

REPORT FOR CIRCULATION

Since the preparation of the Supplement report to Members, an additional eight letters of representation in objection to planning applications 11/01980/FUL and 11/02076/FUL have been received.

It is not considered that these letters of objection raise any new issues in relation to the planning applications being considered and that all issues referred to have been addressed in the main agenda report and supplementary report. Copies of the representations received are however appended to this report as information for Members.

23.01.2012

11/01980/FUL & 11/02076/FUL

F.A.O. Sunderland Council Officers/Members of Highways and
Planning Committee/ Chairman of Planning and Highways
Committee/Decision Makers/Elected Councillor's

Dear all,

In a letter from Sunderland Council 30.12.11 I was informed; ***"The Chair of the above Sub Committee has decided that, as the waste transfer application has strategic implications and that neither application can easily be considered in isolation, it is appropriate that both applications be referred up to the council's Planning and Highways Committee"***.

On that basis your records will show I did request that I be allowed to make a single albeit joint representation at that hearing. In other words rather than take up two separate slots of five minutes to address each application separately, I had combined my representation thereby taking up one allocated slot of approx 8 minutes in total. My reasons for doing so were, as the two applications were inextricably linked a joint representation seemed sensible and fair.

In the meantime I was asked to split my representation into two parts in time for the next hearing scheduled for 03 Jan 2011 and speak on each application separately however, as the meeting of 03 Jan was deferred for reasons already stated above, I am requesting permission once again to make a "one off" representation taking approx 8 minutes

I would be most grateful if you would clarify my taking 8 minutes is acceptable. I am mindful that as the Chair of the Sub Committee felt the applications could not be easily considered in isolation, then the same method will of course apply to the public in terms of their "right to respond" in that these applications cannot easily be responded to separately.

Again I hope you would agree my request is both reasonable and sensible and will ultimately save 2 minutes of the Planning Committee's valuable time when hearing objections.

Moving on you will be aware that an emergency meeting was held by residents of Springwell Village on the 19th January to which the Campground Action Committee were invited and did attend. Among several other problems raised by the residents with regard to the two applications, they are clearly aggrieved and rightly so, to have been deprived of their democratic right to a proper and inclusive consultation period.

I note in a letter to Mrs Lesley Sharp from Mike Mattok on 18th Jan with regard to notifying the public of the planned redevelopment of the Campground Site he states;

100 neighbour consultation letters were sent out on 20 July 2012 to those addresses closest to the site - most of which went to Gateshead residents because the site is geographically closer to Gateshead residents than anyone else.

That said I am not at all surprised by Mr Mattok's play on words and his gross exaggeration of the truth as has been the case with many involved in these applications however, while their exact geographic position might be different nonetheless the residents of Springwell Village live an equal distance from the Campground Site in relation to the qualifying distance of their neighbours in Wrekenton and Eighton Banks and as a result they were entitled to be consulted.

The lamp post notices with the exception of Low Mount Farm, were in no way intended to inform residents of Springwell Village of what was taking place at the Campground site and this appears once again to have been quite deliberate.

Even if the council were to remove the herculean problem of the traffic from the equation, residents from Springwell Village do suffer from many other problems associated with the site and should have been informed that this situation was set to get much worse, the fact that they were not, contravenes their democratic and statutory right to a proper period of consultation from which they have been completely excluded.

Further Mr Mattocks comment in his letter of the 18th;

This level of publicity is beyond what is required of a local planning authority under the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2010.

Is again a play on words and while the statement may be true in isolation, it is yet another attempt by Sunderland Council to circumvent the public's democratic and statutory rights by hiding behind Town and Country Planning legislation just as they have with other matters relating to these applications along with Gateshead Council and Sita by stating, ***the period of consultation is now closed therefore we are unable to get involved in further dialogue re the planning applications or attend meetings held by residents or objectors.*** The truth is, so far as the residents of Springwell Village are concerned the consultation period was never open to them and this exclusion is illegal no matter how it is dressed up.

Further, we are aware that the process for these applications does on several levels contravene European and UK legislation therefore we are currently corresponding with several offices including but not limited to, the Secretary of State and the Prime Minister's office, DEFRA, Friends of the Earth and Natural England in order to stop this illegal process in its current form.

It is not lost on us, as with any major planning application, a decision should normally be reached with a period of 13 weeks, as we are now at some 26 weeks since the applications were validated quite clearly this is the worst example of full and inclusive pre application discussions between the

applicants and local authority and as a result, not surprisingly these applications are now being stymied at every turn with one problem after another.

Again It is not lost on us that had the applicants and the local authorities undergone a full pre application process and consulted fully with the public instead of attempting a *back door* application process then many of these current problems could have been avoided.

Of course we do understand that during the determination period, the local planning authority does have the power to request additional information from the applicants although normal determination periods should continue to apply unless a longer period is agreed in writing between the applicants and the local planning authority to extend the determination period.

If in the meantime such an agreement has been reached, then we are today requesting sight of any such agreement. Having said that many of the problems to date have arisen due to Sunderland Councils own failure to follow proper procedures, not least the exclusion of all residents of Springwell Village from the consultation process.

Any granting of these applications on the 24th will be automatically appealed by the public and should matters be allowed to progress that far when the Council have today 23.01 12 been given formal notice of ongoing and unresolved environmental and legal issues, will as the Council is aware result in extensive investigation into their own Council which will in turn extend to the wider government and European parliament.

On that basis we the public hereby give notice to the council to defer any decision to pass these applications at the meeting of the 24th January on the basis they have now been informed of multiple investigations that are still ongoing including agronomist testing, further independent environmental impact assessments to individual properties and public amenities in the area of Campground site, along with a raft of other types of investigations in relation to the Campground Site and the two associated applications for

redevelopment, therefore the public require more time in order to ensure all outstanding investigations are completed

It is regrettable that matters have reached this stage so late in the day however, it must be noted that every attempt the public have made since June 2011 to involve Sunderland and Gateshead Councils along with Sita and all those involved in these applications to enter into further dialogue in order to resolve all outstanding issues has been denied or refused at every turn with all respondents hiding behind their usual statutory response of either **“The consultation period is now closed therefore we are under no obligation to attend”** or **“it is not normal practice for council officers to attend such meetings”** or in the case of our invisible elected Councillors from Sunderland and Gateshead and for the record paid for by the public purse, a simple rude and cowardly ***no show, no response or no acknowledgement***, therefore we do sincerely hope that all involved in the above applications will have the good grace to accept that this current shameful debacle and the subsequent delays have been brought about, aided and abetted by their collective hands.

In conclusion and if need be, should the Planning Committee take the unwise and precarious decision to pass these applications on the 24th then the public will exercise their right to instigate emergency measures to halt any works in relation to the re development of the Campground Site until such times as all outstanding matters are resolved.

As the Council and Environment Agency are well aware the precautionary principle is required: *“where there are threats of serious or irreversible damage”*. Consequently, *“the precautionary principle contemplates taking pre-emptive action in the face of threatened action. In addition the theme of pre-emptive action also requires the EA to exercise its “pollution control powers” “to prevent or minimise, remedy or mitigate the effects of pollution to the environment”*

Of course in terms of the law, all of the problems associated with the Campground Site are not exclusive to the Environment Agency however there

are currently a number of breaches in place and to list them all is beyond the scope and purpose of today's letter. Respectfully, we do hope that we have today made our intentions clear in terms of the lengths we are prepared to go to in order exercise our rights.

In conclusion we do hope that all those involved in these applications will now accept the gravity of the situation and the need for serious consideration prior to moving matters forward and that further to this, all involved will now refrain from commenting that these application's have attracted just "one or two" complainers as while that may have been what the Councils and Sita had hoped for, this is clearly not the case and never has been.

In keeping with our efforts of openness and transparency we would be most grateful if the Council's Officers would ensure that this letter is forwarded to the appropriate individuals and placed in the public domain on the Sunderland.gov website

Yours sincerely

Debra Coxon
Campground Action Committee

OBJECTION and request for a re-opening of the consultation process

Dear Ms Rising,

I refer to the 2 applications from SITA for planning permissions for development to the Campground/"Incinerator".

We, as a village, have not been involved in the consultation process and I firmly believe that our democratic rights have been denied.

We held an emergency meeting on 19th January in Springwell Village Social Club. We sent out many invitations to Council officers, Councillors, Environmental Agency officers and SITA, the applicant. People were invited to discuss the applications. Anyone in an official position failed to turn up. Nobody wants to talk to Springwell Village about these applications. Do we not matter? Obviously not.

We need time to look at and absorb the implications of these applications and decide a way forward. I am asking for the consultation process to be opened up again and the proper and due processes followed.

There are many historical documents which need to be brought into the equation.

I am a resident of Springwell Village but that doesn't stop me being concerned for the surrounding Gateshead area. If my youngest child fails to get a school place in Springwell Village, then Fell Dyke at Wrekenton may be my next choice. The campground has always been a source of concern. Could I send my very young son into what I know to be a contaminated area?

Road safety is a serious issue. Springwell Village is "Route 5" in any submitted documents. I contacted a ward councillor covering Springwell Village, Cllr Trueman, hoping to get answers from him as to why we, as a village, have not been consulted openly. I feel that my concerns were rubbished. I have therefore contacted Sharon Hodgson MP.

Our meeting was very well attended by residents from Washington and Gateshead on the 19th, the social club function room full of

concerned locals. This was despite notices only going up onto lampposts 3 days before. I am sure that there will be outrage should these applications be passed.

My objections are based on:

Traffic and Road safety issues – I believe the submitted application documents have been cleverly written to confuse the reader into thinking that vehicles will be absolutely prevented from taking a particular route. I refer to a document dated 7/6/1996 (RM/LA/X/27/7) regarding a similar application which details potential routes to be taken and routes to be avoided. GMBC Planning Committee on 27/3/1996 therefore decided at that time that routes through Gateshead Borough via Wrekenton centre were unacceptable. Roads are even more congested now. This Campground site is in the wrong place. Follingsby Park is a far better location.

Development in the Greenbelt – Historical documents exist which prevent development in the greenbelt.

Bat Conservation and protection – I refer to the Campground ecological appraisal of 12/8/09. I notice that no sunrise/sunset survey was completed to establish detection and locality of bats, and species, despite the report being dated during the Bat breeding season.

We, in Springwell Village, need to be PROPERLY consulted on these applications. We need time to explore and consider the positives and negatives of these proposed changes by SITA.

As things stand, it's almost as if all of the parties involved in the processing of this application are trying to "sneak" it past us. If that is the case, alarm bells start ringing.

Yours sincerely,
Lesley Sharpe
1 South View
NE9 7PY

Dear Ms Rising

I have read with interest the comments on Sunderland's website re applications x 2 for Campground Site Wrekenton.

While I support all of the comments and objections whole heartedly, I am surprised that no one has yet mentioned the appalling condition of the old incinerator building at the Campground Site. (Not the Rubb shelter) Already registered as a derelict building for some time now, the building has in recent months deteriorated into a serious condition. The corrugated panels to the outside of the building have fallen away exposing the metal main frame. Recent high winds have added to the problems and now that these panels are loose the deterioration will continue at speed given the exposed location of the site. It is only a matter of time before a serious accident occurs, bearing in mind there are young children at the adjacent school along with local residents living nearby.

In the circumstances I assume that Gateshead Council will be responsible for the safety and condition of the building, nonetheless this does not bode well for the overall condition of the site whose permissions and licences as I understand things are granted by Sunderland Council.

As a matter of urgency these problems along with increasing vermin in the derelict building should be addressed regardless of the outcome of the current applications.

I have no doubt you are in regular contact with members of Gateshead Council in your capacity as senior Planning Officer therefore may I suggest this is something you could address in relation to ongoing problems at this disgusting site.

Please add my comments to the council website.

Many thanks

Mr Brass

1 Jubilee Cottage
Springwell Village
Gateshead
NE9 7PJ

23/1/2012

Planning Officer Sunderland City Council

Planning Applications Number: 11/01980/FUL & 11/02076/FUL

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am Alan Barber, a professionally qualified mechanical engineer and aged 65. I own a number of properties that are affected by the above applications.

This, my objection, is to be taken as an objection to both applications but where obvious to the reader that my objection could only apply to one application then it should only apply to that one.

My objections are:

- Inappropriate development in Greenbelt.
- Substantial increase in traffic.
- Public danger created at the school on Springwell Road "Fell Dyke" – already excessive traffic movements with death and injury outside of the school as a result.
- History of license violations so No Confidence that site operations will remain legal.
- Loss of amenity.
- Proximity of newly designated bridal ways with a resulting increase in horse activity is a concern.
- Noise
 - Recycling machinery – trommel, conveyors, picking station etc – all an increase.
 - Thomsons, using same machinery, exceeded the noise limit set down at nearest house point.
 - Houses at the application site are nearer.
- Thomson's Quarry, recycling station, transfer station, chemical distribution, HGV operating centre, ready-mixed concrete plant added to GMBC recycling and transfer station IS TOO MUCH HEAVY INDUSTRY IN A CONFINED AREA.
- Hours of operation exist as DAYS only – no restriction on applications.
- History :- Thomsons IDENTICAL APPLICATION REFUSED by the City of Sunderland
- Public Participation exercise by Sunderland Council in the 1970's resulted in SPRINGWELL VILLAGE DISTRICT PLAN – approved – incorporated into Tyne & Wear STRUCTURE PLAN – approved – then submitted to the Secretary of State – approved – incorporated into City of Sunderland UDPs since that date. Always approved and then SET IN STONE.

Theme throughout – Protection of the Greenbelt. No further expansion of development. All heavy industry operators encouraged to leave.

- Recently issued amendment by the applicant NOT
- Government inspector at an appeal on extra traffic on the B1288 supported Jayne Stott, chief planning officer of Sunderland Council in her contention that there should be NO INCREASE IN TRAFFIC on Springwell Road, the B1288. to use Springwell Village, route number 5, is a testament to the fact that there is a traffic problem. Passing the problem onto Springwell Road past the school is outrageous. As stated, road accidents and a child fatality is not acceptable.
- The approach to Springwell Village should remain protected to preserve the character and setting of this old mining village.

Yours sincerely,

Alan Barber

Last week the Environment Agency Officer in charge of the Camp Ground site stated that they have no powers to control hours of opening , number of vehicles, tonnage etc etc – IT MUST BE DONE BY THE COUNCIL.
IMPORTANT NOTE

23rd January 2012.

By email.

Ms. Vicky Risng.
Sunderland City Council.

Dear Ms. Rising,

Re. Planning applications in respect of Campground site, Wrekenton, submitted by Sita UK Ltd. and Gateshead Council.

I wish to add my objections/comments to the council website in respect of the above proposal.

Recent documents on the Sunderland CC website now show, and I believe it should be made known to all concerned, that if the above proposal is passed the council will be permitting opening hours at the site from 7.30 a.m. to 8.30 p.m. every day, including Sundays, during which vehicle movement and waste transfer to and from the site, will be allowed. Will there be any respite on Bank Holidays? – I think not, given that Sita have displayed complete and utter disregard for the neighbouring residents since they took up occupation at the Campground Site.

During a recent visit to Sita's waste transfer station in Sleekburn Bedlington, the Site Manager confirmed to all present that his operation closed by 4 p.m. each day. Why then have Sita sought such extensive operating hours at the Campground site? This is an outrageous request and if granted, would be an appalling act of 'two fingers' raised to all living in Wrekenton and the surrounding areas, including Springwell Village. Surely the council would not grant such extensive operating hours, under any circumstances, this simply cannot be justified.

Are the residents to have **no peace and no let up** from Sita's operations? Sita have already ruined that site, their operations leave so much to be desired and they are the worst example of '**fat cats pleasing themselves**', without fear of retribution from any higher office. Seems to us that Sita are the higher office and that by allowing this company 'carte blanche', Sunderland City Council will lose any credibility it has left in terms of perceived competence and capability with regard to effective decision making. Given all that has transpired so far with these applications, Sunderland council are indeed heading for serious trouble in the long term, if they don't do something now to halt this travesty.

It's time to 'man up' Sunderland, what exactly are you waiting for – prosecution?

Mrs. J. Boyle.

(Former resident of Eighton Banks who preferred to move from a lovely home after 40 years, due primarily to the traffic problems in the area.)

Subject: Fw: PLANNING APPLICATIONS 11/0198/FUL and 11/020/76/FUL

Dear Ms. V. Rising,

With reference to the above applications I wish to express my concerns that the democratic position of residents within Springwell Village have been compromised by the lack of appropriate, detailed consultation on the most important issues relevant to these applications.

Within your Department Report to Committee dated 13 Dec 2011, I raise the following points of concern.

POINT1 As Council Tax payers to City of Sunderland we have not been adequately consulted,(the proposal is on Gateshead land but planning consent is to given by Cof SC....an anomaly in its self!!).

POINT 2. I refer to your Document 13/12/2011,.....PAGE 2.....The report indicates `that representations made have been considered.` The Appendix refers to 4 letters of objection and 1 petition of some 307 signatures!!

Does Committee seriously consider that this is a fair and reasonable number of objections to a scheme of this magnitude? Would more have been expected?

I can assure Committee that HAD CONSULTATION BEEN WIDE REACHING THE COUNCIL WOULD HAVE BEEN INUNDATED.

I suggest that the Council has failed to consult fully on both planning applications now at Committee stage. Council has a problem , officers have NOT carried out their responsibilities fully. The letter of the law may well have been fulfilled, \officers may well have complied with the Council`s policy on public consultation(Report page 13) but they have failed to reach the target audience. In particular, the officers failed to reach the local population within Springwell Village. On the basis of such findings , the MOTION must be ` TO DEFER.`

POINT 3 Traffic Movements ...Page12/13...Indicates the inclusion of route 5 via Springwell Village....had consultation been adequate then many letters of objection would have been dispatched to the Council Officers on this issue. As consultation was inadequate Council received no letters !!

POINT 4 DEMOCRACY and REPRESENTATION...(Report page 13)...states 8 Public Notices were displayed within the Gateshead area, 98 notification letters were sent to `neighbours` of the site (again within Gateshead). It is very kind of Sunderland council to raise notices in Gateshead but why did they fail to do so in Springwell

Village? Further the local shop in Springwell Village fails to stock the Sunderland Echo. Whilst I accept

`that the LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY cannot cater for everyones individual preference in relation to their preferred publication`, this is hardly DEMOCRATIC if the local newsagent fails to meet the requirement of the Council and stock a specific publication. The Sunderland Echo is not a stocked item at the local newsagent!

POINT 5 Therefore I must refer to paragraph 3 (report page 14) and simply state ``you cannot be serious``. I would state that the Council has failed to ascertain the `true feeling` of residents within Springwell Village. There is a difference of approach to the same question. Clearly the Council Officers can `hide the `true level of objection` if it fails to undertake targeted methodology in the first place.

POINT 6 (Report page 16 paragraph 4) refers to a public meeting and the reason why such a request was declined, perhaps the Head of Planning and Environment would welcome the opportunity to reconsider in the light of the points raised in this letter?

It is with regret that residents of Springwell Village have NOT had the democratic opportunity to make democratic representation to Council on this most important matter.

Please defer until Council is certain it has fulfilled its moral as well as legal duty to keep its own Council Tax payers informed of such developments.

yours

elsie jones.

planning

Karen Elliott
2 Hill Cottages
Springwell
Tyne and Wear
NE9 7SH

To the Head of Planning and Building Control,

To whom it may concern,

I wish to object to the proposed development by Sita at the Camp Ground site in Springwell Village, on the grounds of it is :

A Green belt Site.
Loss of amenity.
No impact assessment has been carried out, contravening European legislation.
Increased traffic in the area.
No consultation between the operators and local inhabitants.
No confidence in the operator to run within the legal constraints.

And I would ask for any decision to be deferred and consultation to be re-opened.

Yours faithfully

Mrs K Elliott



planning

Norman Elliott
2 Hill Cottages
Springwell
Tyne and Wear
NE9 7SH

To the Head of Planning and Building Control,

To whom it may concern,

I wish to object to the proposed development by Sita at the Camp Ground site in Springwell Village, on the grounds of it is :

A Green belt Site.
Loss of amenity.
No impact assessment has been carried out, contravening European legislation.
Increased traffic in the area.
No consultation between the operators and local inhabitants.
No confidence in the operator to run within the legal constraints.

And I would ask for any decision to be deferred and consultation to be re-opened.

Yours faithfully

Mr N F Elliott

