

**At a meeting of the PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS (WEST) COMMITTEE held in the Council Chamber, Civic Centre on TUESDAY 5<sup>th</sup> OCTOBER, 2021 at 5.30 p.m.**

**Present:-**

Councillor Thornton in the Chair.

Councillors Blackett, Donaghy, Fagan, Lauchlan, G. Miller, Peacock, and Price.

**Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest

**Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted to the meeting on behalf of Councillor Warne

**Minutes of the last meeting of the Committee held on Tuesday 7<sup>th</sup> September 2021.**

1. RESOLVED that the minutes of the last meeting of the Committee held on Tuesday 7<sup>th</sup> September, 2021 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

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

The Executive Director of City Development submitted a report and circulatory report (copies circulated), which related to the West area of the City, copies of which had also 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)

**20/02027/HE4 – Full planning permission for 116 residential dwellings (use class C3) with associated infrastructure and landscaping and outline planning permission (all matters reserved except access) for up to 324 residential dwellings (use class C4), associated infrastructure and landscaping (additional highways information received 21/07/21, amended plans, updated drainage and ecology information and supplement to Environmental Statement received 23/07/21) - Land South West of Herrington Country Park, Chester Road, Penshaw, Sunderland**

The Planning Officer representing the Executive Director of City Development outlined the proposal to Members of the Committee and the relevant material planning considerations against which the application had been assessed.

Councillor Blackett referred to the implications of development relative to built heritage and archaeology on page 47 of the agenda and commented that he took issue with the report in that it focussed on Penshaw Monument yet there was no mention or recognition of key archaeology sites surrounding the area.

The Planning Officer advised that the site had been subject to Archaeology assessments and investigations and the Council had consulted the County Archaeologist with her comments available on the planning portal (and summarised on Page 12 of the report) They were satisfied the works were satisfactory subject to a suitably worded condition as was included in the recommendation.

Councillor Fagan referred to page 9 of the agenda and enquired as to the statement, areas had been “scoped out” of the EIA. The Planning Officer informed that this process was designed to focus on Development proposals likely to give rise to significant environmental effects. Discussions took place ahead of the application being submitted so that all matters were addressed through the planning process.

Councillor Fagan commented that the Section 106 money was to be allocated to secondary schools but none to primary schools and queried why this was the case when both would suffer increased pressure resulting from the development.

The Planning Officer advised that the figures requested and how they needed to be spent were provided by the Council’s Education Officer.

In response to Councillor Peacock’s query over the accuracy over the determination of the land and its green belt status, the Planning Officer advised that the land was not determined to be green belt land and the description was accurate. The site had been removed during the Councils adoption of the Core Strategy Development Plan in 2020 and the site was allocated for housing.

Also in response to Councillor Peacock’s enquiry over the submission of a petition on top of the 274 public objections received. The Planning Officer advised that the application had gone through three separate rounds of consultation and he was not aware of any petition being submitted.

The Chairman referred to the developer funding improvements to the roads and junctions as mentioned on pages 50/51 of the agenda and enquired as to the timeframe for these. The City Solicitor advised that payment would be requested prior to the start of the works so this could start straight away.

The Council's Highways Engineer advised that the section 106 money would be for improvements to three locations to help traffic flow and accessibility to mitigate the impact of the development and would be delivered as part of Phase 1 of the scheme, should the officer's recommendation be approved.

The Chairman introduced Councillor Speding, Ward Councillor, who wished to speak in objection to the application. Councillor Speding advised that he was speaking in order to raise the issues on behalf of the 274 objectors and the approximately 2,500 Members of the Save Penshaw Green Belt Land Facebook page. Councillor Speding also advised that many concerns had been raised at Ward Surgery's around the fact that Green Belt land had been taken out by the Planning Inspector and the misunderstanding of this process with decisions in other areas being reversed for the Core Strategy after investigation, yet this area was not.

Councillor Speding wished to focus on material considerations which he did not feel had been given sufficient weight. A recent traffic survey had been carried out which indicated a quarter of a million cars used this area and Shiney Row roundabout was one of the busiest, most congested in the city. The alternative route should've been the A182 and Biddick Hall roundabout was the original route but this didn't materialise therefore the area would suffer a huge increase in traffic.

Councillor Speding commented that there was no mention within the report of the rat runs, school traffic in the area and that Chislehurst Road was a blind road that still required improvements after recent developments. However the biggest concern was the access to Station Road and that the section 106 was to be used for secondary schools, with no secondary schools in Shiney Row Ward this was an abuse of the section 106 agreements and local ward members had not been involved in this and it didn't meet the requirements of the residents of Shiney Row residents.

Councillor Speding also wished to raise that there was no mention of a historic public right of way at Maiden Law within the report.

The Chairman introduced Russ Hall of Taylor Wimpey Homes who wished to address the Committee as the applicant of the proposals. Mr Hall advised that Taylor Wimpey was a Sunderland based company with a north east workforce.

The Council's Local Plan had identified this area for residential development and this plan had been adopted and the planning officers report covered the details of this. Mr Hall wished to place thanks to Officers for their work and fully supported their recommendation.

The granting of this planning permission would be subject to strict controls by the local planning authority and this, along with Taylor Wimpey's own strict considerate construction principles and also with the governance of the site by statutory authorities and undertakers would ensure that disruption be kept to an absolute minimum.

The Planning Officer advised that traffic had been thoroughly assessed by survey work through Highways England and the Council's own Highways Team.

The Highways Officer advised that there had been a robust transport assessment and traffic surveys undertaken before Covid so it represented the worst case scenario for the accumulation of traffic. This was considered and concluded that some improvements were required, which were part of the Section 106 agreement, including Shiney Row roundabout.

In respect of the Chislehurst Road issues, the Highways Officer advised that the development had taken time to move forward but improvements to the junction were progressing now.

In response to Councillor Blackett's enquiry over the traffic surveys and if these had taken into account the big events held at Herrington Country Park, the Highways Officer advised that they did not consider these as they were very much one off events and managed through the Council so was unreasonable to expect a developer to account for.

The Officer recommendation having been put to the vote, with 4 Members voting in favour and four Members voting against, as the Chairman had the casting vote, it was:-

2. RESOLVED that Members be minded to grant consent under Regulation 4 of the Town and Country Planning (General Regulations) 1992, subject to expiry of public consultation period with no further representations, or representations only raising matters already addressed by the main report, being received, the completion of an agreement under s106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and subject to the 33 draft conditions provided in the main report (with condition 4 amended as set out in the Circulatory Report).

**21/01764/HE4 – Erection of industrial unit to be used for the manufacture of batteries for vehicles with ancillary office/welfare floorspace and associated infrastructure provision, accesses, parking, drainage and landscaping - Location is: Land to the North of Washington Road and West of International Drive, Washington**

The Planning Officer representing the Executive Director of City Development outlined the proposal to Members of the Committee and the relevant material planning considerations against which the application had been assessed.

The Chairman introduced Lynda Newsome, who wished to address the Committee on behalf of the applicant. Ms Newsome advised that Envision was a world leading manufacturer of batteries and had supplied Nissan for the past 9 years for its Leaf model.

The forecast and need to produce batteries was expected to grow significantly with 100,000 electric vehicles produced every year.

Ms Newsome advised that the site had outline permission for this use and there was no outstanding issues or objections to the proposals and she hoped Members would agree the Officers recommendation so that work could commence on site early next year.

In response to Councillor Lauchlan's query over the disposal of the chemicals that would be used in producing these batteries, the Planning Officer advised that as this was an outline planning application, these details would be addressed through hazardous response plans which would specifically cover this in a further application to be submitted.

3. RESOLVED that Members to be minded to grant consent under Regulation 4 of the Town and Country Planning (General Regulations) 1992 (as amended), and subject to the 36 draft conditions contained within the report

### **Items for Information**

Members having fully considered the items for information contained within the matrix, it was:-

4. RESOLVED that the items for information as set out in the matrix be received and noted

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

(Signed) M. THORNTON,  
(Chairman)