

**At a meeting of the PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE held in the CIVIC CENTRE on TUESDAY, 21<sup>ST</sup> JANUARY, 2012 at 5.30 p.m.**

**Present:-**

Councillor Tye in the Chair

Councillors Ball, Charlton, Copeland, Curran, Ellis, Essl, M. Forbes, Francis, E. Gibson, Howe, Lauchlan, T. Martin, Padgett, D. Richardson, Scott, Tate, P. Watson, Wood and A. Wright.

**Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

**Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Fletcher, T. Foster, Gallagher, Kay and Thompson.

**Minutes of the Last Meeting of the Committee held on Tuesday, 20<sup>th</sup> December, 2011**

1. RESOLVED that the minutes of the last Committee held on Tuesday, 20<sup>th</sup> December, 2011 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

**Report of the Meeting of the Development Control (North Sunderland) Sub-Committee held on 5<sup>th</sup> January, 2011**

The report of the meeting of the Development Control (North Sunderland) Sub-Committee held on 5<sup>th</sup> January, 2011 (copy circulated) was submitted.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

2. RESOLVED that the report be received and noted.

## **Reports of the Extraordinary Meeting of the Development Control (Hetton, Houghton and Washington) Sub-Committee held on 13<sup>th</sup> December, 2011 and the Meeting held on 3<sup>rd</sup> January, 2012**

The reports of the meetings of the Development Control (Hetton, Houghton and Washington) Sub-Committee held on 13<sup>th</sup> December, 2011 and 3<sup>rd</sup> January, 2012 (copies circulated) were submitted.

(For copy reports – see original minutes).

3. RESOLVED that the reports be received and noted.

### **Change in Order of Business**

The Chairman proposed a change in the order of business to deal with the remaining items in reverse order, so that Items 06 and 07 would be considered together as the final items, before separate decisions upon those items would be taken.

4. RESOLVED that the proposal to change the order of business be agreed.

### **Wearmouth Masterplan and Design Code: Supplementary Planning Document**

The Deputy Chief Executive submitted a report (copy circulated) to advise the Committee of the responses received following public consultation on the Wearmouth Masterplan and Design Code Supplementary Planning Document and to seek the Committee's comments on the revised document.

The Committee's comments would be reported to Cabinet on 15<sup>th</sup> February, 2012 when agreement would be sought to approve the Wearmouth Masterplan and Design Code as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

(For copy report – see original minutes).

5. RESOLVED that the Committee agreed the amended Wearmouth Masterplan and Design Code for referral to Cabinet for consideration.

### **Objections to the Proposed Traffic Calming and Associated 20 mph Speed Limit Zone around the Barnes Junior and Infant School, Sunderland**

The Executive Director of City Services submitted a report (copy circulated) to inform the Committee of the objections received to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for the introduction of Traffic Calming features and associated 20 miles per hour (mph) Speed Limit Zone in certain streets around the Barnes Junior and Infant School.

(For copy report – see original minutes).

A further letter submitted by one of the objectors before the meeting was circulated for Members' information.

6. RESOLVED that:-

- (i) the formal objections to the Traffic Calming and Associated 20 mph Speed Limit Zone should not be upheld;
- (ii) the Executive Director of City Services be requested to instruct the Head of Law and Governance to confirm the making of the proposed Orders; and
- (iii) the objectors be informed accordingly.

**Reference from Development Control (Hetton, Houghton and Washington) Sub-Committee**

**Planning Application – 11/02076/FUL - Redevelopment of Campground waste transfer station including: Waste reception building, storage facilities, staff site office, visitors centre, wind turbine, car parking and associated infrastructure and landscaping – Campground Refuse Disposal Works**

and

**Reference from Development Control (Hetton, Houghton and Washington) Sub-Committee**

**Planning Application – 11/01980/FUL – Redevelopment of existing Household Waste and Recycling Centre, including raised access platforms, roof over Household Waste and Recycling area and erection of building to accommodate Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) and provide staff facilities and associated access and infrastructure – Gateshead MBC Campground Refuse Disposal Works**

(For copy reports – see original minutes).

Mike Mattok, Technical Manager, Development Control presented the reports. Referring to application 11/02076/FUL he advised that the Campground Waste Transfer Station had a long history with the original permission going back to November 1968. A second permission was granted for an incinerator and ancillary buildings in June 1970. However due to the age of these permissions there are no planning conditions controlling activities on the site. Nevertheless, the current use of the site as a waste transfer station and household waste recycling centre requires an environmental permit controlled by the Environment Agency to control potential impacts on the environment.

The development site (2.45 ha) is rectangular in shape and wrapped around the north east and north west sides of the Gateshead Household Waste and Recycling Centre. The site comprises a number of large vacant buildings and areas of hardstanding. The buildings vary in height but the tallest at 21 metres height is visually prominent. Access is from the B1288 (Springwell Road) linking north to Wrekenton and south to the A194(M) via Springwell Village. The structures include the derelict incinerator plant, a weighbridge in use together with cabins, offices canteen, workshops and a road salt store.

The site is used for the transfer of waste involving the use of a structure known as the Rubb Shelter, which has a temporary planning permission 08/00278/REN allowing use as a waste transfer station until 2013. Beyond the north west boundary is a narrow belt of mature trees, beyond which are residential properties and a school playing field. The closest property is approximately 15 metres from the boundary and the school is approximately 85 metres from the boundary. The site is located in the Green Belt.

The proposal incorporates a building for the temporary storage and handling of residual waste – 80 x 42 metres and 9 metres to the eaves. There is also an education facility proposed to allow the public to visit the site. That building aims to achieve an excellent Breeam Rating, incorporating a number of sustainability features, and measures 28 x 10 metres by 8 metres to the eaves. The Waste Transfer Facility (WTF) will have the capacity to manage 90,000 tonnes of waste per annum. The main purpose of the facility is to bulk up waste material by type for onward transportation to treatment facilities. Recyclable waste will be separated out and this amounts to about 3% of the annual tonnage.

Four letters of objection have been received and one petition and these are at Appendix 1 to the Report. Further letters of objection had been received after production of the report, and these had also been circulated to Members.. The key issues are the principle of the development, the impact on the surrounding area and residential amenity, landscape and visual impact, hydrogeology, hydrology and flood risk, land contamination, noise, ecology, air quality, sustainability, traffic and cultural heritage issues.

The starting point in considering the application are the policies contained the adopted development plan ie Sunderland UDP and European, National and Regional Planning Policy. The European Directive on Waste looks for the cleanest most appropriate technologies in product manufacture and final disposal of waste; managing waste to avoid landfill; self sufficiency in waste disposal facilities and the use of waste as a source of energy. The proposals help implement or meet these policy requirements as detailed in the report. With regard to Green Belt policy PPG2, the policies of which are repeated in the UDP, it accepts the redevelopment of developed sites in the Green Belt where there is environmental improvement. That is true of this proposal which reduces the number of buildings on site, reduces their height and improves their appearance. It also has improved landscaping proposals.

The site is in Flood Zone 1 ie the lowest risk of flooding. A flood risk assessment has been undertaken and this is accepted by the Environment Agency (EA). The drainage design is still to be finalised but will involve discharge to both soakaways and in part the foul water system. The proposal includes collection, harvesting and the use of rainwater in the office and visitor centre.

In relation to ground contamination, although a desktop study of contamination has been done, Environmental Health consider it necessary for a condition to be attached to any permission requiring additional information to be submitted for approval, to include the submission of an updated ground investigation report, site conceptual model, risk assessment and remediation strategy.

City Services have been consulted on noise and vibration. They have raised no objections but have asked for a condition requiring a noise barrier at the northern and western site boundaries of at least 2.5 metres height. In addition they require a noise assessment to be undertaken when the site is operational, and if noise is greater than 5dB (A) above background noise, proposed mitigation measures will have to be submitted, approved and implemented.

In relation to air quality, the conclusion is that vehicular emissions are not likely to be a threat to the health of residents.

On traffic and transportation, the submitted transport assessment (TA) quantifies the existing and proposed commercial traffic movements per day as 124 existing and 202 proposed. This use represents an increase of not more than 1% of traffic on Springwell Lane. A condition is proposed to specify those three routes which heavy goods vehicles within the control of the operator shall follow (routes 1, 2 and 4 set out below).

The objections are considered in detail at appendix 2 to the report, and as most objections do not distinguish between the 2 applications, Members should note each report contains the same appendix 2. The objections were considered as set out below.

Previous use of the site. There are allegations but no evidence provided that the ongoing use of the site has harmed the health of nearby residents. However the EA permitting process is there to ensure no risks to health. Government planning advice requires that waste should be dealt with as near to source as possible. Other issues raised were vermin, noise, vibration and litter, and where there are any possible uncertainties, these are covered by conditions proposed to be imposed on any permission.

A major issue is that relating to traffic movements. With regard to the SITA waste transfer station at present there are 124 traffic movements per day i.e. 62 inwards and 62 outwards. It is anticipated that the increased tonnage of waste to be handled by the proposed new facilities will increase traffic to 202 movements per day i.e. 101 in and 101 out.

5 routes have been considered and appraised by the applicant. 1. Wrekenton Long Banks and the A1, 2. Wrekenton Long Banks and Durham Rd (A167), 3. Old Durham Rd – Sheriff Hill area of Gateshead. 4. Leam Lane and Northumberland Way (A195) and 5. Via Springwell Village and to the south. The applicant has stated that routes 3 and 5 will not be used by any vehicles above 7.5 tonnes in weight and that is mirrored in condition 23 proposed to be imposed on any permission. Accordingly the proposal will not worsen the numbers of HGV movements through Springwell Village.

The issue of surface water drainage. While details of drainage design are still to be finalised the basic principles have been submitted. The key point is that it is not acknowledged that drainage problems at Low Mount Farm are caused by surface water from the Campground site, but if they were the new proposals would reduce that problem for 3 reasons. 1. The present dependency on soakaways to deal with surface water is being reduced; 2. Some of the surface water will be carried by the foul drainage system proposed at the SITA site 3. There is a proposal to harvest

surface water to use as grey water for the proposed buildings and thence on via the foul water system. In this respect the proposals are a vast improvement on the existing systems.

The proposals accord with policy in the adopted development plan and the recommendation is to approve subject to the conditions set out in the report.

In relation to application 11/01980/FUL Mr. Mattok advised that this is an application, submitted by Gateshead Council for modernisation and redevelopment works at the existing household waste and recycling centre. The site is for the disposal of domestic waste only and is used by members of the public. No trade waste is accepted.

4 letters of objection had been received and 1 petition, which are at appendix 1 to the report. The circulation reports include recently received objections..

The report details the proposals, namely improved access to the site; circulation and traffic arrangements; providing a roof to shelter users; raised parking areas to assist in making deposits into skips; the provision of additional skips; improved on site signage and perimeter fencing and landscaping.

The main issues are the principle of the use on this site in relation to national and local policy, including PPS10 and Green Belt issues, together with issues of visual impact and residential amenity. The report details national policy on improving waste facilities and recycling, which clearly this proposal is in accordance with. The proposal lies within the Green Belt and is considered to be an improvement in terms of visual impact. It is not a new development as such but a replacement of existing facilities. Trees lost to the development will be compensated by new planting.

The new building works which will include staff facilities and secure storage of waste electrical and electronic equipment will be largely lost behind the elevated roadway.

There will be no worsening in terms of impact on residential amenity as the hours of opening (8am to 8pm in summer and 8am to 5pm in winter or 8am to 6pm Saturday/Sunday in winter) will remain the same. Noise levels will not be increased by the proposal, but as one existing building screening the development from housing will be removed, any approval should have a condition regarding noise survey and remediation measures if required. Similarly a ground investigation report and remediation strategy have been submitted, but if approved, conditions should be applied requiring an updated ground investigation report, risk assessment and remediation strategy.

At this stage the drainage systems for both schemes are not finalised. However, both the EA and Northumbria Water have been consulted and neither have objections to the present drainage proposals, which are principally a new soakaway system for surface water with water from the service yard going to the foul water system. This is subject to ongoing site investigation, analysis and design.

The responses to the objections are set out in detail at appendix 2 to the report, and were outlined in relation to the Sita application. One difference is the response to the objections relating to traffic movements. In relation to Gateshead's household waste application, deliveries of waste is via private car, and no significant increase in these movements is anticipated.

The recommendation is to approve subject to the conditions set out in the report.

Councillor T. Martin commented that he was very impressed with the running of a similar waste plant in Ashington, and he had also visited the Springwell site which did need to be improved.

Councillor Forbes commented that she considered the report did not give any degree of clarity over certain issues, and the additional objections highlighted matters of real concern over consultation and advertisements in the Springwell area. Apparently residents had taken matters further and were awaiting reports from the Secretary of State etc. Given that there were concerns over the consultation, Councillor Forbes moved to defer the application so that a full consultation could be carried out.

Councillor A. Wright seconded the motion to defer, commenting that he had concerns over the notices placed, and whilst consultation and notification had been done in accordance with the Town and Country Planning Act, surely in this case, due to the boundary issues, more should have been done.

Councillor A. Wright also commented that it would have brought no hardship to place a notice in the Journal and Chronicle publications as well as the Sunderland Echo, and he did feel we needed to step back and look at this.

Councillor Ellis wished to echo those concerns raised in relation to the consultation carried out with residents of Springwell Village, and the fact that reports on drainage and traffic were still outstanding.

The Chairman advised that he would not have allowed this item to come before the Committee if he did not feel that the consultation had been carried out correctly, and that he had received a great deal of information on the matter since last autumn. In his opinion it was unfair to claim that there had not been the opportunity to respond to the consultation.

Councillor Charlton commented that he had also attended the site visit and received a great deal of information on this matter, and would not be happy to defer the item again as he wished for those objectors present, who had given up their time, to be able to voice their views.

The Chairman put the motion of deferral to the Committee. With six in favour and fourteen against, the motion to defer was rejected.

The Chairman then introduced the objectors who had requested to speak, and advised that they would have a total of ten minutes each to speak given that the two items were being outlined together.

Ms. Lisa Wild, representing the Swinburn family who reside at Low Mount Farm and who had objected to the application, mainly over the drainage system on site and at the entrance road, outlined her objections.

Ms. Wild advised that the current drainage system did not work and constantly drains onto Low Mount Farm from the site then into their pond, which drains into the River Don. The Campground site is at a higher level than the Farm.

There was no direct reference in the application to the Springwell Pond which is on their land, and they have at no time been approached by Entec to carry out a complete survey of the farm. Therefore as the survey provided excluded Low Mount Farm, the family felt it should be rewritten and submitted again.

Ms. Wild commented that due to the apparent traffic and drainage issues she could not understand how SITA and Gateshead Council would not address the problems, whilst Sunderland Council allowed this to happen.

Having suffered several floods in the past twenty five years, the most recent in August 2011 when the B1288 was impassable, Ms. Wild commented that now was the time for the issues to be resolved.

Ms. Debra Coxon outlined her objections to the application. Whilst visually the proposals would be better, there would be quality of life impacts. She stressed that the area also has to deal with the former Springwell Quarry and the waste from Thompsons, which when combined would result in 634,000 tonnes of waste being transported. As there was a condition not to travel through Springwell Village, the constituents of Gateshead and primarily Wrekenton would be the people to suffer the burden.

Ms. Coxon commented that the applicant had plans to increase the turnover to 90,000 tonnes per annum, yet failed repeatedly to provide sight of the licence allowing them to do this.

The volume of combined noise, the two years it could take to complete the development and the traffic issues it would create meant everyone would suffer, with the families in Vicarage Close the worst affected as they shared a boundary with the Campground.

Ms. Coxon claimed the applicants did not stick to the allowed operational hours of 8am-5pm and in fact worked 7am-7pm which gave a clear example of how they perceive themselves as above the law.

Ms. Coxon felt that if plans for a recycling plant had been requested in an industrial estate, this would not have been a problem, but as this was in an unsuitable location, it needed to be recognised that Wrekenton and the quality of life of its residents were being destroyed by traffic problems.

Ms. Coxon asked the Committee to consider if the decision was reversed and the traffic was to travel through Springwell Village, causing problems to Sunderland constituents, whether they would make the same decision to approve.

The Chairman then introduced Mr. Swinburn who commented that the land in question was inaccurately described in the field survey as amenity grassland to the south, yet in fact was agricultural land and part of a working farm.

In relation to safeguarding of land, no contact had been made with the landowners of Low Mount Farm, and in his opinion the combined impact of the two sites must be given detailed consideration, as not to do so would go against the Council's duty of care.

An impact assessment of the Farm had still not been carried out despite being only 400 metres away, and assurances were sought that the Farm would not be adversely affected in relation to its soil quality and local biodiversity.

Ms. Lesley Sharp, a resident of Springwell Village, commented that she was concerned for the surrounding area and the problems friends have experienced due to vermin, with 18 rats caught during a two week period. Ms. Sharpe advised that traps did not always kill the rats, which made it an unpleasant experience to dispose of them.

Mr. Alan Barber commented on the present state of the buildings, and felt the correct thing to do was to remove the buildings, as the amenity needed to be protected, along with the Green Belt. There were no environmental benefits for the area the waste site was situated in, and it should be removed and put at Follingsby.

Ms. Carole Smiles wished to comment on the negative impact this proposal would have on Springwell Village through traffic displacement, as drivers use the village as a shortcut to avoid the haulage vehicles.

Ms. Smiles claimed that Low Mount Farm had been ravaged by contaminated water and Sunderland City Council were in possession of many relevant and damning facts, so that if this application were to be approved, then no doubt there would be repercussions.

Mr. David Jones, objecting on behalf of Ms. Elsie Jones, commented that residents who pay their Council Tax to Sunderland City Council had been inadequately consulted and the report needed greater detail. Whilst the letter of the law had been followed, the fact that only four letters of objection and one petition were received on a matter of this magnitude surely indicated that the Council had failed to consult properly, failing to meet the needs of one target group, the residents of Springwell Village.

On the point of democracy, Mr. Jones commented that eight public notices were erected and enquired as to why only one was displayed in Springwell Village. 98 notification letters were sent out yet they failed to undertake distribution outside of the normal jurisdiction. A notice was placed in the Sunderland Echo, a publication not stocked in the local newsagents.

Mr. Jones advised that residents had called for a public meeting, but their request was declined and they felt they had not been allowed to participate in the democratic process.

Mr. Mattok referred to the queries over the Green Belt and advised that redeveloping the existing site was appropriate for Green Belt use.

He did not consider the residents to have been sold short on public consultation.. A public meeting was held, with some Elected Members in attendance, and 14 objection letters had been received, considered and addressed.

Councillor Ellis commented that if Officers were arguing that residents have had sufficient time to object, then why had the risk assessments on drainage etc not been completed in sufficient time.

In response to Councillor Francis' enquiry as to why only one notice was erected in Springwell Village, Mr. Mattok advised that a notice was placed adjacent to the site, predominant notices in Gateshead, one in Springwell, 500 metres away from the site and also in the newspaper, so the Council had gone well beyond the requirements. Mr. Mattok also stated that it was clear Springwell Village had received notification as many residents from the area submitted objections, which were considered.

In relation to Page 27 of the Agenda, Councillor Forbes enquired about the likely noise impact for nearby residents and asked why the application information was limited.

Mr. Mattok advised that very few complaints had been received by either Council over the 12 month period in relation to noise nuisance..

Marion Dixon, Environmental Health Manager (Environment) advised that whilst no complaints had been received, conditions have been put forward in relation to noise screens. An assessment had been carried out, with the model used suggesting the noise levels would be less than the existing, and a further assessment would be undertaken once the work was carried out.

Councillor T. Martin advised that the issue of vermin had been an issue he was concerned about at the visit to the site, and he had not been convinced with the existing traps, but the proposed new facility seemed to take care of this problem

The Chairman introduced Jeff Moffitt of Gateshead MBC who advised that the application was for improvements essential to ensure the site would be fit for purpose. Their quest is to improve all areas of waste management. Not only would the plans improve the look but also improve the recycling rates, traffic management by not having to close while vehicles are emptied, and visitors' usage. It would be more pleasant and quicker for service users, with a separate area for cars and service vehicles. There will be a roof, more containers and improved signage.

Gateshead MBC had allocated scarce financial resources to the new design which would be an asset to the area and would complement the visitor centre. They have carried out consultation on the plans with residents of Springwell, Wrekenton and Eighton Banks and received overall approval.

The Chairman introduced Corrina Scott-Roy representing SITA UK Limited who wished to refute the claim that residents of Springwell had not been consulted. As part of their pre-application strategy SITA had leafleted over 3000 households,

placed notices in the Chronicle publication and held an exhibition, where half of the attendees were residents from Springwell Village.

In relation to the objections about flooding, Ms. Scott-Roy advised that it was quite normal to work up detailed plans for drainage once the planning application was approved. SITA would appoint a consultant engineer should permission be granted, and she was happy to share those plans once drawn up.

The proposals would improve the quality of life for residents, not just visually. Noise levels would be reduced as the operations were to be done under a closed door policy, with limited vehicle movements outside of the building.

Ms. Scott-Roy also refuted claims that SITA were not good neighbours, and stated they do take on board some suggestions, such as those for the colour of the buildings and for additional acoustic screening. They maintain an open dialogue with residents who are invited to join the Liaison Group meetings.

In terms of the Green Belt, the site is listed in the Unitary Development Plan for waste use.

Ms. Scott-Roy also did not accept claims of increased traffic as the waste coming in would remain the same. SITA was seeking an increase under its EA permit to 90,000 tonnes from the current 75,000. However, there were no restrictions on the planning permission in relation to tonnage, as it is covered by the separate EA regime. The haulage routes would not travel through Springwell Village and she wished to assure those residents that there were no proposals to change the route.

Ms. Scott-Roy wished to highlight the benefits of the proposal, in that the old buildings would be removed, the new transfer station would be 10m lower than the existing one and there would be a reduction in noise levels.

SITA had also helped local Community Groups and Football Clubs who have benefited through grants from the SITA Trust, so there were clear intrinsic benefits to this application.

Ms. Scott-Roy advised that if the application was not approved, the operation could remain as it was, in its current state, so it was in the interests of everyone that this site be modernised as it was in dire need of it.

Councillor Wood commented that those Members who sit on the Development Control (Hetton, Houghton and Washington) Sub-Committee had been invited to attend a visit of the site. As this had been referred to Planning and Highways Committee, Councillor Wood felt that Members of this Committee should also have had a site visit to help make an informed decision.

Councillor Wood commented that this was clearly a very contentious planning application with serious complaints made by residents, so if a decision was made now, they would feel a sense of injustice. He would be unable to support the recommendation if the application was put to the vote now.

Councillor E. Gibson commented that the existing facility was already in operation and the application would greatly improve what was already there.

Councillor Charlton thanked the objectors for their input and felt he had learned a great deal. He also commented that a large amount of information had been received on the application, more than any other he could recall in the past. He requested clarification from SITA on the flooding issues.

Andy Stokes, Contract Director (SITA) advised that they were aware of a number of concerns over the drainage and flooding issues, and they have had discussions with Gateshead MBC and Northumbria Water, but they could only develop a scheme once they were able to gain full access to the site should the application be approved.

In response to Councillor Charlton's further query over the number of transport wagons, Ms. Scott-Roy advised there would be 44 wagons per day, which remained the same as at present, and in terms of HGV vehicles there would be no increase. The only increase would come from customer vehicles.

Councillor Charlton commented that if the planning application was not approved the site would carry on "as is". Therefore it was important to bear this in mind during decision making, but he did feel SITA needed to become a better neighbour and work with residents.

Councillor Copeland commented that she had listened to both sides, and as this was an existing site, felt the application needed to go ahead. However she was sympathetic towards the residents, and felt SITA must work with them better. As site manager, they had the responsibility to deal with the concerns, and make the site the best facility they could.

Councillor Ellis commented that she was astounded that there is currently no drainage provision by design, and on reading through the papers she noted that one resident had been told to move house during the consultations SITA had carried out. If the Gateshead MBC facility is not fit for purpose at present, she asked why the residents' suggestion to move the facility to an Industrial Estate is not considered.

Mr. Moffitt advised that he did not recall saying the facility was not fit for purpose.

Councillor Forbes commented that she fully agreed with Councillor Wood in relation to the consultation of Members, and moved that the application be deferred pending a site visit for the Members of Planning and Highways Committee.

Councillor A. Wright wished to second the motion, advising that as comments had been made in relation to the existing site operating now, he would like the opportunity to view this and the traffic issues raised.

Councillor P. Watson moved against the motion to defer, as he believed a site visit would be of no benefit to the Committee as they would not be able to see any increase in traffic that may occur in the future.

Councillor T. Martin seconded Councillor P. Watson's motion.

The Chairman commented that he also was a Member of the Development Control (Hetton, Houghton and Washington) Sub-Committee and had been unable to attend

the site visit which was arranged due to work commitments, but he had visited the site separately of his own accord, which any Member of this Committee could have done prior to the meeting.

The Chairman then put the motion for deferral for a site visit to the vote. With five Members in favour and 13 Members against, the motion to defer the application was rejected.

Councillor Forbes requested clarification as to whether the facility could still operate if the consent was not renewed after 2013.

Mr. Mattok advised that the consent for the Rubb Shelter would lapse in 2013, but there were no limits on the rest of the facilities so it would depend on how essential the Rubb Shelter was.

Ms. Scott-Roy advised that the facility could operate without the Rubb Shelter. The use of the site had been established in perpetuity.

Councillor Forbes felt there was a need to be kept informed of further monitoring of the drainage issues, etc should this be approved as there had been no monitoring in the past which was why problems had escalated.

In response to Councillor Francis' query over the objectors' claims on the increase to 90,000 tonnes of waste and if the licence allowed that, Mr. Scott-Roy advised that the EA licence was currently to handle 75,000 tonnes per annum, but in terms of Sunderland City Council, there were no limits.

Councillor Francis also felt that this Committee should have had a site visit and hoped that adequate monitoring would be carried out, and was very concerned no hydrological survey had been submitted in advance.

Councillor P. Watson commented that this application epitomised the difficult job faced by the Committee, and wished to assure residents that when decisions were made every planning issue was considered. 39 conditions over the two planning applications had been proposed, driven by the concerns of Planning Officers.

Councillor P. Watson also commented that there was a clear decision to be made between keeping the site as it is, which is a massive detriment at present, or grasping this opportunity to bring the site up to modern standards. He urged Members to make a realistic decision on the facts.

The Chairman commented that a lengthy discussion had taken place and the Committee had tried to be as fair as possible to the objectors in relation to the time they were given to outline their concerns. The Chairman advised that he had had concerns over the water drainage, but they had been satisfied through the conditions, and the matter would continue to be worked on.

Mr. Mattok advised that the recommendation for application 11/02076/FUL was to approve subject to the 23 conditions set out in the report.

Having been put to the vote, with fourteen Members in favour, three against and two who abstained, it was:-

7. RESOLVED that the application be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

Mr. Mattok advised that the recommendation for application 11/01980/FUL was to approve subject to the 16 conditions set out in the report.

Having been put to the vote, with fifteen Members in favour, two against and two who abstained, it was:-

8. RESOLVED that the application be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

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

(Signed) P. TYE,  
Chairman.