

**At a Meeting of the DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (SOUTH SUNDERLAND) SUB-COMMITTEE held in the CIVIC CENTRE on TUESDAY, 17<sup>th</sup> DECEMBER, 2013 at 4.45 p.m.**

**Present:-**

Councillor E. Gibson in the Chair

Councillors Dixon, Ellis, Price, Thompson and Wood

**Declarations of Interest**

13/02948/FUL – Sunderland Royal Hospital, Chester Road, Sunderland

Councillor Wood made an open declaration that a close family member had been involved in the preparation of the application and therefore withdrew from the meeting prior to consideration of this application.

13/00544/FUL – Land at Croftside House, Knollside Close, Sunderland

The Chairman declared that she had received correspondence from the applicant Aldi in relation to the application and had also been approached by local residents at her ward surgery in respect of the application. However she had not discussed the planning merits of the application with the applicant or the local residents and would be considering the application at the committee meeting with an open mind.

**Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Ball, Blackburn, Copeland, Essl, P. Watson and S. 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 Regulations made thereunder.

(For copy reports – see original minutes).

**Change in the order of business**

It was agreed that application number 13/02948/FUL be considered first.

**13/02948/FUL – Part demolition of the single storey frontage to existing Accident and Emergency Department; Construction of an extension over five floors to accommodate a new Emergency Department; Creation of a new four storey lift shaft; Creation of a new 8 bay ambulance parking area with canopy; Creation of a new ambulance access road, new cycle store and landscaping, plant and access works.**

**Sunderland Royal Hospital, Chester Road, Sunderland, SR4 7TP**

The representative of the Deputy Chief Executive outlined the officer's report and described the application for the construction of a new emergency department on the hospital site. She then outlined the relevant material planning considerations in respect of the application.

Consultation on the application had been undertaken and there had been no negative responses from any of the statutory consultees. There had been one representation received from a local resident which had expressed concern that there could be parking problems caused by the development and that use of public transport should be encouraged. The officer explained it was considered that the new multi storey car park would ensure that there would be no parking problems caused by the proposed development.

The application was therefore considered to be acceptable and as such the officer's recommendation was to approve the application subject to the conditions.

Councillor Price welcomed the application and queried whether the layby that was within the footprint of the extension was to be relocated and whether there were any intentions to use this layby as a bus stop. The representative of the hospital advised that the layby was currently used for the buses for the park and ride scheme. It had always been desired that a bus route could be potentially routed through the hospital site.

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

**13/00544/FUL – Demolition of existing care home and erection of a foodstore with associated vehicular and pedestrian access, car parking and landscaping. (Amended Plans received 04.11.2013)**

**Land at Croftside House, Knollside Close, Sunderland**

The representative of the Deputy Chief Executive advised that since the previous committee report the applicant had submitted amended plans and there had been a further local consultation process in respect of the amendments to the scheme.

The officer explained that the purpose of these amendments was to address the issues which had been raised by Members at the last committee meeting. There was now a ramp access to the proposed store in addition to the stairs at the north east corner of the site; there was a walkway included in the car park to ensure that pedestrians did not come into conflict with delivery vehicles and the HGV movements had been marked onto the site plan using the Autotrack system. The proposed delivery hours had also been amended and the last delivery time on Monday-Saturday had been brought forward to 9pm.

Additional representations had been received during the further consultation period. However it was not considered that there had been any new points raised over those identified and considered during the first consultation period.

The officer's recommendation was therefore to approve the application.

The Chairman then introduced local resident Mrs MacDonald who addressed the committee in objection to the application. She expressed concerns that in her view the submitted traffic assessment was misleading as it underplayed the amount of traffic that would be generated by the development on Knollside Close. Mrs MacDonald stated that a 5 percent increase had been referred to however her investigation had shown that there was likely to be a 300 percent increase in traffic on Knollside Close as the assessment had shown there would be 100 journeys per hour at peak times while there were currently only 27. She suggested that Members should visit the site on a Saturday to see what the impact would be. She was concerned over the impact the development would have on the amenity of local residents. There was a significant level of local opposition to the proposed development and she asked that the committee refuse the application.

The Council's highways engineer advised that the transport assessment as part of the application had been thoroughly scrutinised by officers and it had been concluded that there would not be more than 5 percent increase in traffic on the wider road network. It was acknowledged that there would be more than a 5 percent increase in traffic on Knollside Close up to the entrance to the car park for the proposed store but there would not be an increase in traffic beyond the store entrance. The traffic impact on Knollside Close was considered to be acceptable.

The applicant's highways consultant then added that while there would be an increase of traffic on Knollside Close the majority of the vehicles would already be using the road network to access other supermarkets in the area.

Councillor Ellis expressed concerns over the potential increase in traffic on Knollside Close and asked what the likely increase in traffic would be. The highways engineer advised that the study had shown that there were estimated to be currently 9 vehicle journeys per hour on Knollside Close at the busiest periods. It was anticipated that there would be 50 vehicles in each direction per hour accessing the supermarket at the busiest times but this was well within the capacity of Knollside Close and the junction with Hall Farm Road.

Councillor Thompson stated that he welcomed the amendments which had been made by the applicant; they went a long way to address the concerns which had been raised previously by the Committee relating to conflict between pedestrians and HGVs.

Councillor Dixon commented that the 50 vehicles per hour at peak time was less than one vehicle per minute which did not seem to be an excessive level of traffic. He queried whether this was the anticipated peak level of traffic. He was informed by the highways engineer that this was the anticipated number of vehicles in each direction and that it was not considered to be a significant volume of traffic.

Councillor Wood commented that he understood the resident's concerns; he acknowledged that the development would change the character of Knollside Close. However he referred to the officer's recommendation and noted that the applicant had done a lot of work to address the issues which had previously been raised by the Committee and due to this he could not see any valid grounds for refusing the application.

The Chairman then put the officer's recommendation to approve the application to the vote and with:

5 Members voting in favour of the recommendation and

1 Member voting against the recommendation

It was:-

2. RESOLVED that the application be approved for the reasons set out in the report and appended report and subject to the 17 conditions set out in the appended report.

**13/02683/OUT – Residential development of 17no. 3 storey town houses with access from Tavistock Place.**

**8-12 Murton Street, Sunderland, SR1 2QY**

The Chairman advised that this application had been withdrawn from the agenda for this committee meeting by officers and would be submitted to a future meeting of the committee for consideration.

**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> November, 2013 to 30<sup>th</sup> November, 2013.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

Members queried the one appeal received in respect of Mill House (Ref 13/00027/CON) as this was an application which had previously been approved by the Committee. The representative of the Deputy Chief Executive advised that the applicant had appealed against the imposition of one of the planning conditions which requires the development to only be used as an annex to the existing main dwellinghouse. The appeal was currently being considered by the Planning Inspectorate and the outcome would be reported to the committee at a future date.

3. RESOLVED that the report be received and noted.

(Signed) E. GIBSON,  
Chairman.