upgrading and identifying new paths and multi-user routes. Policy T14 aims to ensure that new developments are easily accessible to both vehicles and pedestrians, should not cause traffic problems, should make appropriate provision for safe access by vehicles and pedestrians and indicate how parking requirements will be met. UDP Policy T21 relates to the provision of parking within the City and the need to take account of the need to maintain safe road conditions and ensure the economic viability of existing

retail and commercial centres whilst UDP policy T22 seeks to ensure that the necessary levels of car parking provision will be provided.

Further to comments received from both Gateshead Council and Sunderland City Council's Network Management Section the agent has been asked to provide further traffic survey modelling work to assess the impact of the proposed development upon the surrounding highway network. This information is still under consideration and the findings of this additional information shall be reported via a supplement report.

#### Residential Amenity

Reflective of paragraph 17 of the NPPF, as set out above, policy EN6 of the UDP states that, where noise sensitive development is proposed which is likely to be exposed to unacceptable levels of noise or vibration from roads, railways, existing industrial areas or other potentially noisy uses, the Council will require the applicant to carry out an assessment of the nature and extent of likely problems and to incorporate suitable mitigation measures in the design of the development, if necessary. Where such measures are not practical, permission will normally be refused.

There are dwellings in Seaburn Gardens and Eighton Terrace immediately to the north/northwest of the site, the nearest of which is around 40 metres from the proposed car park. Whilst the proposed car park would be occasionally busy, by the nature of its use to accommodate vehicles on a short-term basis it is not considered that the proposal would give rise to any significant level of noise, vibration or consequent disturbance to neighbouring residents.

#### Conclusion

In summary, it is not considered that the proposed car park, by reason of materials used would be detrimental to the visual amenity and the openness of the Green Belt. The proposed cellular plastic paving grid which can be installed with either a grass or gravel surface providing a sympathetic form of development that also by virtue of its porous nature will reduce surface water run off from the site by approximately 20% adding a degree of betterment to the existing drainage in and around the site. With reference to the impact of the development upon levels of residential amenity it is not considered that the frequency of the use of the site will lead to a significant increase in levels of noise, vibration or consequent disturbance to neighbouring properties.

Further comments are awaited with reference to the impact of the proposed car park upon the existing highway network and these comments shall be reported in a supplementary report.

#### **RECOMMENDATION: Deputy Chief Executive to Report**

---

**Reference No.:** 14/00970/FUL Full Application

**Proposal:** **Change of use of existing two storey health and fitness and retail building to allow Class A1 retail use at ground floor and Class D2 health and fitness use at first floor, together with shopfront alterations and new entrance following completion of approved mezzanine floor.**

**Location:** Land At The Peel Centre Glover Washington

**Ward:** Washington North

**Applicant:** Peel Investments (North) Limited

**Date Valid:** 28 April 2014

**Target Date:** 28 July 2014

---

## **PROPOSAL:**

The proposal currently under consideration relates to the change of use of the consented and constructed health and fitness / retail building to allow Class A1 retail use at ground floor and Class D2 health and fitness use at first floor, together with shop front alterations and new entrance following completion of the approved mezzanine floor at Unit E, Peel Centre, Washington.

The building to which this application relates was constructed for the purposes of a two storey, 5100 square metres health and fitness club with 1394 square metres of retail floor space to be used in conjunction with the main health and fitness use at first floor level. The building was constructed by Peel in 2008 and leased to JJB Sports, who later sold their health club business to DW Sports who decided not to take on the unit as part of the corporate sale. The building has been back in Peel's possession since July 2011.

The proposal seeks to increase the approved retail floor space from 1394 square metres to 2555 square metres of the total 5110 square metres building.

With effect from April 2009 Central Government issued a Direction which replaced a number of previous Directions relating to "retail" development, development on playing fields, development within the green belt and development in flood risk areas. Under the 2009 Direction, depending upon their size and other caveats, development falling into one of the above categories may require consultation with the Secretary of State, should the Local Planning Authority be minded to approve the application. In the case of retail/shopping development the proposal has to meet one of a number of size thresholds and not be in accordance with one or more provisions of the development plan in force at the time.

In this regard the site is an out of centre site, the application is not in accordance with one or more provisions of the development plan, namely it will not be fully

consistent with the saved town centre shopping policies S1 and S2 of the Unitary Development Plan and the Washington Town Centre retail policies and finally the proposal seeks to authorise floorspace that exceeds 2,500 square metres which signifies that the application will have to be referred in this instance.

The application has been advertised by way of neighbour consultations as well as both site and press notices.

### The Site

The Peel Centre is an established out of centre retail park located 1.7km to the east of Washington Town Centre at the junction of Spire Road and the Sunderland Highway. The Washington Highway forms the main vehicular connection between the application site and the City Centre which is located approximately 10km to the east. The site provides 300 customer car parking spaces to the front of the building, 18 of which are disabled bays with 50 bays designated for staff parking.

### The Site History

The Peel Retail Park comprises of two distinct phases of development which are detailed below.

Phase 1 relates to a 2.54 hectare site which provides 6,761 square metres of retail floor space across five units.

Phase 2 comprises of a 2.07 hectare site currently occupied by McDonalds and the vacant 5100 square metres health and fitness club. Phase 2 also has an extant permission for a further 4,239 square metres extension restricted to a range of non-food goods.

NB : Clays Garden Centre falls outside Peels ownership.

### Planning History

In 2003 outline planning consent was sought for an extension to the existing retail park (Phase 1) to provide in the region of 5760 square metres of non-food floor space with associated access and car parking.(Ref.03/00120/OUT). The application was referred to the Secretary of State, in line with planning legislation at that time, and the application was subsequently approved in 2004 following a Call-In Inquiry. Condition 13 of this permission restricted the range of A1 goods that could be sold from the site, whilst condition 14 limited the total gross floor space to a maximum of 5760 square metres. Condition 13 reads as follows:-

"The Use Class A1 development hereby permitted shall not be used for the retailing of any of the following goods without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority:

- a) Food and drink (excluding the ancillary 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 and watches;

- f) Cosmetics and toiletries;
- g) Pharmaceutical products;
- h) Books, newspapers and magazines (excluding gardening/DIY books and magazines);
- i) Toys (excluding garden toys and outside play equipment);
- j) Sports goods (including walking and climbing equipment);
- k) Computers and computer games;
- l) Camping equipment;
- m) Videos, DVD's, CDs, audio cassettes and records;
- n) Musical instruments;
- o) Stationery and greetings cards;
- p) Florist;
- q) Travel agency;
- r) Cameras and photographic equipment;
- s) Household/personal telecommunications equipment."

In 2007, an application (ref: 07/02384/VAR) was made under Section 73 for the variation of condition 13 of the outline consent. The application sought to revise the wording of the original condition 13 to enable the items listed in condition 13 to be sold where they are ancillary to the main product being sold at the premises. In addition, sportswear, sports goods and camping equipment were included in the above list. The revised wording of condition 13 reads as follows:-

"The Use Class A1 development hereby permitted shall not be used for the retailing of any of the following goods, except where ancillary to the main product range, without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority:

- a) Food and drink (excluding the ancillary sale of food and drink for consumption on the premises);
- b) Fashion clothing (excluding gardening /DIY overalls protective clothing and sportswear);
- c) Fashion accessories (excluding sportswear);
- d) Footwear (excluding gardening/DIY protective footwear and sports footwear);
- e) Jewellery and watches;
- f) Cosmetics and toiletries;
- g) Pharmaceutical products;
- h) Books, newspapers and magazines;
- i) Toys (excluding garden toys and outside play equipment);
- j) Videos, DVDs, CDs, audio cassettes and records;
- k) Musical instruments;
- l) Stationery and greetings cards;
- m) Florist;
- n) Travel agency;
- o) Cameras and photographic equipment;
- p) Household/personal telecommunications equipment."

The above application was approved at the meeting of the Development Control (Hetton, Houghton and Washington) Sub-Committee on 31.07.2007. The approval of this application effectively issued a fresh consent for the development, enabling the occupation of Phase II of the retail park by "out of centre" warehouse occupiers.

A reserved matters application (ref : 07/02808/REM) for Phase II of the Peel Retail park was submitted shortly after the submission of the above and related

to the detailed submission of information relating to:- the siting, design and external appearance of the buildings and means of enclosure, details of all walls, fences, barriers and other means of enclosure, details of lighting and landscape treatment (hard and soft), provision of a surfaced footway to the west of Spire Road including footway improvements to the eastern boundary of the site, creation of a 272 space car park (max) and remediation of contaminated land. This application was approved at the meeting of the Development Control (Hetton, Houghton and Washington) Sub Committee on 04.09.2007.

At the same sub committee dated 04.09.2007, a full planning application was approved for the erection of a two storey health and fitness club with an element of retail use which was intended to be used in conjunction with the main use of the building (ref : 07/02812/FUL). This consent effectively substituted the largest of the units approved as part of the Phase 2 extension to the retail park, increasing the size of Unit E from 1431 square metres to 5110 square metres. This approval has been built, but the use has never commenced.

### **TYPE OF PUBLICITY:**

Press Notice Advertised  
Site Notice Posted  
Neighbour Notifications

### **CONSULTEES:**

Network Management  
Washington North - Ward Councillor Consultation

Final Date for Receipt of Representations: **09.06.2014**

### **REPRESENTATIONS:**

No letters of representation have been received following the expiry of the consultation period.

### **POLICIES:**

In the Unitary Development Plan the site is subject to the following policies;

B\_2\_Scale, massing layout and setting of new developments  
T\_14\_Accessibility of new developments, need to avoid congestion and safety problems arising  
T\_22\_Parking standards in new developments  
EN\_10\_Proposals for unallocated sites to be compatible with the neighbourhood  
S\_1\_Provision of enhanced shopping service, including local provision, based on existing centres.  
S\_2\_Encouraging proposals which will enhance / regenerate defined existing centres.  
WA\_33\_Improvement of Washington Town Centre  
WA\_34\_Allocation of sites for new retailing and commercial development

## **COMMENTS:**

Paragraph 24 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) explains that local planning authorities should apply a sequential test to planning applications for the main town centre uses that are not in an existing centre and are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan. Applying the sequential approach in this case means assessing whether there are any sites in existing town centres in the catchment area that can meet the identified need in terms of availability, suitability and viability.

Paragraph 26 of the NPPF requires planning applications for retail and leisure developments that exceed 2,500 sq.m (gross), not in an existing centre and not in accordance with an up to date development plan, to be accompanied by an assessment of the impact of the development. The relevant criteria against which the proposal is considered should consider:

1. The impact of the proposal on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in a centre or centres in the catchment area of the proposal and
2. The impact of the proposal on town centre vitality, including local customer choice and trade in the town centre and wider area, up to five years from the time the application is made. For major schemes where the full impact will not be realised in five years, the impact should also be assessed up to ten years from the time the application is made.

Whilst the application has been supported by both a Sequential and Impact Assessment, this information is still under consideration along with all other matters and shall be reported in the Supplementary Report.

**RECOMMENDATION: Deputy Chief Executive to Report**

---

**Reference No.:** 14/01154/FUL Full Application

**Proposal:** **Change of use from light industrial B1 use to takeaway with A5 use.**

**Location:** Unit 4 Gurteens Yard South Street Newbottle Houghton-le-Spring DH4 4EH

**Ward:** Copt Hill

**Applicant:** Mr Curtis Cooper

**Date Valid:** 15 May 2014

**Target Date:** 10 July 2014

---

## **PROPOSAL:**

Planning permission is sought for the change of use to hot food takeaway with at Unit 4, Gurteens Yard, South Street, Newbottle, Houghton Le Spring, DH4 4EH.

## **SITE DESCRIPTION**

The proposed change of use and associated development affects one unit within the recently refurbished Gurteens Yard. Gurteens Yard was constructed between 1919 and 1939, located within the Newbottle Conservation Area. The buildings within the yard are of little historical and architectural merit without any positive impact on the streetscene or wider Conservation Area.

Two white rendered buildings flank the eastern and western boundaries of Gurteen's Yard, which slopes downwards from north towards South Street, running to the south of the site. The subject unit is located within the western run of buildings. The buildings occupy a prominent position in the locality, particularly from the south, primarily due to their scale, but also due to their elevated position in relation to South Street.

The eastern boundary of the site is bordered by a footpath running from South Street, past the gable end of the last properties on Garden Terrace and Hartoft Close, and north to exit onto Front Street. The western boundary of the site is flanked by the rear of the back gardens of properties on Elm Place, whilst to the north of the site stands St. Matthew's Youth and Community Centre and the vicarage of Rochdale House.

## **Proposed Development**

The application seeks to change the use of the unit from a light industrial unit (use class B1 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order (as amended)) to a hot-food takeaway (use class A5 of the Order).

The company owns the Mamas Kitchen Restaurant in Newbottle with the proposed change of use arising due to customer demand. The current premises, and in particular the car park, does not lend itself to a takeaway use. The



proposed hot food takeaway is to be run in partnership with the restaurant with over 50% of sales from the Gurteen's Yard site expected to comprise of deliveries.

The public floor area is limited and restricted to the front section of the unit, whilst to the rear of the premises is food preparation and cooking facilities. Within the centre of the unit, beyond a dividing wall separating the food preparation and cooking area is the service area. A total of 4 no. full-time staff are anticipated to be employed at the premises with the operating hours identified as 10am until 10pm Monday through to Saturday and 10am until 8pm on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

An extraction flue is also proposed to be fitted, with the ducting routed through the roof and venting to the front of the property within the roof slope, finished with a 'mushroom vent'.

Car parking within the site is communal although two parking bays are allocated to the application premises.

There are no significant external alterations proposed to facilitate the change of use, with a shop front to be installed behind the existing roller shutter. Level access is to be provided whilst a dropped counter is to be installed for access for all.

An application of this nature would normally be determined under the Council's Delegation scheme, but it has been referred to the Houghton, Hetton and Washington Development Control Sub-Committee at the request of Cllr Derrick Smith.

#### **TYPE OF PUBLICITY:**

Press Notice Advertised  
Site Notice Posted  
Neighbour Notifications

#### **CONSULTEES:**

Copt Hill - Ward Councillor Consultation  
Network Management  
Environmental Health

Final Date for Receipt of Representations: **26.06.2014**

#### **REPRESENTATIONS:**

Public consultation

Four letters of objection have been received in response to consultation, from the occupiers of nos. 11 and 16 Elm Place, 2 Garden Terrace and Craggside on Houghton Road. It should be noted that the consultation period for both the public and press notice are yet to expire and do so on the 26th and 25th June respectively, which is after the deadline for preparation of this report. Should any additional representations be received they will be reported at the Sub-

Committee Meeting. The concerns raised by the abovementioned objectors are as follows:

- there are already a large number of food outlets and it is not required
- parking issues/ highway safety
- disturbance - noise, odours
- litter
- inappropriate
- loss of privacy
- there has been previous refusals in the area

The above concerns will be considered in greater detail below however with respect to previous refusals it is noted that three applications for a similar use to the proposed have been refused at no. 29 South Street. Notwithstanding the previous refusals in the vicinity of the application site, each application must be assessed on its own merits.

### **POLICIES:**

In the Unitary Development Plan the site is subject to the following policies;

B\_2\_Scale, massing layout and setting of new developments

EN\_10\_Proposals for unallocated sites to be compatible with the neighbourhood

S\_12\_Criteria for hot food take-aways, restaurants, other A3 uses and amusement centres

T\_14\_Accessibility of new developments, need to avoid congestion and safety problems arising

### **COMMENTS:**

#### **RELEVANT POLICY BACKGROUND**

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) provides the current Government's national planning policy guidance and development plans must be produced, and planning applications determined, with regard to it. The NPPF sets out a series of 12 'core planning principles' which underpin plan-making and decision-taking and are considered to contribute to the over-arching aim of delivering sustainable development. Particularly relevant in this case are the principles that development should always seek to secure a high quality design and a good standard of amenity; should proactively drive and support sustainable economic development and should encourage the effective re-use of land and property.

The relevant guidance of the NPPF detailed above feeds into policies EN10, B2, S12 and T14 of the City Council's adopted Unitary Development Plan (1998), which are consequently considered to be pertinent to the determination of this application.

The land is allocated as 'white land' on the City Council's adopted Unitary Development Plan (1998) proposals map. As such, it is subject to policy EN10, which states that where land is not specifically allocated for a particular use, the prevalent land use in the vicinity should be continued.

Policy S12, advises that hot-food takeaways are generally acceptable if they are located within an existing town or local centre and other appropriately located and accessible sites unless they have a detrimental impact on the environment, residential amenity and public or highway safety.

The requirements of policy S12 are expanded upon in section 9 of Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) to the UDP, which states that applications for A5 uses must be set against the need to protect the amenities of residential properties from noise and disturbance associated with food preparation and vehicle and pedestrian movement.

Also relevant are policies B2, which requires new development proposals to maintain an acceptable standard of visual and residential amenity, and T14, which states that new development must not result in conditions which are prejudicial to highway and pedestrian safety.

## ISSUES TO CONSIDER

With regard to the above national and local policy framework, it is considered that the main issues to consider in the determination of this application are as follows:

1. Principle of proposed development;
2. Impact of development on visual amenity;
3. Impact of development on residential amenity;
4. Impact of development on highway and pedestrian safety

### 1. Principle of development

The principle of a hot food takeaway on the site is argued to be generally acceptable. The land is allocated as 'white land' on the City Council's adopted Unitary Development Plan (1998) proposals map, subject to policy EN10, which states that where land is not specifically allocated for a particular use, the prevalent land use in the vicinity should be continued.

With regard to the above, Gurteen's Yard accommodates predominately light industrial uses although it is noted Unit 1 operates a kitchen and bathroom showroom. The use of the premises as a hot food takeaway can draw comparisons to the prevalent manufacturing processes in that food is 'manufactured' on site and then either collected or dispatched.

In line with the requirements of policy S12 and Section 9 of the SPG, an assessment of the impact of the proposed use on the amenity of any nearby residential properties and highway and pedestrian safety is necessary in order fully consider the merits of the proposal. Such an assessment is provided below.

### 2. Impact of development on visual amenity

The only physical alteration to the premises, proposed in association with this application is the erection of a 'mushroom vent' to the front roof slope of the property and the installation of a shop front set behind the existing roller shutter.

The vent, given the scale and location, will not be partially prominent from the surrounding street scene and will appear appropriate within the yard complex. The proposed shop front will also accord with the frontage within the bathroom

and kitchen showroom whilst when closed, the shop front will be screened behind a roller shutter matching the others within the complex.

As such, it is not considered that the vent or shop front would appear unduly obtrusive or harmful to the visual amenity of the locality or Conservation Area, in accordance with the requirements of policy B2 of the UDP.

### 3. Impact of development on residential amenity

Although the principle of the proposed change of use is considered to be broadly acceptable at this site, policies B2 and S12 of the UDP and section 9 of the SPG require the impact of the use on the amenity of nearby residential properties to be considered. The amenity of residential properties can, it is considered, be detrimentally affected by a hot food takeaway due to the noise, disturbance and smells/odours which such a use may generate.

In this respect, the spacing between the unit and residential dwellings are to remain as existing, with the associated alterations restricted to the front, confined within the yard area. Additionally it should be noted that the nearest elevation of the residential occupiers does not form their principle elevation.

Given the extraction and access arrangements, coupled with the proposed limited hours of opening, it is considered residential units would be sufficiently distant and screened by the buildings flanking the yard, so as not to be unduly affected by the proposed use whilst parking should be contained within the yard rather than to the front of residential dwellings.

In addition, a degree of noise and disturbance, even later into the evening, must be anticipated if living adjacent to a commercial yard whilst the authorised use of the site is likely to generate greater disturbance than that of the proposal.

Regard must also be given to the potential for a hot-food takeaway use to impact upon residential amenity via the generation of smells and odours from hot food preparation. The Council's recent experience, however, is that in determining appeals against refusal of planning permission for proposed hot-food takeaway uses, Planning Inspectors usually consider that modern extraction and ventilation equipment is capable of mitigating food odours. The Council does not dispute this view and so, unless there is evidence to the contrary, this is a matter which is no longer considered to warrant a reason to refuse planning permission in its own right.

As such, the proposed change of use of the unit, associated extraction flue and shop front is considered be acceptable in relation to residential amenity, in accordance with the requirements of the core planning principles of the NPPF, the requirements of aforementioned policy S12 of the Council's adopted Unitary Development Plan and section 9 of the 'Development Control Guidelines' Supplementary Planning Guidance.

### 4. Impact of development on highway and pedestrian safety

In response to consultation, the Council's Network Management team has not offered any objection to the proposal in relation to highway and pedestrian safety. The proposal is therefore considered to comply with policy T14's requirements.

## CONCLUSIONS

With regard to the above comments, it is considered that the principle of a hot-food takeaway in the subject unit is acceptable in terms of its location within a commercial yard, whilst the proposal raise no concerns in relation to visual amenity, residential amenity or highway and pedestrian safety.

The proposal is therefore considered to comply with the core principles and requirements of section 2 of the NPPF, policies EN10, S12, B2 and T14 of the UDP and the relevant sections of the SPG. Accordingly the recommendation is that Members grant permission for the proposed development subject to no additional representations being received raising issues that have not been considered above and subject to the conditions below. If any representations are received prior to the Sub-Committee meeting, these will be relayed at the Sub-Committee Meeting and the recommendation reappraised if necessary.

### **RECOMMENDATION: Approve**

#### **Conditions:**

- 1 The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date on which permission is granted, as required by section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 to ensure that the development is carried out within a reasonable period of time
- 2 Unless otherwise first agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, the development hereby granted permission shall be carried out in full accordance with the following approved plans:

Drawing No. 11/14: Plans, elevations and section, received 15.05.2014  
The location plan, received 15.05.2014

In order to ensure that the completed development accords with the scheme approved and to comply with policy B2 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan.

- 3 The hot food takeaway shall not be open to customers and no orders taken or deliveries despatched in connection with the use hereby permitted outside the following hours; 10.00 to 22.00 on Monday to Saturday and 10.00 to 20.00 on Sundays and Bank Holidays. In order to protect the amenities of the area in accordance with policies S12 and B2 of the UDP.
- 4 Notwithstanding the submitted drawings and other information, before the use hereby permitted is commenced, full details of the ventilation/extraction/filtration system, including all external ducting and stacks and their external treatment shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter all works shall be completed in accordance with the agreed details before the use commences, in order to protect the amenities of the area and to comply with policy S12 of the UDP.

**4.**

**Washington**

**Reference No.:** 14/01177/LP4 LP4 (Regulation 4) 3rd Party Developer

**Proposal:** **Erection of stable block to replace existing stables.**

**Location:** Washington Riding Centre Stephenson Road Stephenson  
Washington NE37 3HR

**Ward:** Washington North

**Applicant:** Washington Riding Centre

**Date Valid:** 28 May 2014

**Target Date:** 23 July 2014

---

**PROPOSAL:**

Planning permission is sought to erect a single-storey detached structure to provide 8no. stables for horses in addition to a classroom, teaching/demonstration area, feed room, w.c. and storage.

The proposed building measures 18m by 14.5m in depth to provide a gross internal floorspace of 242sq.m. A gabled pitched roof would be provided comprising heights of 4.7m to ridgeline and 2.3m to eaves and incorporating a total of 7no. rooflights. The proposed structure would replace and be set forward of an existing timber block of 5no. stables and storage measuring 17.8m by 14.2m and 4m in height to ridgeline situated to the eastern part of the site to the rear of the main arena/administration building. Two doorways would be provided in the front and 3no. would be provided in the rear and windows would be provided in all but the east elevation. The external materials to be used comprise Scottish larch timber cladding, a masonry south-facing wall and dark grey onduline roofing.

The application site is situated off Stephenson Road to the northeast of the Northumbria Centre playing fields within the Tyne and Wear Green Belt. The site comprises substantial outdoor and indoor arenas and a variety of ancillary detached structures of differing sizes and design constructed using an assortment of external materials. The site is predominantly enclosed by open-boarded timber fencing, beyond which exists open agricultural land.

Planning permission was granted in 1987 (ref. 87/00272/10) to erect a barn and storage shed, in 1990 (ref. 90/00497/10) to alter the ground floor of, and add first floor accommodation to, the main arena building, in 1995 (ref. 95/00266/10) to erect the block of 6no. timber stables which exist to the east of the arena building and in 2012 (ref. 12/00899/FUL) to provide 2no. stable blocks in the north section of the site.

**TYPE OF PUBLICITY:**

Site Notice Posted  
Neighbour Notifications

**CONSULTEES:**

Network Management  
Environmental Health  
Northumbrian Water  
Washington North - Ward Councillor Consultation

Final Date for Receipt of Representations: **01.07.2014**

**REPRESENTATIONS:**

No representations have been received from neighbouring occupants.

The Council's Network Management section advised that the proposal could lead to an increase in the number of visitors to the premises and suggested the introduction of passing places along the single-lane access. Having considered these comments, the Local Planning Authority (LPA) does not consider that the proposal would have a significant impact given that only 3no. additional stables would be provided.

**POLICIES:**

In the Unitary Development Plan the site is subject to the following policies;

B\_2\_Scale, massing layout and setting of new developments  
CN\_2\_Purpose of the Green Belt in Sunderland  
CN\_5\_Safeguarding the visual amenity of the Green Belt  
WA\_19\_Maintenance of a Green Belt

**COMMENTS:**

The main issues to consider in determining this application are the appropriateness of the proposed development in the Green Belt and any potential impact on the openness of the Green Belt.

Appropriateness within Green Belt

The site is allocated within the Tyne and Wear Green Belt as identified by Policy WA19.1 of the UDP. Chapter 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the Government's approach to protecting Green Belt land. Paragraph 80 of NPPF sets out five purposes of including land within Green Belts, which are reflective of policy CN2 of the UDP. Those which are relevant to the current proposal require the Green Belt to be maintained to:

- check the unrestricted sprawl of the built up area of Sunderland;
- safeguard the City's countryside from encroachment;
- assist in the regeneration of the urban area of the City; and
- prevent the merging of Sunderland with surrounding urban areas and neighbouring town with one another.

The essential characteristic of Green Belts is permanence and their protection must be maintained as far as can be seen ahead. In order to safeguard the Green Belt, paragraph 87 of the NPPF considers 'inappropriate development' to be, by definition, harmful and should therefore not be approved except in 'Very Special Circumstances'. Paragraph 88 goes on to state that, 'when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations'.

Paragraph 89 of the NPPF sets out exceptions to inappropriate development in Green Belt and is similar, in nature, to policy CN3 of the UDP. However, an additional criterion has been added and specific wording has been changed, so the NPPF must take precedent wherein the construction of new buildings for the 'provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation and for cemeteries, as long as it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it' is an exception to inappropriate development with the Green Belt.

The proposed stables would accommodate additional and enhanced stabling and associated facilities by the Centre. Accordingly, it is considered that the proposed structure constitutes appropriate facilities for outdoor sport/recreation. As such, provided that the proposed stable block preserves the openness of the Green Belt, to be assessed below, the proposal is considered to constitute appropriate development within the Green Belt.

#### Impact on Openness of Green Belt

Pursuant of Chapter 9 of the NPPF, policy CN5 of the UDP states that care will be taken to ensure that the visual amenities of the Green Belt will not be injured by proposals for development within, or conspicuous from, the Green Belt. In addition, UDP policy B2 states that the scale, massing, layout and/or setting of new developments should respect and enhance the best qualities of nearby properties and the locality, relating harmoniously to adjoining areas.

The proposed stable block would occupy a footprint of 261m<sup>2</sup> and would replace an existing structure which is similar, albeit smaller in scale, situated to the rear of the arena between an existing building and container. Such a siting would ensure that the proposed structure would not extend beyond the existing compound or built-up area of the Riding Centre so, in the context of the site within the Green Belt, is considered to be appropriate.

The structure would also have a relatively shallow dual pitched roof and its heights is limited so as not exceed the height of the adjacent timber building to the south. The external materials to be used are considered to be sympathetic to the character and setting of the existing buildings within the Centre whilst maintaining the rural setting and further mitigating their visual impact.

As such, it is not considered that the proposed development would be harmful to the openness of the Green Belt.

#### Conclusion



For the reasons given above, it is considered that the proposal constitutes appropriate development within the Green Belt and it is not considered that the development, by means of its scale, siting and design, would be detrimental to the openness of the Green Belt. Accordingly, the proposal complies with the criteria as set out by chapter 9 of the NPPF and policies B2, CN2 and CN5 of the UDP and the application should be approved accordingly, subject to the following conditions.

**RECOMMENDATION: Approve**

**Conditions:**

- 1 The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date on which permission is granted, as required by section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, to ensure that the development is carried out within a reasonable period of time.

- 2 Unless otherwise first agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, the development hereby granted permission shall be carried out in full accordance with the following approved plans:

Drawing no. AL (0) 0020: Proposed Elevations received 21.05.2014

Drawing no. AL (0) 0200: Proposed Plan received 21.05.2014

Drawing no. AL (0) 0400: Proposed Roof Plan received 21.05.2014

Drawing no. AL (0) 1000: Location Plan received 21.05.2014

Drawing no. AL (90) 0200: Proposed Site Plan received 21.05.2014

In order to ensure that the completed development accords with the scheme approved and to comply with policy B2 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan.

- 3 Notwithstanding any indication of materials which may have been given in the application, the external materials to be used shall be those specified on the approved plans and the roof shall be coloured dark grey, unless the Local Planning Authority first agrees any variation in writing; in the interests of visual amenity and to comply with policy B2 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan.