

**At a meeting of the PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE held in the CIVIC CENTRE on TUESDAY 26<sup>th</sup> October, 2010 at 6.00 p.m.**

**Present: -**

Councillor Tye in the Chair

Councillors Ball, Charlton, Ellis, Essl, Fletcher, M. Forbes, Francis, E. Gibson, Howe, Miller, Padgett, Scaplehorn, J. Scott, D. Wilson and A. Wright.

**Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

**Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Francis, G. Hall, Miller and Tye.

**Minutes of the Last Ordinary Minutes of the Committee held on 28th September, 2010 and of the Extraordinary Meeting held on 5<sup>th</sup> October, 2010**

1. RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of this Committee held on 28<sup>th</sup> September, 2010 and of the Extraordinary Meeting held on 5<sup>th</sup> October, 2010 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

**Report of the meeting of the Development Control (South Sunderland) Sub Committee held on 5<sup>th</sup> October, 2010**

The report of the (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 (Hetton, Houghton, Washington) Sub Committee held on 5<sup>th</sup> October**

The report of the meetings of the Development Control (Hetton, Houghton and Washington) Sub-Committee held on 5<sup>th</sup> October, 2010 (copy circulated) was submitted.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

3. RESOLVED that the report be received and noted.

### **Reference from Cabinet: 6 October 2010 Seaburn Masterplan – Draft Supplementary Planning Document**

To seek the views of this Committee on a report (copy circulated) considered by Cabinet on 6 October 2010 which sought approval of the draft Seaburn Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document and accompanying Sustainability Approval and Appropriate Assessment for the purposes of consultation.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

Mr. Keith Lowes, Head of Planning and Environment presented the report and advised that the Draft Seaburn Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document was being referred to the Committee for comments as part of the public consultation process. Mr Lowes also explained that the document would be used as interim planning guidance and as a material consideration in the determination of applications, pending its finalisation and adoption following the consultation process.

Councillor Howe enquired what type of leisure activities would be included in the 'leisure area' and whether this would include a swimming pool. Mr Lowes advised that the draft Document was sufficiently flexible to permit the provision of a swimming pool facility as part of any future development proposals for the seafront. .

In response to a question from Councillor Francis, Mr Lowes advised that the definition of leisure was very broad in accordance with the Use Classes Order 1987 and could include cafes, restaurants, hotels etc.

Referring to paragraph 4.6, which stated that a potential residential development could be located to the west of the area on vacant and underused land comprising the public car park and former miniature golf course, Councillor Ellis queried where people would now park.

Mr Lowes advised that it was important to get the balance right between access and facilities. The draft masterplan was not a scheme per se and was for indicative purposes only against which to assess future development

proposals. Further assessments would be carried out once the consultation process was complete.

Councillor Charlton informed the Committee that following public consultation, which would inform the completion of a planning document this would help to facilitate the planning and regeneration of the seafront at Seaburn in a manner that would help achieve the aspirations set out in the Sunderland Strategy and Seafront Regeneration Strategy. North Sunderland Area Committee would also be consulted on the Masterplan.

4. RESOLVED that the Committee note and accept the report for information.

### **Consultation from Neighbouring Councils on Planning Applications**

The Deputy Chief Executive submitted a report (copy circulated) to seek the Committee's agreement to responses about to be made to consultations from neighbouring Councils about planning applications affecting sites close to the common boundary with the City of Sunderland.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

Mr Lowes presented the report and advised that where the Council was consulted by a neighbouring authority on a planning application in their area but which may have an impact on Sunderland's interests, the approval of the Planning and Highways Committee is obtained to agree the form of the proposed response.

Sunderland City Council had recently been consulted by Durham County Council (Easington Area) a planning application regarding the demolition and erection of 7,990 sq. metre food store with associated car parking.

Mr Lowes advised that whilst it is accepted that the development proposed is large in scale than the existing retail development on the site, the likely level of impact on the retail centres of Sunderland is not considered to be significant given the attractiveness and consumer preference of alternative shopping destinations. As a consequence, it is proposed that the Council does not object to the application.

5. RESOLVED that the Committee agree with the officer's comments outlined in the report which will be sent to Durham County Council in relation to application no. PL/5/2010/0444

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

(Signed) P. Tye  
Chairman.

**At a meeting of the DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (SOUTH SUNDERLAND)  
SUB-COMMITTEE held in the CIVIC CENTRE on TUESDAY, 2<sup>ND</sup> NOVEMBER,  
2010 at 4.45 p.m.**

**Present:-**

Councillor E. Gibson in the Chair

Councillors Ball, Charlton, Copeland, M. Dixon, Ellis, Essl, Fletcher, M. Forbes, Old, Tye, Wood, A. Wright

**Declarations of Interest**

10/02519/LAP – Engineering operations comprising demolition of bridge parapets and infilling of the redundant railway bridge and cutting to reflect adjacent land levels including stopping up and creation of highway. Installation of street lighting and ramp. (Amended description)

Councillors Tye, E. Gibson, M. Dixon and A. Wright declared a Personal Interest in the application as Members of the South Sunderland Area Committee which had previously awarded conditional grant funding for the project.

**Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Miller and P. Watson

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

The Deputy Chief Executive submitted a report and circulatory report (copies 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 the Regulations made thereunder.

(For copy reports – see original minutes).

Change in the order of business.

It was agreed that application number 10/02862/FUL would be considered first given the presence of a member of the public who wished to speak in respect of that item.

**10/02862/FUL – Erection of a two storey extension to the front and re-alignment of roof.**

The representative of the Deputy Chief Executive presented the report to the Members of the Committee.

Councillor Fletcher queried the presence of other front extensions to properties in the local area.

The representative of the Deputy Chief Executive advised that there had been other planning applications for front extensions in the locality which had been approved. However each planning application had to be considered on its own planning merits based on the location of the property and the siting, design, appearance and scale of the proposed extension.

Councillor Copeland commented that she did not see a problem with the front extension, all of the houses in the area were of different styles and this extension would potentially enhance the appearance of the area.

The representative of the Deputy Chief Executive advised that the staggered positioning of the properties in Bishops Way/ Vicarsholme Close was an important and harmonious feature of the street scene and the proposed extension would have a negative impact on this staggered effect.

Councillor Tye commented that 30 Bishops Way was in line with the rest of the houses in the street and it was Vicarsholme Close which had the staggered formation. He was of the opinion that the application property was out of line with the rest of the street and this development would bring it in line with the other houses in the street.

Councillor A. Wright agreed that the house appeared to be out of line with the other houses on Bishops Way. He also queried whether it would be possible for the application to be amended to include windows in the gable wall to improve the outlook from 1 Vicarsholme Close onto the application property.

The representative of the Deputy Chief Executive advised that the impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring property 1 Vicarsholme Close needed to be taken into account and the development would lead to unacceptable overshadowing of the front habitable rooms and garden of 1 Vicarsholme Close. There would be additional privacy issues arising if windows were included in the gable wall of the proposed development.

Councillor Ellis stated that she had attended the site visit and it was her opinion that the application property formed part of the staggered layout of the houses and this was an attractive design feature of the street scene.

Councillor M. Forbes asked what distance there was between the application property, 28 Bishops Way and the neighbouring property, 1 Vicarsholme Close.

The representative of the Deputy Chief Executive advised that 1 Vicarsholme Close was 2m from the boundary with 28 Bishops Way and there was approximately 3m between the two buildings.

The officer also advised that the only material difference between the new application and the previous application (which was refused by both the Council and the Planning Inspectorate on appeal) is the re-orientation of the roof ridge line.

The Applicant, Mr Hamilton, was then invited to address the Committee in support of his application.

He stated that:

- In 2009 he had submitted an application for a front extension, there had been no objections from neighbours however the Council had refused the application
- He had explored the possibility of a 3m rear extension however it seemed that this would be likely to have a greater impact on the neighbouring properties.
- He had attempted to address the previous concerns of the Council and the Planning Inspector through this new application.
- The property has a long front garden and there would still be a stagger between the properties of approximately 1 metre. The garden would still be large and the site would not appear overdeveloped.
- The perceived difference in height arising from the extension would be minimal.
- There would be a minimal impact on the street scene. Similar extensions had been approved in respect of other properties in the locality including 26 Bishops Way.

Councillor M. Forbes asked what extensions would be possible as a rear extension would be closer to the neighbouring houses.

The representative of the Deputy Chief Executive advised that any proposed extension would be considered on its individual merits and in accordance with the Council's Household Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document. An extension to the rear of the property would not impact on the staggered appearance of the properties. However the acceptability of any such development should be discussed between Mr Hamilton and the case officer.

Councillor Wood raised a query regarding the previous refusal to issue a certificate of lawful proposed development. He asked whether there was a right of appeal against this refusal.

The representative of the Deputy Chief Executive advised that there was a right of appeal against that decision to the Planning Inspectorate. That decision related to a separate development proposal at the rear of the property which the owner had contended was permitted development through an application for a certificate of lawfulness. This had been refused as the proposal did not accord with the provisions of Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (No. 2) (England) Order (GPDO) due to the size of the proposed extension and because the pitch of the new roof did not match the existing roof.

Councillor Charlton commented that the previous planning application for an extension at the front of the property had been turned down and the Council's

reasons for refusal had been upheld on appeal. This new application was for substantially the same development as the previous application so the same planning objections applied.

The legal advisor to the Committee, Jonathan Rowson, advised that the previous decision of the Planning Inspectorate to refuse the appeal in respect of the previous planning application was a material consideration in determining this new application. How much weight should be attached to the appeal decision depends on how similar or distinguishable the two schemes are.

Councillor Tye commented on the bricks used to construct the existing extensions in the street; number 26 had been extended using bricks that looked different to the original structure and he felt that it seemed unfair to use the unavailability of the original type of brick as an objection to the application. He also asked for clarification of the reference to the house being three storeys as he could only see two on the plans.

The representative of the Deputy Chief Executive advised that the proposed loft space would be converted into rooms and was therefore classed as being an additional storey.

The Chairman expressed support for the Members' comments which had been made.

Mr Rowson then interjected and advised Members that there was a procedure set out in the Constitution which should be followed where some Members have concerns regarding the Officer's recommendation.

Councillor Tye stated that at this stage it would be sensible to defer the application to allow Officers and the applicant to engage in further discussions in light of the views expressed by Members and to see if suitable revisions can be made to the application to overcome the officer's concerns. He then moved that the decision be deferred.

Councillor M. Forbes seconded the motion to defer.

Councillor Ellis stated that she agreed with the officer's recommendation to refuse the application.

Accordingly it was:

1. RESOLVED that the application be deferred to enable further discussions to take place between the applicant and the planning officers with the aim of securing a form of development which could be recommended for approval.

**10/02519/LAP – Engineering operations comprising demolition of bridge parapets and infilling of the redundant railway bridge and cutting to reflect adjacent land levels including stopping up and creation of highway. Installation of street lighting and ramp. (Amended description)**



2. RESOLVED that Members be minded to grant consent under Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 subject to the 8 conditions set out in the circulatory report and subject to no objections being received by 4<sup>th</sup> November, 2010, for the reasons set out in the report and circulatory report.

**10/02794/FUL – conversion of listed house to 5 new apartments and 2 new houses in the converted stable block. Demolition of infill block to provide 3 town houses. With associated landscaping and parking.**

Councillor Tye commented that there had been a lot of Section 106 monies in respect of other housing developments spent at St. Matthews Field; he felt that Doxford Park would be the most appropriate location for the money to be spent.

Councillor M. Forbes queried how likely it would be that the Section 106 agreement would be completed by 11<sup>th</sup> November.

Mr Rowson confirmed that substantial progress had been made on a without prejudice basis in preparing the draft agreement in advance of the Committee meeting and it was hoped that the agreement would be completed by 11<sup>th</sup> November.

3. RESOLVED that the application be delegated to the Deputy Chief Executive to either:
  - a. Grant planning permission for the reasons set out in the reports subject to the 35 conditions set out in the report and circulatory report and subject to the completion of a Section 106 agreement to secure a financial contribution towards children's play provision at either Doxford Park, St Matthews Field and/or Foxhole Woods, in lieu of on site play provision by 11<sup>th</sup> November 2010 or such other date as is agreed by the Deputy Chief Executive. Or:
  - b. Refuse permission should the legal agreement not be completed by 11<sup>th</sup> November, 2010 or such other date as is agreed by the Deputy Chief Executive, on the grounds that the development does not make adequate provision for children's play, contrary to the requirements of policy H21 of the adopted UDP.

**10/02795/LBC – Conversion of listed house to 5 new apartments and 2 new houses in the converted stable block. Demolition of infill block to provide 3 town houses. With associated landscaping and parking.**

4. RESOLVED that the application be approved subject to the 29 conditions set out in the report and for the reasons set out therein.

**10/02846/FUL – Change of use of upper floors from offices (B1) to independent college (D1) (amended description).**

5. RESOLVED that the application be approved subject to the 5 conditions set out in the report and for the reasons set out therein.

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

The Deputy Chief Executive submitted a report (copy circulated) concerning the appeals received and determined for the period 1<sup>st</sup> September, 2010 to 30<sup>th</sup> September, 2010.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

6. RESOLVED that the report be received and noted.

(Signed)      E. GIBSON  
Chairman

**At a meeting of the DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (HETTON, HOUGHTON AND WASHINGTON) SUB-COMMITTEE held in the CIVIC CENTRE on TUESDAY, 2<sup>nd</sup> NOVEMBER, 2010 at 5.45p.m.**

**Present:-**

Councillor Fletcher in the Chair

Councillors Charlton, Cuthbert, Padgett, D. Richardson, Scaplehorn, Snowdon, Tate and Tye

**Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Cuthbert declared a personal interest in application 10/03238/FUL – erection of retail shop unit and hot food take-away as a ward colleague lived in the area and he had been involved in previous campaigns regarding the flats.

Councillor Tate declared a personal interest in application 10/03311/FUL – Site of Middle House, East Croft and Summerhouse Farm, South Street, East Rainton, Houghton-le-Spring under the Items for Information as a Member of Hetton Town Council, which is a consultee and that in such capacity, he had not taken part in any consideration or discussion of their response.

**Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Miller, I. Richardson, J. Scott and Wakefield

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

The Deputy Chief Executive submitted a report (copies circulated) and a supplementary report, which related to Hetton, Houghton and Washington areas, copies of which had also been forwarded to each Member of the Cabinet upon applications made under the Town and Country Planning Acts and Regulations made thereunder.

(for copy report – see original minutes)

**10/02587/FUL – Subdivision of one unit into two and external alterations at Unit 2, Galleries Retail Park, Washington, NE38 7QY**

1. RESOLVED that the application for planning permission be granted for the reasons given and subject to the three conditions as set out in the report.

**10/03238/FUL – Erection of (A1) retail shop unit 455.sqm and (A5) hot food take-away 62.9sqm at the public car park open east of Barmston Centre, Washington**

Councillor Cuthbert asked if the neighbouring care home had been consulted as part of the planning application process and if they had were they objecting to the scheme. The representative of the Deputy Chief Executive advised that the care home had been fully consulted and that no objections had been received from them.

Discussions ensued around there being enough litter bins in the surrounding area to the shop and also on the most appropriate time for it to close, and it was:-

2. RESOLVED that the application for planning permission be granted for the reasons as given, subject to the sixteen conditions as set out in the report, amending the condition relating to opening hours to the A5 hot food take-away to state that the premises should cease trading by no later than 23:00 and to include a condition regarding the ample provision of litter bins in the area.

**10/03334//AML – Amendments to previously approved application 10/00810/LAP (single storey extension to front) to alter ridge height of proposed roof at Bernard Gilpin Primary School, Hall Lane, Houghton-le-Spring, DH5 8DA**

3. RESOLVED that in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulation 1992 that the application be approved for the reasons as set out in the report and subject to the two conditions set out therein, read alongside the existing permission and the conditions attached to that permission.

**Items for Information**

4. RESOLVED that a site visit be undertaken to the following application:-

- 10/03311/FUL – Site of Middle House, East Croft & Summerhouse Farm, South Street, East Rainton, Houghton-le-Spring, DH5 9QR at the request of Councillor Tate.

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

The Deputy Chief Executive submitted a report (copy circulated) concerning the appeals received and determined for the period 1<sup>st</sup> September, 2010 to 30<sup>th</sup> September, 2010.

(For copy report – see original minutes)

4. RESOLVED that the report be received and noted.

(Signed) J. FLETCHER,  
Chairman.

**PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE –  
23 NOVEMBER 2010**

**RYHOPE VILLAGE CONSERVATION AREA: CHARACTER APPRAISAL &  
MANAGEMENT STRATEGY**

**REPORT OF THE DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

**1.0 Why has the report come to the Committee?**

- 1.1 To advise Planning and Highways Committee of the responses received following consultation on the draft version of the 'Ryhope Village Conservation Area Character Appraisal & Management Strategy' and to seek Committee's comments on the revised document.
- 1.2 The Committee's comments will be reported to Cabinet at its meeting on December 1<sup>st</sup> 2010 when approval will be sought to adopt the revised Ryhope Village Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Strategy as Formal Planning Guidance.

**2.0 Background**

- 2.1 The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (LB&CA) Act 1990 defines Conservation Areas as "areas of special architectural and historic interest, the character and appearance of which it is desirable to preserve and enhance". The Act stipulates that Local Authorities are under a duty to formulate and publish proposals for the preservation and enhancement of their conservation areas.
- 2.2 The Council also has an obligation under the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) Policy B4 to produce supplementary guidance in the form of character appraisals for conservation areas in the City. This is reinforced in the new national planning guidance for the historic environment, Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 5 'Planning for the Historic Environment' (March 2010), which stipulates that Local Authorities should ensure that they have evidence about the historic environment and heritage assets in their area and that this is publicly documented.
- 2.3 The Council's performance in preparing up-to-date character appraisals for its conservation areas is currently the subject of the heritage "Best Value Performance Indicator" (BV219). The purpose of BV219 is to monitor local authorities' performance in relation to Sections 71 and 72 of the above Act.
- 2.4 The Ryhope Village Character Appraisal and Management Strategy is the eleventh in a series of such studies that will address all fourteen of the City's conservation areas. It fulfils the Council's duties and obligations under the Planning (LB & CA) Act 1990. It will also help to satisfy the above BVPI target for 2010/11 and contribute towards delivering the Council's strategic objectives and outcomes under the Attractive and Inclusive City theme of the Sunderland Strategy.

### **3.0 Current Position**

- 3.1 Ryhope Village Conservation Area encompasses the area of the medieval village of Ryhope that developed as a 3-row village centred upon a triangular village green. It is a typical Old English Village that originated as an agricultural settlement and later evolved into a mining village before ultimately developing into a predominantly suburban residential area as part of the wider conurbation of Sunderland. The Village contains numerous fine 'listed' 18<sup>th</sup> century houses alongside former farmhouses and barns, interspersed with impressive 19<sup>th</sup> century civic buildings and 20<sup>th</sup> century modern housing developments. As with other conservation areas in the city, the integrity and character of the area is coming under increasing pressure from householder and commercial property alterations and new housing developments. The Council's planning powers allow it to exercise tight controls over works to Listed Buildings, however, its powers to conserve unlisted buildings and other features in the Conservation Area are limited.
- 3.2 A Character Appraisal and Management Strategy (CAMS), adopted as formal Planning Guidance, would strengthen the Council's policies for the Conservation Area and help to protect its best features, including historic buildings, significant green spaces and mature trees, from the potentially adverse effects of property alteration and new development. It will also help to promote the quality of the physical environment in this part of the City and raise awareness and appreciation among residents of their local heritage, helping towards building and sustaining a strong sense of place and community, in support of the Council's strategic priorities.
- 3.3 The draft Ryhope Village CAMS follows the relevant guidance set out in the joint Office for the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) (now the Department for Communities and Local Government)/ English Heritage publications 'Guidance on conservation area appraisals' and 'Guidance on the management of conservation areas' (2006). Part 1 of the document, the 'Character Appraisal', identifies and appraises the characteristics and features that give the Conservation Area its special interest. Part 2, the 'Management Strategy', addresses in detail the issues raised in the Character Appraisal by establishing objectives and proposals to secure the future preservation and enhancement of the Conservation Area's special character.
- 3.4 The draft document has now been subject to consultation. Initial consultation was carried out in May 2010 as part of the production of the CAMS with Ward Councillors, the Portfolio Holders for Prosperous City and Sustainable Communities and Historic Environment Champion, and all residents, businesses and other property occupiers in the Conservation Area. Councillors and relevant Service Areas and sections within the council were then consulted on a first draft of the document during June and July prior to it being exposed to public consultation. A letter and CD of the consultation draft of the document was sent to all residents, businesses and other property occupiers and a range of organisations and interested parties, including English Heritage, national and local heritage societies and local architects. Hard copies of the document were additionally available on request from the

Council's Conservation Team and available for viewing at the Civic Centre, Ryhope Library and the City Library.

- 3.5 The CAMS was also available to be viewed on the Council's website. Comments were able to be submitted electronically via the Council's Limehouse on-line consultation tool.
- 3.6 A public exhibition was held at Ryhope Community Centre on the 3<sup>rd</sup> August 2010 to discuss the document, with particular reference to the Management Proposals. Details of the exhibition were given in the consultation letters, on the Council website and posters advertising the exhibition were placed in local shops, Ryhope Library, Ryhope Community Centre and St Paul's Church.
- 3.7 The period of consultation expired on 28<sup>th</sup> August 2010 and the Character Appraisal and Management Strategy has now been modified in light of the representations received. A summary of the responses and modifications is given below.

#### **4.0 Summary of Consultation Responses and Modifications**

- 4.1 In all, 12 written representations have been received out of a total of approximately 200 consultation letters sent. Seven responses were received from local residents, three from heritage specialists/groups, one from a Ryhope Ward Councillor and one from English Heritage. Twenty-one people attended the public exhibition; notes were taken covering the main issues discussed at the exhibition.
- 4.2 The document was generally very well received by residents, with many respondents praising its quality and content and expressing their support for the Management Proposals. A considerable amount of useful historical information and photographs was provided by local residents and heritage groups, which has been incorporated into the Character Appraisal. Suggestions for issues to be considered in the Management Strategy were also provided. Various minor additions and amendments to the document's text have been made in light of these comments (see full schedule of responses in Appendix 1).
- 4.3 Some issues of concern were raised, most repeatedly about the condition of the former Village School. Some additional text has been added to the document to acknowledge recent progress on addressing this matter.
- 4.4 The schedule attached to this report summarises the responses received and, where appropriate, the corresponding modifications made to the document. A summary list of external consultees is also appended. Copies of the final (revised) version of the Ryhope Village Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Strategy are available in the Members' library.

#### **5. Recommendation**

- 5.1 The Committee is invited to make comments on the Ryhope Village Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Strategy.



## **6. Background Papers**

- Adopted City of Sunderland Unitary Development Plan.
- Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 5 'Planning for the Historic Environment'.
- ODPM / English Heritage publication 'Guidance on conservation area appraisals'.
- ODPM / English Heritage publication 'Guidance on the management of conservation areas'.
- Draft Ryhope Village Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Strategy.
- Responses to public consultation.

## Appendix 1: Schedule of Consultation Responses and Action Taken – Ryhope Village Conservation Area Character Appraisal & Management Strategy

Written Representations		
Consultee	Comments	Action / reason for no action
<u>Heritage Organisations</u>		
English Heritage	No specific comment.	No action required.
Tyne & Wear County Archaeologist	Very supportive and complementary of document. Considers Sunderland's CAMS to be the best in Tyne and Wear. Advised that the term 'garths' should be replaced by 'crofts' or 'tofts' which more accurately describe the enclosures referred to. Noted some corrections required to terminology on Archaeological sites map on page 53.	Terminology corrected on pages 5, 10, 12, 22, 28 and 29.  Map corrected accordingly.
<u>Councillors</u>		
Councillor A. Emerson	Suggested consideration be given to extend boundary of Conservation Area southwards to include iron footbridge over former railway.	No action required, discussed on page 33 of document. The footbridge is considered too remote from the village core and somewhat detached from the Conservation Area's essential village character (and the basis on which it was originally designated) to warrant inclusion.
<u>Local Heritage / Amenity groups</u>		
Ryhope Heritage Group	Queried why the former Village School is not on English Heritage's 'Heritage at Risk' register.  Queried why the Forge Garage is not included in Conservation Area.  Noted photograph on page 7 dates from the post war period and not early 1900's. Noted houses in photograph on page 34 are on north side of The Green rather than south. Noted that the owners of Coqueda Hall have renamed the property 'Barton House'. Queried how the existing signage for the Garage on the Green was permitted and why the garage is allowed to park vehicles on the footpath / hard standing on the opposite side of Station Road.	The Heritage at Risk Register only includes grade I and Grade II* listed buildings. The village school is not listed and is not therefore eligible for the list. Whilst there is certainly some historical merit for including the Forge Garage in the Conservation Area, the building has been considerably altered from its original form and it is questionable whether it is worthwhile extending the boundary to incorporate one additional property. Text added to page 33 to this effect. Annotation to photograph amended to correct date, in this case the 1960's. Annotation to photograph corrected accordingly.  Comment added to page 19 to acknowledge this fact.  No action required. The signage concerned was erected many years ago without consent from the Council and at a time when there was less emphasis on conservation and design standards. Discussions have taken place with the owner over possible improvements to the signage. The issue of parking vehicles is outside the scope of the CAMS. Issue to be referred to

		Transportation.
<i>Local Residents</i>		
Local resident 1	Provided useful historical information on High Farm and South Farm and other properties within Ryhope Village.	Information added to pages 19 and 29.
Local resident 2	Very complementary and supportive of document. Suggested the remnants of the old Salutation Inn are an eyesore and should be removed. Suggested that a parking area should be demarcated on the site of the old urinals at the entrance to Beach Road and a lockable bollard provided at the entrance.	Text added to page 49 discussing issue of site of former Salutation Inn.  Beyond scope of document. Matter to be referred to Transportation.
Local resident 3	Very complementary and supportive of document. Noted that the poor condition of some buildings in the area detract from the general good standard of buildings in the village. Complained about the state of the grass verge to the east of the Railway Inn.	No action required. Issue addressed in Management Strategy (pages 48-50).  Beyond scope of document. Issue to be referred to City Services.
Local resident 4	Noted the need for a litter bin at the bus stop in front of Kilburn Close.	Beyond scope of document. Issue to be referred to City Services.
Local resident 5	Requested to be kept informed of any plans concerning the former Village School. Noted that the large tree within its grounds needs trimming as it is interfering with overhead cables.	Text added to page 48 describing recent works carried out to address condition of Village School. Information to be passed on to resident. Issued of tree passed on to owners of site who are investigating the possibility of trimming its branches.
Local resident 6	No specific comment. Requested hard copy of document.	Copy of document sent out.
Local Resident 7	Provided useful historical information on The Wilderness and general history of the Village.	Text added to historical development section of Character Appraisal and to page 27.

<b>Comments made at Public Exhibition</b>		
<b>Attendees</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Action / reason for no action</b>
No's 1	Supportive of proposed Article 4 Direction on his property.	No action required.
No 2	Noted that no's 9 and 10 The Village were previously one farmhouse that was subsequently sub-divided into 2 cottages.	Text added to page 21 to explain evolution of buildings.
No's 3 & 4	Noted St Paul's Church incorrectly referred to as St Matthew's at one point in document. Suggested the Forge Garage should be included in the Conservation Area as it is a historically significant building in the village, formerly known as 'The Smithy'.	Text on page 52 corrected accordingly.  Whilst there is certainly some historical merit for including the Forge Garage in the Conservation Area, the building has been considerably altered from its original form and it is questionable whether it is worthwhile extending the boundary to incorporate one additional property. Text added to page 33 to this effect.
No 5	Owner of listed building in village. No	No action required.

	specific comment on document, queried whether certain works to property required consent from Council.	
No 6	Expressed concern over condition of remnants of former Salutation Inn. Queried position of traffic island opposite Post Office.	Text added to page 49 discussing issue of site of former Salutation Inn. Beyond scope of document. Matter to be referred to Transportation.
No 7	Very complementary of document, was impressed by its quality and content. Expressed concern over condition of former Village School.	Issue of Village School addressed in Management Strategy. Text added to page 48 describing recent works carried out to address condition of the building.
No's 8, 9 & 10	Expressed concern over condition and vacancy of former Village School, noted that it presents a health and safety risk.	Issue of Village School addressed in Management Strategy. Text added to page 48 describing recent works carried out to address condition of the building.
No 11	Advised that the terraces referred to on page 33 were not in fact built for colliery workers.	Reference to colliery workers deleted from page 33.
No 12	Noted the need for a litter bin on the green space in front of Kilburn Close. Expressed concern over cars from Garage on the Green obstructing Station Road.	Beyond scope of document. Request to be passed on to City Services. The issue of parking vehicles is outside the scope of the CAMS. Issue to be referred to Transportation.

## Appendix 2 – List of external consultees

<b>National Organisations / local amenity groups</b>	<b>Architects</b>	<b>Residents / businesses</b>
English Heritage	Fitz Architects	All owners and occupiers in the Conservation Area.
Victorian Society	John D. Waugh	
The Georgian Group	Gerard McCormack	
Twentieth Century Society	Jane Darbyshire & David Kendal	
Institute of Historic Building Conservation	Reid Jubb Brown	
Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings	Mario Minchella Architects	
Department for Culture, Media and Sport	Napper Architects	
Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment	Red Box Design Group	
Sunderland Civic Society	Anthony Watson Chartered Architect	
Sunderland Antiquarian Society	Purves Ash LLP	
Sunderland Heritage & Local History Forum	Planit Design	
Sunderland Old Township Heritage Society	Jeff Park Building Consultancy Services	
North of England Civic Trust	Gray, Fawdon & Riddle Architects	
Living History North East	Howarth Litchfield	
Grace McCombie, Buildings Historian	HLB Architects	
Victoria County History	Wearmouth Architectural Design	
Ryhope Heritage Group	John D. Waugh	
History Society of Sunderland	A.M. Watt	
Tyne & Wear County Archaeologist	Ward Hadaway Solicitors	