

## PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE

### AGENDA

Meeting to be held in the Committee Room 2, CIVIC CENTRE on  
Thursday, 20<sup>th</sup> March, 2014 at 5.30 p.m.

ITEM		PAGE
1.	<b>Receipt of Declarations of Interest (if any)</b>	
2.	<b>Apologies for Absence</b>	
3.	<b>Minutes of the last meeting of the Committee held on 18<sup>th</sup> February, 2014</b>  (copy attached)	1
4.	<b>Consultation from a Neighbouring Council on a Planning Application – Durham County Council</b>  <b>Land at Field House Farm to the south of Robin Lane, to the East of West Rainton, North of Low Pitlington and West of High Moorsley</b>  Report of the Deputy Chief Executive (copy attached)	9

Elaine Waugh,  
Head of Law and Governance,  
Civic Centre  
SUNDERLAND

12<sup>th</sup> March, 2014

**This information can be made available on request in other languages and formats. If you require  
this, please  
Telephone 0191 561 1044**



**At a meeting of the PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE held in the COUNCIL CHAMBER on TUESDAY, 18<sup>TH</sup> FEBRUARY, 2014 at 5.30 p.m.**

**Present:-**

Councillor Tye in the Chair

Councillors Blackburn, Copeland, Curran, Davison, Dixon, Ellis, E. Gibson, T. Martin, Price, D. Richardson, Scaplehorn, Thompson, Walker, D. Wilson and Wood.

**Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest

**Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Ball, Essl, Francis, Howe, Lauchlan, Padgett, Scott, Turton and P. Watson.

**Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 19<sup>th</sup> December, 2013.**

1. RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 19<sup>th</sup> December, 2013 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

**Report of the Meetings of the Development Control (North Sunderland) Sub Committee held on 18<sup>th</sup> December, 2013 and 28<sup>th</sup> January, 2014**

The report of the meetings of the Development Control (North Sunderland) Sub-Committee held on 18<sup>th</sup> December, 2013 and 28<sup>th</sup> January, 2014 (copies circulated) were submitted.

(For copy report – see original minutes)

2. RESOLVED that the report be received and noted.

**Report of the Meetings of the Development Control (South Sunderland) Sub-Committee held on 17<sup>th</sup> December, 2013, 7th January and the 28<sup>th</sup> January, 2014.**

The reports of the meetings of the Development Control (South Sunderland) Sub-Committee held on 17<sup>th</sup> December, 2013, 7<sup>th</sup> January and the 28<sup>th</sup> January, 2014 (copies circulated) were submitted.

(For copy reports – see original minutes)

3. RESOLVED that the reports be received and noted.

**Report of the Meetings of the Development Control (Hetton, Houghton and Washington) Sub-Committee held on 18<sup>th</sup> December, 2013, 8<sup>th</sup> January and the 30<sup>th</sup> January, 2014.**

The reports of the meetings of the Development Control (Hetton, Houghton and Washington) Sub-Committee held on 18<sup>th</sup> December, 2013, 8<sup>th</sup> January and the 30<sup>th</sup> January, 2014 (copies circulated) were submitted.

(For copy reports – see original minutes)

4. RESOLVED that the reports be received and noted.

**Consultations from Neighbouring Councils on Planning Applications – Durham County Council. Land to the South West of Station Road, West Rainton, County Durham.**

The Deputy Chief Executive submitted a report (copy circulated) to seek the Committee's agreement to the response to be made to a consultation from a neighbouring authority regarding a planning application affecting a site within proximity to the boundary of the City of Sunderland.

(For copy report – see original minutes)

Danielle Pearson, Senior Planner presented the report and advised that as it was unlikely that the proposal would prejudice the interests of the City of Sunderland, it was recommended that Sunderland City Council advise Durham County Council that it does not have any comments or observations to make with regards to the proposal.

5. RESOLVED that the Committee agreed to the above recommendation, which would then be sent to Durham County Council in relation to application no. CMA/4/112.

**Reference from Development Control (Hetton, Houghton and Washington) Sub Committee – 13/01617/FUL**

**Erection of 63no. dwellings with associated landscaping, public open space and infrastructure.  
Land East of Gillas Lane, Houghton Le Spring.**

The Deputy Chief Executive submitted a report (copy circulated) for Members to consider the planning application 13/01617/FUL which was for the proposed erection of 63 detached dwellings, associated public open space, infrastructure and landscaping at the land east of Gillas Lane, Houghton Le Spring.

(For copy report – see original minutes)

Mrs Pearson presented the report which focussed on the following considerations:-

- Principle of the Development
- National Planning Policy
- Local Planning Policy
- Open Space
- Impact of the Development on the open space provision
- Ecology
- Flood Risk
- Risk to Controlled Waters
- Ground Conditions
- Play Space
- Proposed Section 106 Contributions

Mrs Pearson advised that the proposed figure in relation to the Section 106 financial contribution for affordable housing has been revised and increased to £386,561.

In response to Councillor T. Martins enquiry, Mrs Pearson advised that Riparian Habitat Management mentioned on Page 41 of the report would entail a cumulative response and programme by the Council in respect of the ecology in the local area. It was proposed that the developer would pay a financial contribution to this through Section 106.

The Chairman introduced Councillor Derrick Smith as ward councillor who wished to speak in objection to the proposal and he circulated photographs of the current flooding and drainage problems faced in the area.

Councillor Smith commented that the development had no local support whatsoever and the proposal was to build upon important settlement break land. The influx of people that would result from the development and the other housing developments recently approved in the area would exacerbate the flooding and drainage issues already occurring in the area and would

have a detrimental impact of local amenities including Schools and doctors surgeries.

The area was still suffering from flooding issues left over from previous developments. Councillor Smith also commented that Persimmons Flood Risk Assessment stated that detailed site investigations needed to be undertaken. This had not happened and had only been a desk top study. One recommendation that surface water would be stored on site had not been followed up and there were no calculations or drawings as to how this would be done.

Councillor Smith requested that Members either refuse this application or defer the application until the developers provide a complete flood risk assessment and an environmental statement on Hetton Bogs so that all concerns are addressed. If they cannot be addressed then the development was unsustainable and should be refused.

The Chairman then introduced Councillor Wakefield who also wished to speak in objection to the proposals. Councillor Wakefield commented that this was the fifth application for housing development in this area during the last 12 months. 3,000 new homes had been approved in the Hetton/Houghton area that has long suffered from flooding and there was little mitigation to stop this from Northumbria Water.

The surface water from this development was proposed to run off into a stream which was already the root cause of the current flooding issues experienced and there was no capacity for this additional run-off. He argued that as the Council are the relevant drainage authority, Members should refuse this application to ensure that the flooding problems in the local area were not exacerbated further.

The Chairman then introduced Jim Murray, a local resident who wished to speak in objection to the proposal. Mr Murray commented that the report was very much focussed on technical issues and legal jargon, whereas he considered his objection to be based on common sense. The proposed location was on settlement break land and it should be safeguarded. The existing residential properties would be overlooked by this development which would cause an invasion of privacy.

Mr Murray commented that the development would cause disturbance and increased noise, impacting on surrounding houses and may lead to a significant impact on road safety. Nobody wanted this proposal to go ahead and it had no public support as an increase in housing would result in an increase in the flooding issues.

Those sites in the area that have already been approved would have a huge effect on the flooding problems that residents already suffer from. Mr Murray argued that this proposal would further worsen these problems. He asked that Members give some moral thought to this point when voting on this

application as this was their responsibility to represent the interests of the residents.

The Chairman introduced Pat Robson who wished to speak in opposition to the proposal. Mrs Robson raised concerns in relation to the effect this would have on the existing wildlife corridor and the water voles present. In her view the surveys had been undertaken at sub optimal times and out of season. It was vital the wildlife corridor be safeguarded and enhanced.

Mrs Robson advised that chemicals entered the Hetton burn downstream which already caused negative impacts and this development would exacerbate the situation. Mrs Robson requested that the application be refused.

The Chairman introduced Bill Little, who wished to speak in opposition to the proposal. Mr Little advised that this was the third committee meeting he had attended in relation to various housing development proposals in the local area. He commented that each application has stated that the burn would be used for drainage for each development therefore increasing the risk of flooding.

Mr Little stated that this had been acknowledged in the flood risk assessment, but there were no figures for the estimated run off. Therefore this proposal could not be classed as sustainable. Mr Little felt that a cumulative assessment of all of the development sites was required in respect of drainage due to the issues in the area already. In addition Northumbria Water have previously stated they could not accept any increased capacity into the Sedgeleth facility until 2015.

Mr Little urged Members to decline the application in its current form and vote in favour of the local residents, who knew the area better.

The Chairman introduced Rosalind Pickersgill who wished to speak in objection to the proposal. Ms Pickersgill commented that many of her friends and neighbours already had no control over what was happening to them in relation to sewage entering their homes during flooding. There was no capacity for further homes so the flooding problems would simply worsen.

The Chairman then introduced Councillor Bob Heron who wished to speak in objection to the proposal. Councillor Heron commented that due to the current government changing of the rules for planning applications through the NPPF, previously protected settlement breaks could now be considered for development, which was out of the Council's hands. However, Councillor Heron referred to the photographs circulated by Councillor D. Smith of the area and the streams that had water running continuously and felt that due to the flash flooding experienced recently it was not good enough that people had to suffer with sewage coming into their homes and until this problem was solved, this application should be rejected as there was no capacity for further development.

Councillor Ellis commented that she was horrified at the pictures of the flooding experienced in the Ward by residents and was not satisfied that this development would not worsen these problems.

Councillor Ellis referred to the adverse effect of the proposal on the wildlife and suggested that this should be protected. Councillor Ellis also commented that she was very interested to hear what Northumbria Water had to say on the proposal as she could not believe Members were being asked to accept another development in this area.

Councillor Dixon commented that all of the speakers had spoken very eloquently and he had great sympathy for their current problems with regard to the flooding in the area. However he noted on page 42 of the officer's report that there was a drainage solution and it would be a condition of any approval that a suitable surface water drainage scheme must be approved by the Local Authority and installed before the development could commence.

The Chairman introduced Les Holt of Northumbria Water who spoke to clarify the situation with the sewerage treatment works and the capacity at Sedgeleth. It had been clarified in 2013 during the course of the previous applications for the Broom Hill sites that the facility has the capacity for over 2000 properties therefore there was certainly the capacity for this proposed development and many others like it.

Mr Holt advised that the main issue was surface water, with three sites on Rough Dene Burn. The taking out of the combined system from the other two development sites would actually have a positive impact on the area and wished to stress that this development would not increase the existing problems or cause an adverse flooding risk.

Councillor Ellis queried how it was stated in 2008 that Sedgeleth did not have the capacity for additional developments, and yet now it did have the capacity. She asked NWL what had changed.

Mr Holt advised that investment was carried out between 2005 – 2011 to improve the capacity.

Councillor D. Wilson asked the applicant's representative if they could confirm that there would be no flooding caused by the development. The Representative for Persimmon Homes advised that the development would be designed with its drainage features so as to not increase the flooding issues in the area.

Councillor Curran referred to the photographs circulated and commented that he knew the area and the extreme weather it had experienced and had reservations that this area would be suitable for additional development given the current problems and the risks surrounding the surface water run-off and capacity..



The Chairman introduced the applicant's representative, Dominic Smith of Persimmon Homes who advised the Committee that in terms of flood risk, National Planning Policy Framework stated that a development must not increase the risk of flooding, which this proposal would not. The Environment Agency, Northumbria Water and the Council's officers have all been consulted and agree that the proposal would not increase the risk of flooding.

In terms of Ecology, Mr Smith advised that the wildlife corridor was around the burn itself and not the development therefore the scheme would be designed as a buffer and act as ecological benefit to the area. Section 106 contributions had been agreed in respect of ecology in the local area.

Mr Smith also commented that there was evidence of a local shortage for housing needs and stated that this application meets all the policy criteria and was in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

In response to Councillor Ellis' query, Mr Smith advised that this application did not require an environmental impact assessment. Mrs Pearson advised that the application had been screened for EIA against the national guidance and it has been concluded that an EIA was not required. Mrs Pearson also commented that all the relevant impacts of the application proposal have been thoroughly assessed and are summarised in the committee report. .

In response to Councillor Ellis enquiry on if the screening of EIA was a subjective decision, Mrs Pearson advised that there were thresholds and criteria set out in national guidance that were applied when considering screening for EIA..

Councillor Wood commented that the Ward Councillors of this area had all spoken against this proposal and it was very clear what their views were and he was concerned over the loss of the settlement break land but it was true that we had a need for more housing. The issue here was if the proposal was a sustainable development or not and whilst requests had been made to defer or reject this application then there had to be specific planning reasons given to do so.

Councillor Wood commented that at this stage he did not feel the officer's report contained a detailed assessment of the flooding risks that had been raised by the objectors.

The Chairman commented that the Committee had received professional advice from both council officers and NWL that the development proposal would not increase the risk of flooding. The current problems were very unfortunate but the sole issue in respect of this application was the impact of this development proposal, not the current flooding problems in the area. Deferring the application would not change the expert advice given already and the Chairman queried what further information Members would expect to come back to a future meeting.

Councillor Ellis referred to page 40 of the report which stated there remained a major concern that needed to be addressed in relation to the cumulative impact of developments across the Houghton – Hetton area and therefore she felt there was no reason why this application could not be deferred until this was addressed.

The Chairman advised that should the application be deferred then the developer could apply for non determination and there was a risk of costs if the deferral of the application was not held to be reasonable.

Councillor D. Wilson commented that he was uncomfortable in making a decision based on the current information available and further detailed clarification of the flood risk assessment was needed.

Councillor Ellis then moved that the application should be deferred, which was seconded by Councillor Wood.

The Chairman requested Members to provide the grounds for the motion to defer the application.

Councillor Ellis advised that the application should be deferred for further information to be provided on the following issues:-

Detailed Flood Risk Assessment given current flooding problems  
Impact on Ecology  
The Section 106 proposals for ecology  
The detail of the proposed planning conditions

Having been put to the vote, with 11 Members voting in favour and 5 Members against the motion to defer, it was

6. RESOLVED that the application be deferred.

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

(Signed) P. TYE  
(Chairman)

## PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE 20 March 2014

## CONSULTATION FROM A NEIGHBOURING COUNCIL ON A PLANNING APPLICATION

## REPORT OF THE DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE

## 1.0 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 To seek the Committee's agreement to the response to be made to a consultation from a neighbouring authority regarding a planning application affecting a site within proximity to the boundary of Sunderland City Council (SCC).

## 2.0 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Where the Council is consulted by a neighbouring authority, in this case Durham County Council (DCC) on planning applications that are not within the administrative boundary of the City but which may have an impact on Sunderland's interests, the approval of the Planning and Highway's Committee is obtained to agree the content of the Council's response. Within this context Sunderland City Council is only consultee and therefore all statutory duties associated with the application, including its determination, is the responsibility of DCC as the competent Mineral Planning Authority.

## 3.0 APPLICATION DETAILS

- 3.1 **Notifying Authority:** Durham County Council  
**Application Number:** CMA/4/107  
**Applicant:** Hargreaves Surface Mining Ltd  
**Proposal:** Field House surface mine scheme involving surface mining operations for the winning and working of 514,000 tonnes of coal and up to 83,000 tonnes of fireclay, ancillary site operations with progressive restoration and aftercare to agriculture, broadleaved woodland, hedgerows, water bodies, wetland and low nutrient grassland over a 3 year period.  
**Application site:** Land at Field House Farm to the south of Robin Lane, to the south east of West Rainton, north of Low Pittington and west of High Moorsley.
- 3.2 In accordance with the requirements of The Town and Country Planning (Environment Impact Assessment) Regulations the application was supported by an extensive Environmental Statement. This substantial document details and considers issues relating to landscaping and visual amenity, noise, archaeology, ecology, land contamination, dust, mine gases and transportation.

#### 4.0 CONSULTATION

- 4.1 The Council's Network Management, Natural Heritage and Pollution Control sections were consulted as part of this neighbouring authority consultation request and their responses and observations form part of this report
- 4.2 Members should note that DCC has confirmed that the planning application's consultation process involved residents within 1km of the site's boundary and as such included residents within Sunderland. Three site notices were also erected within the City, including East Rainton, while public notices were placed in both the Northern Echo and Sunderland Echo. Furthermore, Hetton Town Council and Hetton School were consulted and have made representation to DCC directly.
- 4.3 A representation has also been received from Cllr Blackburn to this neighbouring authority consultation request. Cllr Blackburn's comments detail local Member concerns about the disruption to this rural area of the City. Concerns relate to the potential for dust and scarring to the landscape. Cllr Blackburn also highlighted the tangible mental stress being caused to many residents and wanted this to be conveyed to DCC.
- 4.4 Two letters in objection were received by SCC from residents within the City. Their concerns relate to piece and quiet being lost, as well as noise, dust and increased traffic impacts arising from the development proposal. The objections also expressed concern about views and recreationally opportunities being detrimentally impacted. These letters also stated that local residents were not informed of the planning application. In this respect Members may wish to review and note paragraphs 2.1 and 4.2 of this report.

#### 5.0 PROPOSED SCHEME

- 5.1 The planning boundary for the Scheme covers 55.9 hectares, located to the south east of the settlement of West Rainton and the A690, south of Robin Lane.
- 5.2 The proposed Scheme involves surface mining operations for the winning and working of 514,000 tonnes of coal and up to 83,000 tonnes of fireclay, ancillary Site operations, with progressive restoration and aftercare to agriculture, broadleaved woodland, hedgerows, water bodies, wetland, and low nutrient grassland, over a 3 year period. Within this timescale Site excavation operations would be completed within an estimated 2 year and 3 month period (including coal and fireclay extraction over a 2 year and 2 month period). The Scheme also provides for early ecological enhancement works in the off-site area to the north and north-west of the Site.

- 5.3 The Site operations would be restricted to a single shift basis with all soil handling, overburden excavation along with coal and ancillary fireclay extraction operations, including coal cleaning, haulage from the cut, processing, loading and overburden backfill and restoration works to be carried out between 0700 and 1900 hours Monday to Friday and 0700 to 1300 hours on Saturday. No such operations would be carried out on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays. Coal and fireclay HGVs would transport products from the Site during these normal hours of operation.
- 5.4 Site drainage operations and any pumping, where necessary, would take place 24 hours per day 7 days per week. Operations for maintenance of plant and vehicles is proposed to be carried out on the Site between 0700 to 2100 hours Monday to Friday, 0700 to 1700 hours on Saturday and 0800 and 1600 hours on Sunday.
- 5.5 In terms of restoring the site the proposed scheme has been designed to closely follow the key characteristics of the existing Site with an undulating, south facing landform, failing gently to the south west, overlaid by a strong pattern of hedgerows containing arable fields. The restoration scheme would also provide enhancement measures to support local biodiversity including a network of new ponds and ditches set within grassy margins and larger areas of permanent grassland.

## 6.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES AND CONSIDERATIONS

### 6.1. Strategic Policy considerations

- 6.1.1 The application site abuts SCC's administrative boundary as its south eastern boundary adjoins the extreme south western boundary of Hetton, to the south east of High Moorsley. The predominant land use policy within this area is allocated under Unitary Development Plan (UDP) policy EN10. This policy identifies those areas where the existing land use pattern is considered to be satisfactory and as such should be maintained. In this context this area of the City is largely associated with arable farmland, wildlife corridors and the Great North Forest.
- 6.1.2 Furthermore, the Council's Core Strategy (Preferred Options), which is currently out for consultation and is the document which sets out how the City will move towards its planning vision for the future, highlights that no areas earmarked for either Economic Prosperity, Thriving Communities or Locations for Major Development will be impacted by the development proposal.
- 6.1.3 It is therefore considered that there are no strategic planning policy considerations which exist that give rise to concern either in respect of the UDP, or going forward in terms of the emerging Core Strategy.

6.1.4 Nevertheless, given the nature of the development proposal the following sections consider the development proposal in terms of public health, highway engineering, ecology and visual amenity considerations.

## 6.2 Public Health Considerations

Colleagues in the Council's Pollution Control Section were consulted and in response stated that provided the applicant complies with all relevant regulatory requirements, maintains control measures detailed in the submitted documentation and operates under the terms of any Environmental Permit issued under the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2010, Pollution Control have no additional comments to make.

## 6.3 Network Management

Comments received from Colleagues in Network management were informed by the proposals as described in the Transport Statement (incorporated in the Environmental Statement as Appendix 12.1). The Transport Statement has been prepared by the applicant's traffic consultants, in accordance with national guidelines for transport assessments. The main issue in the document relates to HGV routing.

### 6.3.1 HGV Trips

The proposed development will extract and export over a 26 month period. Average HGV movements are anticipated to be 74 (37in/ 37out) per day, in the order of 6 (3in/ 3out) per hour.

### 6.3.2 Traffic Management Plan – Proposed HGV Haul Route

The proposals include the following restrictions on HGV movements:-

For outbound coal and fireclay HGVs the route serving the proposed development will involve the use of Robin Lane and the A690, to access via the A1(M)/ A690 Interchange and then onward to market. There will be no coal and fireclay HGV traffic turning right from Robin Lane onto the A690 or using Robin Lane to the east of the Site access.

For inbound HGVs the local highway authority (DCC) has stated that no HGV traffic should turn right from the A690 onto Robin Lane. Therefore from the A1(M) the coal and fireclay route serving the proposed development will involve the use of the A690 (eastbound), the B1284 junctions at Rainton Meadows/ Four Lane Ends, Durham Road, A690 (westbound) then turn left onto Robin Lane to the Site access. It is also noted that the movement of plant and machinery to and from the site on HGVs will be subject to these route restrictions.

### 6.3.3 Highway Engineering Conclusion

It was noted that the proposal to restrict right turn movements at the junction of the A690/ Robin Lane is to be introduced in the interests of road safety. The consequence is that unladen HGVs travelling eastbound on the A690 will need to travel further to the B1284 Rainton Meadows/ Four Lane Ends junction, to be able to turn back onto the A690 westbound to the site. In light of this implication for the City's road network the applicant's traffic consultant was requested by Network Management to clarify that the overall exposure to risk predicted would be reduced as a consequence.

In response the applicant's traffic consultant explained that consideration was given to the specific junctions. Their assessments confirmed that there is no historical evidence to suggest that any significant, inherent road safety issues exist on the chosen road network. It is considered that the level of increase in traffic as a result of the development will not have a material impact on road safety.

On assessing the additional submission Network Management consider that it provides relevant evidence the proposals will not have a material impact on road safety, and on this basis have no further observations or comments to make in this respect.

Nevertheless, Network Management has recommended that all HGV movements are specifically excluded from all roads within the East Rainton 30mph zone and also from Hazard Lane. In response to the HGV routing issue the applicant's traffic consultant also took the opportunity to explicitly confirm that HGVs will be specifically excluded from these roads, stating that it is their understanding the chosen Routing Strategy will form part of a planning condition, should the application be approved by DCC.

## 6.4 Ecology

6.4.1 Following consultation with colleagues in the Natural Heritage Team comments were received which confirmed that from a nature conservation perspective it appears that the applicant has dealt with all potential concerns regarding biodiversity and that the development proposal offers a restoration scheme appropriate to the nature and location of the site. As such there are no major objections to the proposals subject to the applicant addressing the following:-

6.4.2 All of the recommended species and habitat mitigation and enhancement measures are implemented in full and the measures are extended to similar habitat outwith the site, in particular the wildlife corridor (wetland and grassland habitats) along Bridleway 25/ the former railway line and Robin House and Moorsley Marsh Local Wildlife Site.

6.4.3 Ensure that the hydrology and wetland habitats of the Moorsley Burn catchment to the north-east of the site are not affected adversely by the development and opportunities to improve water quality and flow, and habitats, are implemented as part of the scheme wherever possible.

6.4.4 Planning approval must be subject to a comprehensive management plan that ensures species, habitat and landscape mitigation and enhancement measures are sustained in perpetuity; including monitoring and modification where necessary to retain and improve biodiversity gain associated with species such as water vole, bats and amphibians.

## 6.5 Visual and residential amenity

6.5.1 A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment was submitted as part of the planning application. The visual impact aspect of this assessment considered residents, users of public rights of way, roads and recreational facilities, as well as cultural heritage features.

6.5.2 The visual impact analysis considers that during the mining phase of the development only a substantial adverse impact will be put upon the Great North Forest trail, part of which runs through SCC's boundary, along with a moderate impact on Moorsley Road itself, as it adjoins the application site's southern boundary to the north of Pitlington.

6.5.3 However, given the location of the application site and the undulating nature of the surrounding area, the visual impact analysis has only earmarked The Fold, which is a residential property situated on the western side of Moorsley Road in High Moorsley, as being moderately adversely impacted by the proposal, again this is during the mining phase.

6.5.4 In light of the fact that the Scheme's proposed operations will include the formation of substantial screening bunds, including grassed embankments on the outward facing slopes, the applicant's submitted Noise Assessment considers that by implementing such mitigation measures the noise associated with the scheme would not cause unacceptable adverse impact at the nearest residential properties.

## 7.0 CONCLUSION

7.1 As it is unlikely that the proposal would prejudice the interests of the City of Sunderland, it is recommended that Sunderland City Council advise Durham County Council that it does not have any objections to make with regards to the proposal.

7.2 However, and as detailed above, it is considered that when responding to DCC it is important to emphasise the comments made in respect of the HGVs being prohibited from using East Rainton 30mph zone or Hazard Lane; and that the scheme should be subject to a



comprehensive ecological management plan, whilst also highlighting those comments received from Cllr Blackburn and the two representations from local residents.

- 7.3 The Committee is therefore recommended to agree the above, which will then be sent to Durham County Council in relation to application no. CMA/4/107 (SCC ref. 13/02559/CAA).