

At a meeting of the PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE held in COMMITTEE ROOM 2 of the CIVIC CENTRE on TUESDAY 17TH MARCH, 2020 at 5.30 p.m.

Present:-

Councillor Jackson in the Chair.

Councillors Bewick, Butler, M. Dixon, Foster, Greener, Haswell, Johnston, Mullen and Potts.

Also Present:-

Councillor Peter Wood (Ashbrooke Ward)

Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest made.

Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors E. Gibson, Hodson, Lauchlan, McKeith, Scaplehorn, P. Smith, Stewart, Turner, Tye and D. Wilson.

Minutes of the last meeting of the Committee held on 12th February, 2020.

1. RESOLVED that the minutes of the last meeting of the Committee held on 12th February, 2020 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

Reports of the meetings of the Development Control (South) Sub Committee held on 3rd February and 2nd March, 2020

The reports of the meetings of the Development Control (South) Sub Committee held on 3rd February and 2nd March, 2020 (copies circulated) were submitted.

(For copy reports – see original minutes)

2. RESOLVED that the reports be received and noted.

Reports of the meetings of the Development Control (North) Sub Committee held on 4th February and 3rd March, 2020

The reports of the meetings of the Development Control (South) Sub Committee held on 4th February and 3rd March, 2020 (copies circulated) were submitted.

(For copy reports – see original minutes)

3. RESOLVED that the reports be received and noted.

Report of the meeting of the Development Control (Hetton, Houghton and Washington) Sub Committee held on 4th February, 2020

The report of the meeting of the Development Control (Hetton, Houghton and Washington) Sub Committee held on 4th February, 2020 (copy circulated) was submitted.

(For copy report – see original minutes)

4. RESOLVED that the report be received and noted.

Objection to the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for the Proposed Community Parking Management Scheme (CPMS) in the Ashbrooke Phase 2 Area (St Michael's Ward).

The Executive Director of City Development submitted a report (copy circulated) which advised of an objection received with regards to the Traffic Regulation Order in respect of the proposed Community Parking Management Scheme (CPMS) Ashbrooke Phase 2 Area and requested that the Committee did not uphold the objection.

(For copy report – see original minutes)

The Highways Officer representing the Executive Director of City Development informed the Committee that the Council proposed to introduce a permit based CPMS in the Ashbrooke area. The CPMS had been designed following extensive consultation with elected Members, residents, businesses and other organisations in the area, and was intended to reduce the amount of indiscriminate and obstructive parking, principally by city centre workers, on the streets within the scheme.

In response to the TRO advertisement the council received one objection. Members attention was drawn to the proposals as shown on plans in Appendix A of the report, the approximate location of the objector as shown on a plan in Appendix B, a summary of the objection detailed in Appendix C and a copy of the full objection as detailed in Appendix D.

The Chairman asked if members had any questions or comments on the report.

Councillor M. Dixon stated that having read the report and listened to the highways Officer's presentation he was 'bamboozled' with the objector's reference to the effect on businesses in the area. As far as he was aware there were only two businesses, Ashbrooke Sports Club and Ashbrooke Store and he was aware from conversations with the owner of the store that he was in favour of the proposals. Councillor Dixon also contested the objector's assertion that the area was lightly populated and far enough from the city centre to discourage all day parking as detailed in Appendix C of the report. He welcomed the Officer's commentary on the same page and also paragraph 3.2 (The indiscriminate parking at junctions causes difficulty for all users with reduced 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) which refuted the objector's assertion.

Councillor Bewick noted that the objector was a resident of South Tyneside and asked if it was known whether he also owned a business or premises in the Ashbrooke area. The Highways Officer replied that he did not believe so however the only information he had to go on was the letter of objection detailed in Appendix D. He had contacted the objector on a number of occasions to discuss the objection and also to invite him to the meeting however he had received no response.

In response to an enquiry from Councillor Dixon, the Highways officer confirmed that even if an objection had come from a resident of Nottingham it would have to be treated in the same way and ultimately brought before the Committee if it remained unresolved.

Councillor Greener referred to the images of the proposed signage detailed on page 32 of the agenda papers and asked if it was possible to use larger lettering to make the signs clearer? The Highways Officer replied that the signage had to comply with the guidelines issued by the Department of Transport and which the Council was governed by. There would however be a dedicated sign at each individual parking bay.

There being no further questions or comments on the report, the Chairman welcomed and introduced Councillor P. Wood who had registered to speak in support of the proposals. Councillor Wood stated that he would be brief as he did not wish to detain the Committee. He informed Members that there was strong support for the scheme from the residents of the area which was most recently demonstrated at the meeting of the Thornholme Residents Association. He referred to paragraph 2.1 of the report and confirmed that the consultation with elected Members, residents, businesses and other organisations in the area had indeed been extensive. With this in mind he welcomed the proposals and paid tribute to the Officers concerned for their efforts and professionalism in developing the Scheme. He believed that the Scheme had been extremely well thought through and addressed all the

issues raised by the Ashbrooke residents and businesses. In conclusion he urged the Committee to agree the recommendations contained in the report.

The Chairman thanked Councillor Wood for his comments and drew the Committee's attention to the recommendations as detailed in paragraph 3 of the report. Upon being put to the vote the recommendations were approved unanimously and therefore it was:-

5. RESOLVED that:-

- i) The objection to the TRO, for the proposed CPMS in the area of Ashbrooke Phase 2 not be upheld;
- ii) The objector be advised accordingly; and
- iii) All necessary preparatory works be carried out to enable delivery of the CPMS on site.

Planning Application 19/020237/LP3 Local Authority (Reg 3) Installation of temporary lighting onto Wearmouth Bridge - A1018/Bridge Street Sunderland SR1 3AH (Extension of Period to Display Lighting Granted under 19/01304/LP3

Planning Application 19/01305/LB3 Listed Building Consent (Reg3) Installation of temporary lighting onto Wearmouth Bridge - A1018/Bridge Street Sunderland SR1 3AH (Extension of Period to Display Lighting Granted under 19/01305/LB3)

The Executive Director of City Development submitted reports (copies circulated) in respect of the above matters.

(for copy reports – see original minutes)

The representative of the Executive Director of City Development presented the reports advising the Committee of the key issues to consider in determining the applications and informing members that the reports were essentially a resubmission of the applications approved by the Committee at its meeting held on 11th September, 2019 and which were now seeking an extension to enable the display of lighting to continue on the Bridge until 30th March 2020.

There being no questions or comments the Chairman put the Officer's recommendations to the Committee and with all Members being in agreement it was:-

6. RESOLVED that :-

- i) in respect of Planning Application 19/020237/LP3 and in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992,

consent be granted to the application subject to the 2 conditions as detailed in the report; and

ii) in respect of Planning Application 19/01305/LB3 and in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992, approval be given to the granting of listed building consent for the proposal subject to the 2 conditions as detailed in the report.

Urgent Business

The Chairman advised that in accordance with Section 100B(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 she would take the following item as a matter of urgent business given the reporting timescales involved.

Residents' Concerns Regarding the Sewage Network in Seaburn – Discussion Item

The Chairman advised that she was aware the Committee was missing a number of key players as a result of the Coronavirus measures but she wanted to update Members on the issue following the discussion at the last meeting.

She informed Members that she had spoken to Julie Elliott MP who had met with Mr Latimer to discuss residents' concerns and who was also planning a meeting with Northumbrian Water. She believed that the Committee had taken the issue as far as it could within its remit and that members would all recognise the limitations of using a planning committee as a mechanism to deal with the issue. Nevertheless she believed Members had a duty to listen to residents and the Committee was not going to just ignore them despite the restrictions it faced. With this in mind she had sought advice about having the issue taken up by the council's Scrutiny Coordinating Committee.

Councillor Haswell replied that he felt the issue should stay with the Planning and Highways Committee he stated that "We, as a committee, have the ability to report an issue to the full council where we feel it is a huge enough issue and should be debated there. As a committee we need to look like we're standing up and saying something."

The Chairman asked how he envisaged the matter being taken forward. Councillor Haswell replied that he understood that Mr Latimer was planning to submit the information he held to the Council's Development Control team. He felt the Committee could use this information to formulate a report that could be referred to full Council.

The Chairman stated that it was important that the Members were able to clearly understand what residents would want to see as an ideal outcome.

Councillor Butler added that it was important to discriminate between matters of fact and matters of opinion.

The Chairman asked the Planning Officers present if this was an issue that had ever come up before. The representative of the Executive Director of City Development replied that the issue was one that was unique to Seaburn. She advised that she was in conversation with the Assistant Director as to the most appropriate way to take the matter forward. She advised that while she would be happy to receive the information from Mr Latimer and find a way to make it available to Members she wanted to make it clear that it could not be loaded onto the Council's Planning Portal as it was not material to the planning process.

The Chairman thanked the Officer and asked the Committee how it wished to proceed. Councillor Haswell suggested that for the moment, the matter was placed as a rolling item on the Committee's agenda until the Coronavirus issue had ended and also so if any new information came to light the Committee could follow it up. Once the Committee had something more structured it could then have a discussion about whether Scrutiny Committee or full Council was the best option to take the issue forward.

The Chairman having put Councillor Haswell's proposal to the Committee, it was agreed accordingly.

7. RESOLVED that the issue be placed as a rolling item on agenda for future meetings of the Planning and Highways Committee.

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

(Signed) J. JACKSON,
(Chairman)