

**At a Meeting of the DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (SOUTH SUNDERLAND) SUB-COMMITTEE held in the CIVIC CENTRE on TUESDAY 19<sup>th</sup> APRIL, 2016 at 4.45 p.m.**

**Present:-**

Councillor Porthouse in the Chair

Councillors Ball, Bell, D. Dixon, M. Dixon, English, Jackson, Mordey, Price, Scaplehorn and S. Watson

**Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

**Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor P. Watson.

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

The Executive Director of Commercial Development 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).

**15/02557/HY4 – HYBRID APPLICATION: The development will comprise a first (detailed) phase (7319 sq.m Gross External Area) to include 6319sq.m (GEA) Office Accommodation (B1) and ground floor uses (1000sq.m GEA) including leisure (D1,D2) food and drink (A3,A4) and retail uses (A1) stopping up of existing highways and creation of associated infrastructure including internal access roads, landscaping, public realm and the continuation of the Keel Line landscape feature. The application also seeks outline consent for up to 201 residential units, commercial uses including offices (B1), Hotel (C1), Leisure (D1, D2), Food and Drink (A3, A4), Car Parking (Sui Generis) and Retail (A1) (maximum of 2499sq.m for retail developments across the entire site) together with associated landscaping, car parking, public realm and creation of extended promontory to support the Keel Line beyond the upper site plateau. All matters apart from access to be reserved in relation to the outline element of the proposals. Stopping up of highway.  
Former Vaux Brewery Site, Gill Bridge Avenue, City Centre, Sunderland**

The representative of the Executive Director of Commercial Development presented the report and drew Members attention to the representations which had been received; these objections were broadly supportive of the scheme although archaeological concerns had been raised and these would be covered by conditions attached to any consent granted.

In terms of land use and policy the application was considered to be acceptable as the application accorded with the policies and the land use allocation. The proposal represented a full masterplan for the redevelopment of this key site.

The proposal included parts of the site being used for town centre uses; as the site was located within the city centre boundary it was considered to be an appropriate use and a sequential test was not necessary.

A transport assessment had been completed which had looked at the impact of the proposal on the accesses to the site; it was considered that the junctions would be able to accommodate the traffic created by the development. There were plans for a multi-storey car park and undercroft parking to be included in later stages of the development. For plot 1 the level of car parking provision required was 114 spaces and this would be served by the existing car parks at Livingstone Road and St Mary's Way until the new parking provision was implemented. Vehicle access into the site would be taken from Livingstone Road to the west and Cumberland Street to the east.

There were good links into the site for pedestrians and cyclists as there were a number of crossings on St Mary's Way. There would be 12 cycle spaces included as part of the plot 1 development and further plots would have further cycle provision included. It was also proposed that there would be communal cycle storage located adjacent to the public realm space. There were also a number of bus services which stopped on St Mary's Way and the site was close to the St Peter's metro station and Sunderland Central Station. The proposal was considered to be acceptable in highways terms.

A habitats regulations assessment had been undertaken by the Council and this considered the likely impacts of the development on the Durham Coast Special Area of Conservation and the Northumbria Coast Special Protection Areas; it was not considered that there would be an adverse impact from the development. An Ecological assessment had also been undertaken and this had identified that there was a negligible likelihood of protected species using the site.

The impacts on the setting of heritage assets including the Wearmouth Bridges and the Bishopwearmouth Conservation Area was unlikely to be significant although there was a need to carefully consider the impact of the development of plot 12 on the Magistrates Courts building. The proposal presented a significant regeneration opportunity and there were potential spin-off benefits to the wider area including potential benefits to the heritage assets in the area. The design of the scheme had also been given careful consideration and the Masterplanning approach had involved architects, urban designers, engineers, landscape architects and developments managers to create a masterplan which provided a framework for the development and would help deliver varied development over the projects 20 year build period. The layout of the site had been designed to maximise pedestrian and cyclist access through the site. The active facades and windows facing the street would provide

natural surveillance which would help to create safer spaces and would add interest to the street scene. It was proposed that each of the buildings would be 6 – 7 storeys high with block 12 being envisaged as a landmark building of up to 8 storeys; this combined with the streets being between 14m and 18m wide would ensure that there was a suitably dense feel to the development.

A flood risk assessment had been undertaken and this had confirmed that the site was at very low risk of river or sea flooding. The assessment had identified that surface water flooding occurred in isolated areas of the site; this would be addressed by using an existing surface water outflow into the River Wear and by the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems to attenuate the outflow.

A Section 106 agreement would be imposed on the development which would require the provision of up to 21 affordable housing units based on the proposal being for up to 201 dwellings. There would also be a financial contribution made in respect of education provision based on the payments being: £713 for each 2 bed dwelling; £2,853 for each 3 bed dwelling and £3,567 for each 4 bed dwelling. There would also need to be a contribution to recreation play space to provide new play facilities or the improvement of existing facilities; this would be a maximum of £140,901 based on the current rate of £701 for each dwelling of 2 or more bedrooms. The section 106 agreement would also require the developer to maintain the publically accessible spaces in accordance with an agreed management and maintenance plan. There would also be a contribution of £9,111.03 towards the clearance and maintenance of the steps leading from the site to Riverside Park.

It was not considered appropriate to impose the usual time restrictions on the proposal given that it was a large multiphase development; as such it was proposed that should Members be minded to grant the application that the time limit be extended to 15 years for the submission of all reserved matters applications along with a 5 year expiry date for the commencement of the final stages of development following the approval of the last reserved matter.

The Chairman then introduced John Seager who was in attendance to speak in support of the application. Mr Seager advised that he was the Chief Executive of Siglion. Siglion would be regenerating a number of key sites in the city and this proposal was the first stage of the redevelopment of the Vaux site. He had nothing to add to the officer's report and he was happy to answer any questions from Members.

Councillor M. Dixon referred to the concerns raised in representations 1 and 3 that there was too much office space being proposed. Mr Seager advised that in order to attract businesses there needed to be high quality office space available; there had already been enquiries from companies. The first step was to provide accommodation which would then attract businesses. The site was proposed to be a mixed use site.

The Chairman commented that this proposal was a key component of the Economic Masterplan and was a positive step towards the regeneration of the city.

Councillor Mordey welcomed the development which was an important part of the ambitions to regenerate the city. The new Wear Bridge would help to improve connectivity to the site.

The Chairman then put the officer's recommendation to the Committee and with all Members being in agreement it was:-

1. RESOLVED that consent be granted in accordance with Regulation 4 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 for the reasons set out in the report subject to the 36 conditions set out in the circulatory report.

**16/00405/FU4 – Installation of 4no. 6m high lampposts and 1no. 6m high CCTV column.**

**Land at Johnson Street, Sunderland**

The representative of the Executive Director of Commercial Development advised that the columns were similar in size to the existing columns and it was proposed that a condition be added to any consent granted requiring that the columns be painted black to match the existing columns.

There had been no representations received and the proposal was considered to be acceptable in terms of policy, amenity issues and highways issues.

Councillor Price expressed concerns that the university were looking to acquire the car park from the Council; there were already major parking problems in the area and he was concerned that the car parking being changed from public car parking to university parking would lead to the parking situation being made worse. He suggested that it could be appropriate to defer the decision making on this application until after there was more information available on the Community Parking Management Scheme for the area.

Councillor Mordey advised that the consultation on this Community Parking Management Scheme was expected to start in June or July.

The Chairman advised that this application was just for the installation of columns to accommodate street lighting and CCTV and was nothing to do with parking. The university intended to acquire the land however it was possible that this might not happen. The ownership of the land was not a material consideration for this planning application. He did not feel that it would be appropriate to defer the application.

2. RESOLVED that consent be granted in accordance with Regulation 4 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 for the reasons set out in the report subject to the three conditions set out therein.

**Items for Information**

3. RESOLVED that the following site visits be undertaken:-
  - a. 16/00388/HY4 – Chapelgarth, South of Weymouth Road, Sunderland at the request of the Chairman
  - b. 15/01546/FDC – Ryhope Village CE Primary School, Ryhope Street South, Sunderland, SR2 0HG at the request of the Chairman.

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

The Executive Director of Commercial Development submitted a report (copy circulated) concerning the appeals received and determined for the period 1<sup>st</sup> March, 2016 to 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2016.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

4. RESOLVED that the report be received and noted.

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

(Signed)      S. PORTHOUSE,  
Chairman.