

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (SOUTH SUNDERLAND) SUB-COMMITTEE

AGENDA

**Meeting to be held in Committee Room 2 on Monday, 3rd
February, 2020 at 5.15p.m.**

Membership

Councillors Atkinson, Bewick, D. Dixon, M. Dixon, E. Gibson, Greener, Haswell, Hodson, Jackson, Mordey, Mullen, Scaplehorn, P. Smith, Tye, Waller and A. Wilson

ITEM		PAGE
1.	Receipt of Declarations of Interest (if any)	
2.	Apologies for Absence	
3.	Applications made under the Town and Country Planning Acts and Regulations made thereunder	1
	Report of the Executive Director of City Development (copy herewith).	

**E. WAUGH,
Assistant Director of Law & Governance.**

Civic Centre,
SUNDERLAND.

24th January, 2020

Item 3

Development Control (South Sunderland) Sub-Committee

3 February 2020

REPORT ON APPLICATIONS

REPORT BY THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF CITY DEVELOPMENT

PURPOSE OF REPORT

This report includes recommendations on all applications other than those that are delegated to the Executive Director of City Development for determination. Further relevant information on some of these applications may be received and in these circumstances either a supplementary report will be circulated a few days before the meeting or if appropriate a report will be circulated at the meeting.

LIST OF APPLICATIONS

Applications for the following sites are included in this report.

1. 19/01965/FUL
Land To The Rear Of Tudor Grove Sunderland SR3 1SB

COMMITTEE ROLE

The Sub Committee has full delegated powers to determine applications on this list. Members of the Council who have queries or observations on any application should, in advance of the above date, contact the Sub Committee Chairperson or the Development Control Manager (0191 561 8755) or email dc@sunderland.gov.uk.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that “where in making any determination under the planning Acts, regard is to be had to the development plan, the determination shall be made in accordance with the plan unless material consideration indicates otherwise.

Unitary Development Plan - current status

The Unitary Development Plan for Sunderland was adopted on 7th September 1998. In the report on each application specific reference will be made to those policies and proposals, which are particularly relevant to the application site and proposal. The UDP also includes a number of city wide and strategic policies and objectives, which when appropriate will be identified.

STANDARD CONDITIONS

Sections 91 and 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 require that any planning application which is granted either full or outline planning permission shall include a condition, which limits its duration.

SITE PLANS

The site plans included in each report are illustrative only.

PUBLICITY/CONSULTATIONS

The reports identify if site notices, press notices and/or neighbour notification have been undertaken. In all cases the consultations and publicity have been carried out in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 – ACCESS TO INFORMATION

The background papers material to the reports included on this agenda are:

- The application and supporting reports and information;
- Responses from consultees;
- Representations received;
- Correspondence between the applicant and/or their agent and the Local Planning Authority;
- Correspondence between objectors and the Local Planning Authority;
- Minutes of relevant meetings between interested parties and the Local Planning Authority;
- Reports and advice by specialist consultants employed by the Local Planning Authority;
- Other relevant reports.

Please note that not all of the reports will include background papers in every category and that the background papers will exclude any documents containing exempt or confidential information as defined by the Act.

These reports are held on the relevant application file and are available for inspection during normal office hours at the City Development Directorate at the Customer Service Centre or via the internet at www.sunderland.gov.uk/online-applications/

Peter McIntyre

Executive Director City Development

Reference No.: 19/01965/FUL Full Application

Proposal: **Erection of 4 bedroom dwelling**

Location: Land To The Rear Of Tudor Grove Sunderland SR3 1SB

Ward: Barnes

Applicant: Marikal Ltd

Date Valid: 9 December 2019

Target Date: 3 February 2020

PROPOSAL:

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is a plot of land to the rear of 7-19 Tudor Grove that was until recently part of an area of open space bounded by Tudor Grove to the south-west, Alpine Way to the south-east, and Durham Road to the north. The wider site is currently being developed for 8 'executive' dwellings, of a high quality contemporary design, and boasting a number of sustainability features (ref 14/01638/FUL).

The wider development site sits on a small rounded hill known as Humbledon Hill, a well-known local landmark, and occupies the northern slopes of the hill excluding the disused reservoir atop the crown of the hill. The current application site comprises an area that was proposed to be left as Magnesian Limestone grassland and would provide an information board and the visitor car parking spaces, which are now proposed to be located further to the south east as part of application ref. 18/01665/VAR (approved 14/11/18).

The remaining undeveloped part of the hill is occupied by the remains of a defended settlement of Iron Age date which developed from a Later Bronze Age site; the monument was scheduled under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (as amended) in 2011. It was deemed to be of national importance as it is a rare survival of a lowland, coastal hillfort or defended settlement. The scheduled area includes the western half of the defended settlement; to the east, the settlement has been compromised by housing development, gardening activities and the construction of a Victorian reservoir. This area is not included in the scheduling.

The 8-dwelling development includes an access road from Alpine Way across the land adjacent to no. 31 Tudor Grove, wrapping around the hill following the boundary of the scheduled area, and terminating in a turning head adjacent to 24 Alpine Way. A retaining wall will support and define the edge of the scheduled area to the south of this road, whilst the properties are positioned downhill to the north of the new road.

The design concept of the proposal includes the enhancement and management of the remaining open space as Magnesian Limestone grassland, a habitat defined by the underlying geology of the hill and unique to the Magnesian Limestone landscapes. The applicant envisages the hill as providing an educational role based on the history, geology and biodiversity of the site.

APPLICATION PROPOSAL

The application relates to the erection of an additional two storey residential property. Similar to the approved dwellings, it is designed around two flat roofed rectangular blocks, one atop and at right angles to the other; the lower one set down and partly cut into the hillside, with the upper block accessed from the new road level. The design of the properties incorporates terraces/balconies and north facing fenestration that will take advantage of the views out from the hill. The flat roofs are proposed to be 'green' roofs as part of the sustainability package proposed.

Two very similar applications have already been considered by the LPA and refused. The first was refused on 30/10/19 (ref 18/01295/FUL) for reasons relating to the overdevelopment of the site, the loss of open space, and the ecological impacts of the development. The second application (ref 19/00199/SUB) was refused on 2/4/19 for similar reasons. An appeal against this decision (ref 19/00025/REF) was dismissed on 3/9/19.

The current application seeks to address the ongoing ecological concerns by reducing the garden space within this plot and plots 1 and 2 to create additional Magnesian Limestone grassland.

TYPE OF PUBLICITY:

Site Notice Posted
Neighbour Notifications

CONSULTEES:

Tyne And Wear Archaeology Officer
Natural England
Network Management
Barnes - Ward Councillor Consultation
Environmental Health
Northumbrian Water
English Heritage

Final Date for Receipt of Representations: **04.02.2020**

REPRESENTATIONS:

Publicity

Six letters of objection have been received. The objectors note that the scheme is essentially unchanged from that dismissed at appeal and wish their previous concerns to stand, which relate to;

- Potential overlooking of the windows and gardens of existing properties on Tudor Grove,
- Loss of privacy, both from the development and through construction works,
- Potential harm to the wildlife and biodiversity on the site,
- Potential harm to the scheduled ancient monument,
- Loss of greenspace through the development of the allocated mitigation grassland,
- Overdevelopment of the site, particularly given that the original scheme was limited to 8 dwellings,
- The development will lead to an increase in traffic congestion within the vicinity of the site,

- The re-siting of the visitor car parking spaces being too close to existing residential properties,
- The proposal would set a precedent for a further increase in residential plots,
- Noise, dust and disruption to local residents during ongoing construction works would be exacerbated,
- Vibrations from construction works have caused damage to existing properties,

The latter point is not a planning issue that can be addressed within the context of the current application.

Northumbria Water

- no objections

Council's Highways team

- no objections

Council's Public Protection and Regulatory Services team

- no objections subject to the use of a condition relating to dealing with unexpected contamination

Council's Built Heritage team

- no objections

Council's Natural Heritage team

- concerns regarding the impact of the development upon protected species and their habitats and the biodiversity of the area.

POLICIES:

In the Unitary Development Plan the site is subject to the following policies;

EN_10_Proposals for unallocated sites to be compatible with the neighbourhood
 B_2_Scale, massing layout and setting of new developments
 B_3_Protection of public/ private open space (urban green space)
 CN_18_Promotion of nature conservation (general)
 CN_22_Developments affecting protected wildlife species and habitats
 T_14_Accessibility of new developments, need to avoid congestion and safety problems arising
 T_22_Parking standards in new developments
 B_11_Measures to protect the archaeological heritage of Sunderland (general)
 B_12_Preservation of scheduled ancient monuments
 B_13_Sites and monuments of local importance affected by development
 B_14_Development in areas of potential archaeological importance
 EN_14_Development on unstable or contaminated land or land at risk from landfill/mine gas

COMMENTS:

ISSUES

The main issues to consider in the determination of the planning application are:

- Principle of development
- Archaeology
- Design and amenity issues
- Ecology and biodiversity
- Highway considerations
- Ground conditions

Principle of Development

The site to which the application relates is not allocated for any specific purpose in the UDP and as such is defined as 'white' land, subject to the provisions of policy EN10. In this regard, given that the surrounding area is predominantly residential in nature, the proposed development accords with the objectives of this policy.

In addition to the above, regard should also be given to the fact that the wider site has previously had planning permission for a residential development scheme and given that local planning policy and site circumstances are not significantly and materially different from the time of granting the former consent, then this is a further material consideration in assessing the proposal.

Archaeology

UDP policy B11 states that the City Council will promote measures to protect the archaeological heritage of Sunderland and ensure that any remains discovered will be either physically preserved or recorded.

Policy B12 states that there will be a presumption in favour of the preservation of Scheduled Ancient Monuments and other nationally important archaeological sites. Planning permission for development which would have an adverse impact on their site or setting will be refused unless exceptional circumstances prevail.

Policy B13 seeks to safeguard sites of local archaeological significance.

Policy B14 of the UDP dictates that the city council will require an archaeological assessment to be submitted as part of a planning application to assess the nature, extent and significance of the remains present and the degree to which the proposed development is likely to affect them.

Given the site's proximity to the scheduled monument of Humbledon Hill, a programme of archaeological investigation was carried out within the context of the planning application for the wider site (ref. 14/01638/FUL). An archaeological trench was excavated on this plot in 2014 and nothing of archaeological interest was found.

The County Archaeologist was thus satisfied that the proposed development will not impact upon pre-historic remains and no further archaeological works were required.

Historic England has commented previously that the dwelling will be outside of the boundary of the Scheduled Monument and will therefore have no direct impact upon the protected archaeological remains. In terms of the impact of the development on the setting of the Scheduled Monument, the proposed dwelling will contribute to an increase in the cumulative harm, but it is considered that the addition of one more dwelling in this location is still less than substantial harm overall to the significance of the monument.

Comments are awaited in response to consultation regarding the current proposal, however, there are no changes in circumstances to suggest that this view will differ in this instance. Any comments received to the contrary will be reported to the meeting.

The Council's Built Heritage Team has offered no objection in terms of heritage impacts of the proposal.

Given the above, the proposal is considered to comply with policies B11, B12, B13 and B14 of the UDP and is acceptable in this respect.

Design and amenity issues

Policy B2 of the Council's adopted UDP relates to new developments and extensions to existing buildings and states that their scale, massing, layout or setting should respect and enhance the best qualities of nearby properties and the locality and retain acceptable levels of privacy.

Policy B3 of the UDP states that public and private open space will be protected from development which would have a serious adverse effect on its amenity, recreational or nature conservation value; proposals will be considered in the light of their contribution to urban regeneration and to the importance of such space to the established character of the area.

In addition, consideration should be given to Sunderland's Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

The nearest residential properties to the development are those at Tudor Grove nos. 7-19, with nos. 11-15 being opposite the actual building. At its closest point, the new building will be 24m away from the properties, increasing to up to 32m in response to the oblique angle at which the dwelling will be positioned.

The Residential Design Guide SPD requires a minimum distance of 21m where windows of main habitable rooms face each other, or 14m where windows face an elevation with secondary or no windows. This is increased by 2m with every 1m difference in ground levels. Although no accurate levels have been provided, the dwelling will be excavated into the hill so that it is estimated that the property will be at a ground level approximately 1.5m higher than those on Tudor Grove, requiring a minimum of 24m. Given that this distance is achieved, and additionally that the property will be positioned so that the windows will not directly face the rears of the houses within Tudor Grove and will be partly screened by the boundary enclosure, in this respect it is considered that the proposed layout satisfies the spacing standard requirements within the Residential Design Guide SPD and policy B2 of the UDP.

The proposed house type reflects the style of those previously found to be acceptable in design terms within the context of the previous application. In terms of layout, one of the design characteristics of the original scheme was that this area of land was to be maintained as Magnesian Limestone grassland to serve as a buffer between the new development and the existing properties and present an open, green setting to the entrance to the estate to retain a feeling of spaciousness and exclusivity around these executive properties. It would also provide an area of amenity open space to provide a visual amenity and a context for the information/ interpretation board which will include references to the biodiversity of the site.

Whilst the dwelling would have a garden area and a green roof, this would be private amenity space that would not fulfil the role of public amenity open space as described above and would prevent the provision of the area of Magnesian Limestone grassland as required by the original application for the estate.

Within the appeal decision the Inspector states; "...In terms of its impact on the character and appearance of the existing open area, which under the 2014 application was given over to an area of restored MLG, the appellant claims that the proposed mitigation including the private garden area, green roof, inclusion of planted hedgerows would provide adequate offsetting for the loss of this MLG area. However, these proposed measures cannot be seen as an adequate buffer or alternative green space provision particularly as the area would no longer be a public amenity space but part of a domestic curtilage which would not be accessible to the public. Given the gardens domestic use it would be reasonable to consider that there would be a means of enclosure which would further restrict the visual amenity of the area thus eroding the areas open characteristics. For these reasons there would be harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area as a result of the visual intrusion of built development into the open area identified as restored MLG thus conflicting with Policy B2 and B3 of the CSUDP."

Given the above, it is still considered that the development of this site will represent the overdevelopment of the wider site, will dilute the integrity of this executive estate, and remove the only accessible area of open space other than the scheduled area itself (upon which public access should be restricted), which is an important contribution to the visual amenities of the area. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to policies B2 and B3 of the UDP and is unacceptable in this regard.

Ecology and Biodiversity

Policy CN18 of the UDP seeks the promotion of the interests of nature conservation throughout the city. Areas of nature conservation interest, particularly those of national importance, will be protected and enhanced through measures including; encouraging landowners and occupiers to adopt management regimes sympathetic to nature conservation, making provision in development proposals for the preservation of habitats or creation of compensatory habitats, seeking opportunities in development proposals for new habitat creation on both public and private land, improving access and providing interpretation to appropriate sites of wildlife interest, and refusing inappropriate development.

Policy CN22 of the UDP states that development which would adversely affect any animal or plant species afforded special protection by law, or its habitat, either directly or indirectly, will not be permitted unless mitigating action is achievable, and the overall effect will not be detrimental to the species and the overall biodiversity of the city.

The application for the wider site was accompanied by a number of Ecological studies to assess the impact of the development upon the flora and fauna on the site. The Natural Heritage Officer was satisfied that the ecological reports provided a comprehensive assessment of the site and adjacent areas, and offered appropriate mitigation and enhancement measures.

The original consent for the residential development included a landscaping strategy which detailed areas of reinstated natural Magnesian Limestone grassland, including the current application site. The strategy included the installation of an interpretation board on the site to provide information about the scheduled ancient monument, the ecology and biodiversity of the site, and the design of the residential development.

The approval was subject to condition 24 which required the developer to ensure the viability and long-term sustainability of all landscape and ecological mitigation and enhancement measures, including in perpetuity management and maintenance, and monitoring of the ecological factors such as mammals, flora and invertebrates, controlled access to and use of the grassland areas by humans and domestic animals, and sensitive external lighting across the site. As part of the

details submitted to discharge this condition, the current application site was specifically identified as an area of restored Magnesian Limestone grassland within which to create hibernacula and communal composting, given the practical problems of placing these within the garden plots. The current application site is therefore central to the success of the ecological mitigation and enhancement measures required by the original consent.

A report entitled Ecology Comments on Planning Refusal dated 10/5/19 was submitted with the current application which claims that the modified scheme, with a new area of grassland formed from the reduced garden plots, provides an additional area of approximately 775sqm, the same area as Plot 0's original footprint, which would offset the loss of any limestone grassland within the current site.

A similar proposal was put before the Inspector during the course of the previous appeal but was rejected as a consideration as it had not been part of the planning application against which the appeal was lodged. Additionally, the Inspector noted that the proposed amendments to the boundaries of plots 1 and 2 are outside of the red line application site and therefore could not in any case be considered within the context of the application under consideration. This remains the case here; the proposed boundary amendments are outside of the red line for the current application and so cannot be considered as part of this proposal.

The proposed amendments are so different that they would involve an amendment to the development approved by 14/01638/FUL. Even if consent could be obtained for such an amendment, there is no guarantee that this would be implemented as the original permission remains valid and could legitimately be implemented in its original form. The proposed boundary changes to plots 1 and 2 are therefore inconsequential.

The Inspector concluded "*...I concur with the Council that the future use of the green roof and garden area would be difficult to control and there is no certainty these areas would be retained or managed. Policy CN22 of the City of Sunderland Unitary Development Plan (1998) (CSUDP), requires developments which have a detrimental effect on the biodiversity of an area to have an appropriate mitigation strategy in place, given the above concerns, it would not be considered possible to secure a successful mitigation scheme in this instance and, therefore, the proposal is in conflict with the aims of Policy CN22.*"

The Natural Heritage Team has reiterated that the site's development will reduce the residual area and the connectivity of Magnesian Limestone grassland and further impact negatively on species of conservation concern. As no other practicable measures have been proposed other than the green roof and garden area to mitigate for the loss of this area, for which there is no surety that these areas will be retained and managed appropriately post construction, it is considered that the proposal will have a detrimental impact upon protected species and the biodiversity of the site, contrary to policies CN22 and CN18 and the application is unacceptable in this regard.

Highway Considerations

UDP Policy T14 aims to ensure that new developments are easily accessible to both vehicles and pedestrians, should not cause traffic problems, should make appropriate provision for safe access by vehicles and pedestrians and indicate how parking requirements will be met. In addition, policy T22 seeks to ensure that the necessary levels of car parking will be provided.

The Network Management Team has offered no objections to the proposal. The layout includes two in-curtilage car parking spaces for the additional dwelling, which is considered to be an acceptable level of provision for the development.

Given the above, it is considered that the proposed development is unlikely to lead to any significant increase in on-street parking in the vicinity of the site or highway and pedestrian safety concerns, in accordance with the requirements of policies T14 and T22.

Ground conditions

Policy EN14 of the UDP requires the applicant to carry out investigations to determine the nature of ground conditions below where development is proposed on land which there is reason to believe is either unstable or potentially unstable, contaminated or potentially at risk from migrating contaminants, or potentially at risk from migrating landfill gas or mine gas.

The site has been investigated as part of the larger scheme for housing. The Desk Study and Phase II Investigation already reviewed have previously been judged adequate for the proposal and the Public Protection and Regulatory Services Team raised no objections to the proposal provided that any consent that may be forthcoming is subject to a condition relating to unexpected contamination.

CONCLUSION

The above assessment concludes that there will be no further detriment to the setting of the scheduled monument. Archaeological investigations have previously been undertaken and no further work is required in this respect.

The positioning of the proposed dwellings is such that it is unlikely that neighbouring properties will be overshadowed, or will be unduly overlooked and it is unlikely that the development will adversely impact upon residential amenity.

The proposal is also acceptable from the highway safety point of view and the development raises no new concerns relating to ground conditions.

However, as detailed above, the proposed additional dwellinghouse is considered to constitute overdevelopment of the wider site leading to a dilution of the quality of design of the wider executive residential development site, to the detriment of the character of the new residential development and the visual amenities of the area in general, contrary to policy B2 of the UDP.

The proposal would lead to the loss of the only area of accessible open space within the vicinity, to the detriment of the amenities of the area and contrary to policy B3 of the UDP.

Additionally, the proposal represents a weakening of the sustainability credentials of the wider residential development site and is considered to be potentially harmful to local wildlife and its habitat and the biodiversity of the area through the loss of an area of restored Magnesian Limestone grassland, contrary to policies CN18, CN22 of the UDP.

Given the above, it is considered that the application is unacceptable and the application is therefore recommended for refusal.

RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE, for the reasons set out below:

Reasons:

1 The proposal represents a weakening of the sustainability credentials of the wider residential development site and is considered to be potentially harmful to local wildlife and its

habitat and the biodiversity of the area through the loss of an area of restored Magnesian Limestone grassland without adequate mitigation, contrary to policies CN18, CN22 of the UDP.

2 The proposed development would appear as a visually intrusive incursion into an area allocated as restored Magnesian Limestone grassland by virtue of application ref 14/01638/FUL, to the detriment of its visual and functional merits, resulting in a consequent loss of amenity open space and open aspect that the land affords to the street scene and, as such, is contrary to policies B2, and B3 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan.

3 The proposed additional dwellinghouse is considered to constitute overdevelopment of the wider site leading to a dilution of the quality of design of the wider executive residential development site currently under construction under application ref 14/01638/FUL, to the detriment of the character of the new residential development and the visual amenities of the area in general, contrary to policy B2 of the UDP.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

LIST OF OTHER APPLICATIONS CURRENTLY ON HAND BUT NOT REPORTED ON THIS AGENDA WHICH WILL BE REPORTED WITH A RECOMMENDATION AT A FUTURE MEETING OF THE SUB COMMITTEE

Application Ref and Ward	Applicant and Address	Proposal	Date Valid	Determination Date
19/01497/HY4	Burdon Lane Consortium	Hybrid Planning Application - Full Planning permission for 532 residential dwellings (Use Class C3) with associated infrastructure and landscaping:Outline planning permission (all matters reserved except access) to erect up to 397 residential dwellings (Use Class C3), a neighbourhood centre (comprising 2.4 hectares of development including 1.5 form entry school and uses from within use classes A1,A3,A4, D1, and D2), associated infrastructure and landscaping.	23/10/2019	12/02/2020
Doxford	Land North OfBurdon LaneBurdonSunderland			

Application Ref and Ward	Applicant and Address	Proposal	Date Valid	Determination Date
18/00640/FUL	Persimmon Homes Ltd.	96 dwellings with access from Burdon Road and associated open space, landscaping, infrastructure and earthworks.	20/09/2018	20/12/2018
Doxford	Burdon Lane Burdon Sunderland			
19/02074/FUL	Lexton Investments Ltd	Change of use of first and second floor from offices to 26no. 1- bed studios apartments and 2 no. 5 - bed cluster flats, including conversion of retail unit at 6 Fawcett Street to create a new residential entrance.	18/12/2019	18/03/2020
Hendon	Havelock House 1-6 Fawcett Street And 223 High Street West Sunderland SR1 1SJ			
19/02155/LP3	Sunderland City Council	Engineering works including re-profiling of land and erection of sub-station.	09/01/2020	09/04/2020
Hendon	East Shore Enterprise Zone Port Of Sunderland Sunderland SR 1 2BU			

Application Ref and Ward	Applicant and Address	Proposal	Date Valid	Determination Date
19/01559/FUL	Fit-Out Yorkshire	Erection of apartment block to provide 13 no. residential units.	03/12/2019	03/03/2020
Hendon	Land At James Williams Street Sunderland			
19/02149/LP3	Sunderland City Council	Demolition of NDRC centre. Construction of new NDRC centre to South of the site, and erection of 17 1&2 bedroom bungalows to the North including stopping up of public highway and association landscaping.	02/01/2020	02/04/2020
Hendon	North East Disabilities Resource Centre Cork Street Sunderland SR1 2AN			
19/02054/LBC	Mr Stephen Treanor	Internal works to facilitate change of use to 11 student apartments.	05/12/2019	30/01/2020
Hendon	25 John Street City Centre Sunderland SR1 1JG			

Application Ref and Ward	Applicant and Address	Proposal	Date Valid	Determination Date
19/02053/FUL	Mr Stephen Treanor 25 John StreetCity CentreSunderlandSR1 1JG	Change of use from offices (Use Class B1) to 11 no. student apartments.	17/12/2019	17/03/2020
Hendon				
18/01820/FUL	Persimmon Homes Durham Former Paper MillOcean RoadSunderland	Construction of 227 dwellings with associated access, landscaping and infrastructure.	19/10/2018	18/01/2019
Hendon				
19/00392/FUL	Jaspia Ltd Forster BuildingChester RoadSunderlandSR1 3SB	Demolition of existing university building and erection of 2no. buildings containing retail at ground floor, with 258no. student bed accommodation on upper floors.	08/05/2019	07/08/2019
Millfield				

Application Ref and Ward	Applicant and Address	Proposal	Date Valid	Determination Date
19/02000/LP3	Sunderland City Council	To install a temporary cremator and hoarding at Sunderland Crematorium to increase operational resilience (Amended plan received on 19.12.19 (amended description 20.12.19)	26/11/2019	21/01/2020
Pallion	Sunderland Crematorium Chester Road Sunderland			
17/02430/OU4	O&H Properties	Outline application for "Redevelopment of the site for residential use up to 700 dwellings, mixed use local centre (A1-A5, B1), primary school and community playing fields, associated open space and landscape, drainage and engineering works involving ground remodelling, highway infrastructure, pedestrian and vehicle means of access and associated works (all matters reserved). (Amended plans received 27 March 2019).	18/12/2017	19/03/2018
Pallion	Former Groves Cranes Site Woodbine Terrace Pallion Sunderland			

Application Ref and Ward	Applicant and Address	Proposal	Date Valid	Determination Date
19/00006/OUT	Mr Phil Jeffries - CJ Taverns	Proposed new residential development consisting of up to 15 dwelling houses and 10 apartments with associated parking	27/02/2019	29/05/2019
Silksworth	The Licensee The Hunters Lodge Silksworth Lane Sunderland SR3 1AQ			
