

**At a meeting of the PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE held in the CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER on MONDAY 28 NOVEMBER 2022 at 5.30 p.m.**

**Present:-**

Councillor Thornton in the Chair.

Councillors Doyle, Foster, G. Miller, Mullen, Nicholson and Scott.

**Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest made.

**Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor Herron

**Minutes of the last ordinary meeting of the Planning and Highways Committee held on 31<sup>st</sup> October 2022**

1. RESOLVED that the minutes of the last ordinary meeting of the Planning and Highways Committee held on 31st October 2022 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

**Planning Application 21/02737/LP3 – Change of use of existing building to community centre with associated elevational alterations, including replacement roof, gutters and piping, new entrance doors to front, steps/handrail to side, and patio area to front. - Usworth Park Pavilion, Usworth Recreation Park, Manor Road, Concord, Washington**

The Executive Director of City Development submitted a report (copy circulated) in respect of the above matter.

(for copy report – see original minutes)

The representative of the Executive Director of City Development presented the report advising the Committee of key issues to consider in determining the application.

In conclusion the Committee was advised that the development had been found to be acceptable in principle and unlikely to result in any serious

detriment to highway safety, the visual amenities of the host property and the area in general, or the biodiversity of the area, subject to the use of appropriate conditions. The proposal accorded with policies VC5, ST3, BH1 and NE2 of the Core Strategy and Development Plan (CSDP) and was therefore recommended for approval.

The Chairman thanked the Officer for her report and invited questions of clarification from Members.

There being no questions, the Chairman invited the Committee to comment on and debate the application. Councillor Miller stated that the city had a shortage of this type of building and he was delighted to see it being given a new lease of life. The Chairman having put the Officer recommendation to Members, it was:-

2. RESOLVED application be granted consent in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992, subject to the conditions detailed in the report.

#### **Planning Application 22/00621/FUL - Land to the Rear of 21 South Hetton Road, Easington Lane**

Members noted that the above item had been withdrawn by the Agent of the applicant.

#### **Planning Application 22/01592/FUL – Development of flexible commercial units (Class B2, B8, and E(g) (ii) and (iii)) including mezzanines with associated accesses, car parking, cycle parking, bin stores, landscaping and associated ancillary works – Land at West Quay, Crown Road, Sunderland**

The Executive Director of City Development submitted a report (copy circulated) in respect of the above matter.

(for copy report – see original minutes)

The representative of the Executive Director of City Development presented the report, advising the Committee of the key issues to consider in determining the application.

The Committee was advised that the proposed development would deliver employment uses and eight flexible commercial units within a designated Key Employment Area. It would support sustainable economic growth including by developing employment land and generating employment, within the existing urban area in a sustainable location.

The development would have minor negative impacts on the setting of the Queen Alexandra Bridge, in relation to very specific views, however it was

considered that the economic benefits of the proposed development would comprise public benefits which, in the planning balance, would outweigh the minor negative impacts on the setting of the Grade II Bridge. The proposed development would also accord with the development plan when read as a whole.

Subject to the discharge of and compliance with the recommended conditions it was considered that the proposed development would be of an acceptable design and have no harmful visual impacts when viewed from the public domain, it would also have no unacceptable impacts on the amenities of the occupiers of any neighbouring properties and would cause no unacceptable impacts on the highway network in terms of its capacity and safety, or in relation to sustainable travel.

In relation to ecology, the development would result in a net loss in biodiversity, however, it was considered that, in the planning balance this would be outweighed by the economic benefits of the proposed development. It was considered that the development would have no other unacceptable impacts on ecology. It was also considered that there would be no unacceptable impacts in relation to archaeology, flooding / drainage and land contamination subject to the discharge of and compliance with the recommended conditions. Accordingly, the application was recommended for approval.

The Chairman thanked the Officer for his report and invited questions of clarification from Members.

There being no questions or comments, the Chairman put the Officer recommendation to the Committee and it was:-

3. RESOLVED that the application be approved subject to the conditions listed in the report.

**Planning Application 22/01637/LBC Listed Building Consent Remove existing palisade fencing from existing Grade II\* Listed Victoria Viaduct and replace with anti-trespass fencing. Victoria Viaduct, Washington, NE38 8LQ**

The Executive Director of City Development submitted a report (copy circulated) in respect of the above matter.

(for copy report – see original minutes)

The representative of the Executive Director of City Development presented the report, advising the Committee of the key issue to consider in determining the application, namely, whether the proposed development would sustain and enhance the significance of a heritage asset.

In conclusion it was considered that the proposal was likely to have only a minor negative impact on the setting of the Bridge and result in a minimal amount of harm to its significance, albeit still falling within the category of less than substantial harm. However, the proposed security measures were required to provide a more robust solution to the problems associated with unauthorised access onto the Bridge and therefore brought public benefits that were likely to outweigh the minimal degree of harm. Accordingly, the application was recommended for approval.

The Chairman thanked the Officer for her report and invited questions of clarification from Members. There being no questions, the Chairman invited the Committee to comment on and debate the application.

Councillor Doyle stated that he would be supporting the recommendation because of the health and safety concerns but highlighted the comments in the consultation reply from Historic England that the fencing was something that was “necessary rather than desirable.”

Councillor Miller stated that as both a resident of the Washington East ward and a Washington Councillor, the issue of safety and anti social behaviour associated with the viaduct had been a long standing, major concern for the residents of Washington. He agreed with the comments highlighted by Councillor Doyle and believed that if the proposals were not acted upon, the serious risk of a fatality would remain. He therefore welcomed proposals which would make the viaduct safer.

The Chairman having put the Officer recommendation to the Committee, it was:-

4. RESOLVED that Listed Building Consent be granted subject to the conditions detailed in the report.

**Planning Application 22/01803/FUL    Change of use from open space to private garden with 1.8 metre boundary fence – 50 Monkside Close, Lambton, Washington, NE38 0QB**

The Executive Director of City Development submitted a report (copy circulated) in respect of the above matter.

(for copy report – see original minutes)

The representative of the Executive Director of City Development presented the report, advising the Committee of the key issues to consider in determining the application. In conclusion the Committee was advised that the principle of the proposed change of use was considered to be acceptable without causing demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the area and would also have no significant adverse impact on nature conservation, residential/visual amenity, environmental health or highway safety. Accordingly, the application was recommended for approval.

The Chairman thanked the Officer for his report and invited questions of clarification from Members.

There being no questions or comments, the Chairman put the Officer recommendation to the Committee and it was:-

5. RESOLVED that that the application be approved, subject to the conditions detailed in the report.

### **Items for information**

Members gave consideration to the items for information contained within the matrix.

In response to an enquiry from Councillor Doyle, the representative of the Executive Director of City Development updated the Committee on the current position in relation to Application No. 20/01442/VA3 (Bay Shelter Whitburn) and hoped to be in a position to provide a definitive picture soon.

In addition, she advised that a report in respect of Application No. 22/01330/MW4 – (Quantafuel Sunderland Limited - East Shore Enterprise Zone Port of Sunderland) was likely to be submitted to Committee in the near future and perhaps Members could benefit from a site visit.

6. RESOLVED that the items for information as set out in the matrix be received and noted and that a site visit be undertaken in respect of Application No. 22/01330/MW4.

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

(Signed) M. THORNTON  
(Chairman)