

NORTHUMBERLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE

At the meeting of the **Strategic Planning Committee** held at Meeting Space - Block 1, Floor 2 - County Hall on Tuesday, 2 November 2021 at 3.00 pm.

PRESENT

T Thorne (Chair) (in the Chair)

MEMBERS

C Ball	R Dodd
B Flux	J Foster
G Hill	Jl Hutchinson
J Lang	M Robinson
G Stewart	M Swinbank
A Wallace	A Watson

OTHER COUNCILLORS

P Scott

OFFICERS

M Bulman	Solicitor
R Greally	Assistant Democratic Services Officer
G Halliday	Consultant Planner
L Little	Senior Democratic Services Officer
C Mead	Highways Development Manager
R Murfin	Director of Planning
J Murphy	South East DM Area Manager
G Park	Environmental Health Officer
M. Paye	Consultant Engineer

Around 7 members of the press and public were present.

43 **PROCEDURE AT PLANNING COMMITTEES**

The Chair outlined the procedure to be followed at the meeting.

RESOLVED that the information be noted.

44 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from Councillors Darwin, Reid and Renner-Thompson.

Ch.'s Initials.....

45 **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings of the Strategic Planning Committee held on Tuesday 5 October 2021, as circulated, were agreed as a true record and signed by the Chair.

46 **DETERMINATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The report requested the Committee to decide the planning applications attached to the report using the powers delegated to it. Members were reminded of the principles which should govern their consideration of the applications, the procedure for handling representations, the requirement of conditions and the need for justifiable reasons for the granting of permission or refusal of planning applications.

The Chair highlighted the site visits which had been undertaken in respect of three of the applications on the agenda and thanked both Members and Officers for their attendance.

RESOLVED that the information be noted.

47 **21/01944/FUL**

**Construction of 18no. Starter Units
Factory D , Ennerdale Road, Riverside Business Park, Blyth NE24 4RG**

J Murphy, Planning Area Manager - Development Management provided an introduction to the report with the aid of a power point presentation. Updates were provided as follows:-

- Paragraph 1.1 should refer to the Strategic Planning Committee and not the Castle Morpeth Local Area Council as stated.
- Condition 12 refers to condition 9 and it should state condition 11.

A Franklin, Hedley Planning Services addressed the Committee speaking in support of the application on behalf of the applicant. His comments included the following:

- The applicant had worked closely with the Council at every stage in order to deliver 18 high quality business units within a sustainable location which would create an additional 1,600 sqm of floorspace and an estimated 92 jobs for local people.
- As evidenced, the proposed development made effective use of previously developed land within an established business park benefitting from existing infrastructure and provided suitable access to the shops and services which Blyth Centre had to offer.
- The principle of construction 18 high quality units was acceptable within an allocated industrial estate and policies within the emerging Northumberland Local Plan (NLP) also supported proposals for economic growth especially in main towns such as Blyth.
- The principle of development was considered acceptable with other material considerations having been assessed. The proposed units matched the

Ch.'s Initials.....

building materials to that of adjacent units and would integrate with its surroundings. The design and scale of each unit was considered appropriate for the end commercial use.

- There had been public comments with regard to highway safety, in particular the internal road network within the business park. The proposal would create a new site entrance off Coniston Road along the eastern edge of the proposed site and detailed consideration had been given towards the design of a functional highways access which would be safe for all users. The applicant had worked in co-operation with the Council to evidence these measures within the Transport Statement submitted in support of the application.
- An additional road safety assessment had been undertaken to determine the safety of the access point in relation to the adjacent road network and had been assessed by an independent party.
- The detailed plans and assessments concluded that a safe and suitable site access had been achieved off Coniston Road which would not adversely impact the adjacent road network. Therefore the comments regarding road safety had been resolved following collaboration between the applicant and the Council's Highways Team.
- The Officer's recommendation was welcomed and the Committee were requested to endorse this recommendation and grant planning permission.

In response to questions from Members of the Committee the following information was provided:-

- The site was not complex and was allocated for business use. Additional assessments and scrutiny had been undertaken due to concerns of highway safety following the history of the road with a fatal collision occurring. For this reason a Highway Safety Audit had been undertaken prior to the scheme being recommended for approval, which was beyond what would normally be required. The independent Road Safety Audit had not found anything unsafe and the visibility at the proposed access met technical specifications.
- The proposed units could be used for a number of businesses uses including storage or office space.
- There were no plans by the Local Authority to change the existing or provide additional road signage.
- The Road Safety Audit had looked at the totality of the road network including signage and speed limits and had concluded that the fatal accident was not connected to the road layout and had not recommended any interventions.
- Monitoring of the road network would not form part of one development, however it would be looked at as a matter of course over time.

Councillor Dodd proposed that the application be granted in line with the Officer's recommendation with the amended condition 9 as outlined above, which was seconded by Councillor Stewart.

It was highlighted that there were two 90° bends on the road in close proximity and that cars should not be travelling in excess of 30 mph in that location. In respect of the safety of users of the centre for adults with learning disabilities it was confirmed that the centre had barriers to gain entrance to/from the site with all doors locked and all service users escorted on and off the site. There had in

Ch.'s Initials.....

the past been larger factories in the area with a large number of HGV vehicles servicing these and there was now less traffic than had previously been the case.

A vote was taken on the proposal to grant permission in line with the Officer's report with the amendment to Condition 9 as outlined and it was unanimously:

RESOLVED that the application be **GRANTED** for the reasons and subject to the conditions as outlined in the report and amended Condition 9.

48 **21/01106/CCD**

**Construction of a two-platform railway station including: ramped pedestrian access, new highway access; modifications to existing highways including pedestrian footways; provision of parking for cars, electric vehicles, motorcycles, cycles, and taxis and other associated works. Construction of facilities ancillary to the station including, lighting, soft and hard landscaping, surface and subsurface drainage, utilities and other services, boundary treatment and other associated works
Bedlington Railway Station, Station Street, Bedlington, Northumberland
NE22 5UZ**

G. Halliday, Consultant Planner provided an introduction to the report with the aid of a power point presentation which included visualisations of the proposed development. Updates were provided as follows:

- East Bedlington Parish Council had now advised that they were in support of the application.
- A letter had been received from Mr Orr, Consultant for Ward Hadaway who were acting on behalf of Bernicia Group in their objection to the application. The letter set out comments relating to noise impacts and requesting that any decision should be deferred until the severity and cumulative impacts had been assessed in detail and all appropriate information had been put before the Committee. They further suggested that if Members were minded to approve the application a further three conditions be imposed on any permission granted. A full copy of the letter was available on the planning portal.

Members were advised that a Main Contractor had only just been appointed and if permission was granted they would be building six stations and other associated works with the detailed programming of the various works still to be decided. The information that was known at the current time had been included in the Committee Report and whilst this was not complete it was the best that was available. The main issue was the proximity to Sleekburn House and whilst there would be some impact during the construction and operational phases proposals to mitigate these were the subject of conditions and these were appropriate to use with the final detail to be provided at a later date. It was not wrong to make a decision based on the information provided.

Councillor J Foster joined the meeting at 3.45 pm and did not take any part on deciding this application.

Ch.'s Initials.....

F Orr, Consultant for Ward Hadaway addressed the Committee speaking in objection to the application. His comments included the following:

- Members would be aware of the very familiar social landlord role that Bernicia had and of the very good working relationship it had with the Council which was valued. It shared the same desire to bring the best to the County and its people and both Bernicia and the Local Authority had a responsibility to their residents.
- Bernicia objected to the application in respect of the interests of its residents which it felt would “fall between the cracks of the planning position and the Transport and Works Order”. They asked that Members took time to consider the needs of the 29 residents of Sleekburn House, the majority of which were over 75 years of age with the oldest being 93. Many of the residents were in poor health, were disabled or had some learning disability, 5 were housebound and over half of the residents had care packages in place.
- At the closest point Sleekburn House was only 3.25m from the proposed station with some residents spending most of their time in living rooms. Currently there were only a limited number of passing freight trains which did not stop and had limited effect on residents amenity which would be a stark contrast during both during the construction and operation of the new station which would have a severe and damaging effect on amenity and their health.
- There was insufficient detailed information on the programme of works, however it was known that there would be an 18 month programme of regular non stop work over a 79 hour period over weekends from Thursday evenings to Monday mornings. This would have a significant effect and render Sleekburn House uninhabitable during that period with the closest working area just 1.55m from residents’ windows.
- He requested that the consideration of the application be delayed until more detail and the effects of the construction phase were known, or a model form of condition was used to establish noise limits which must not be exceeded.
- Noise consultants had undertaken additional measurements and following this suggested draft conditions which had been submitted to the Council today which required mitigation at Sleekburn House to achieve appropriate noise levels or the relocation of residents during the construction process.
- During the operation there would be 62 new stops at the station and together with the operation of the level crossing this would have a significant effect on residents.
- The impact of the PA system, which needed to be louder than background noise would be like having the PA announcements amplified directly outside residents’ windows every 5 minutes of the waking day.
- Residents’ living conditions would be adversely affected as at present they looked out over soft landscaping and instead they would be looking out to a 3.5m high fence and would have over 200 PA announcements and 330 noise events in total each day. Residents in other locations similar to this had described it as psychological torture and of having to spend their lives behind closed windows which was not acceptable.
- He asked that the application be deferred until the mitigation was known or planning conditions to achieve specific noise levels on both the construction and operational phases were included.

A Healey, Planning consultant, addressed the Committee speaking in support of the application on behalf of the applicant. Her comments included the following:

Ch.’s Initials.....

- The proposed station at Bedlington was one of six new stations proposed as part of plans to reintroduce passenger services between Newcastle and Ashington. It was envisaged that there would be a half-hourly service with an anticipated journey time of 35 minutes between Ashington and Newcastle.
- The application before the Committee had been the subject of extensive consultations both before and after the planning submission. The proposals had also been the subject of a significant public consultation exercise where several hundred people wrote to support the overall scheme, with 128 representations specifically supporting the proposals at Bedlington.
- The applicant had listened to the concerns raised by residents and had sought to identify alternative sites which were appropriate to provide for anticipated car parking demand. This culminated in the withdrawal of the site on Ravensworth Street and the submission of a separate application for a car park on Liddle's Street which was also being considered at today's Committee.
- The applicant acknowledged the concerns raised by objectors related to noise and other residential amenity impacts and had worked with the local planning authority to agree appropriate conditions to ensure appropriate mitigation measures were implemented. The applicant was working with representatives of Bernicia to provide assurances that the project would work with them as part of the schemes to discharge those conditions. The report confirmed that the proposed mitigation measures were considered appropriate by Public Protection, subject to the imposition of appropriately worded conditions.
- The submitted scheme was the only scheme technically possible to deliver a railway station at this location. The information submitted confirmed this to be the case and had been acknowledged by officers.
- The submitted documents provided a robust case which demonstrated the application was in accordance with relevant planning policies, with the Transport Assessment including information on passenger demand.
- Officers had accepted the modelling basis for the car park demand and were content to recommend approval, subject to conditions.
- The station and wider scheme would deliver the transport infrastructure required to attract inward investment, create additional employment opportunities, enhance economic vitality and encourage further economic growth in Bedlington Station, Bedlington and South East Northumberland. The proposed new station, adjacent to the site of the original railway station, respected the local townscape and historical importance of the line's industrial heritage.
- Policies within both the Wansbeck Local Plan and emerging NLP identified Bedlington Station as a safeguarded location for a future railway station. The station was sustainable development which both national and local planning policies confirm should be supported. There were no objections from statutory consultees and when balancing the objections made to the application against the significant economic, social and environmental benefits of the scheme, we believe the application ought to be approved.
- The application had been thoroughly assessed and found to be in accordance with the relevant planning policies and there were no material considerations to indicate permission should not be granted subject to the conditions set out in the Officer's report.

Ch.'s Initials.....

In response to questions from Members of the Committee the following information was noted:

- It was proposed that the taxi drop off point would be the northern end of the Park Terrace car park which would give direct access to the northern ramp of the southbound platform.
- A survey undertaken in respect of the existing car parks had shown that they were usually at 80% occupancy and it would be necessary for additional car parking to be provided. The 67 spaces proposed had been modelled close to the maximum modelling requirement undertaken and had been agreed by Highways.
- The approach to making a planning decision was to look to see if the location was the correct one for the proposed development. Consultees, including Public Protection had accepted, in principle, that this was an acceptable location for a railway station. In respect of the concern raised by the speaker on the lack of how the works would be undertaken, it was accepted that not all details were available, however it was usual to attach conditions for a Construction Management Plan and Noise Management Plan to be submitted and agreed as part of the discharge of conditions. The public speaker had requested that noise limits be set, however Officers advised that Members look at this as part of the reserved matters when limits could be imposed which would be based on evidence. A PA system was required to be provided and would also be the subject of reserved matters and would allow different ways of utilising equipment to be considered as part of a detailed scheme.
- Any relocation of residents from Sleekburn House during the construction phase would be a matter for the applicant to consider with Bernicia and was not for discussion as part of the planning decision.
- During the construction phase it would be necessary for the boundary of the site to be 1.55m away from Sleekburn House in order to construct the platform, however afterwards the distance would be approximately 4.5m – 5m away. As much detail as possible had been sought and the information given was all that the applicant was able to provide at the current time. The 79 hours of construction time over the weekend was to allow freight trains to continue to use the rail line. The applicant had advised that work would not take place every weekend or for all 79 hours and when works were being undertaken a shift pattern would be in operation.
- The provision of bollards on the section outside the station in the location of the pedestrian crossing could be considered as part of the Section 278 agreement.
- Consultation had been undertaken with households and it was not thought that the school had been consulted.
- If Members were minded to support the application, it was clarified that all car parks associated with the Northumberland Line would have car park management plans and if it became clear that there were issues with displacement onto local roads then there would be the potential to look at introducing residents only schemes.
- Detailed investigation work had been undertaken in respect of the positioning of the station and a major constraint had been the forking of the railway line and the safety considerations of this. Alternatives had been discounted due to operational and safety issues prior to submission. Members were reminded they needed to consider the merits of the scheme which was in front of them

Ch.'s Initials.....

and if they thought it was wrong and this could be evidenced then they would need to refuse the application. It had been an exhaustive process with a lot of public consultation being undertaken and the application had come forward at the end of the process and not at the beginning.

- The business case put forward to Government for financial support for the whole Northumberland Line was based on the economic benefit for the area and was the justification for the entire case and this was the reason it had been supported.
- Modelling of the parking provision had been based on free parking. The commitment from Cabinet had been that the parking would be initially free and then this would be reviewed. No assumption could be made on the results of the review. Prior to any changes in strategy, details of clear mitigation would be required including how to handle displacement if charges for parking were introduced in order to protect residential amenity and this was covered by a planning condition.
- Assessments had been undertaken at all level crossing points by both Network Rail and Highways with the Bedlington South crossing to be upgraded and the footway widened as much as possible with new barriers installed to ensure the safety of pedestrians.
- Bernicia were requesting that the application be deferred until the scheme could be properly worked out or to use the conditions that they were suggesting. Officers advised against the use of these as it might be wished to use more or less onerous ones as part of the construction management plan which would be secured by a condition. The principle had been looked at by Public Protection who had no objections subject to conditions as outlined in the report. Attention was drawn to the well-used conditions 28, 29, 30, 31 and 32 which would be attached to any permission granted and addressed the concerns of the public speaker. The construction management plan would normally be agreed at officer level, however assurance was provided by the Interim Executive Director of Planning & Local Services that details of the construction management plan and schemes within the aforementioned conditions would also be discussed with the Chair and Vice-Chair in order to ensure that the concerns expressed by Members had been adequately addressed.

Councillor Wallace advised that he had listened to the questions and answers provided, attended the site visit and had listened to residents, and wished to propose acceptance of the recommendation to approve the application subject to the conditions as outlined in the Officer's report. This was seconded by Councillor Dodd.

During debate, Members in the most part supported and welcomed the application and the benefits the opening of the line for passengers would bring. Councillor Ball advised that whilst she supported the opening of the line did not feel that this station was in the right place and as there were a number of issues still to be addressed would have preferred to have deferred consideration of the application.

In summing up, Councillor Wallace advised that Bernicia had not raised their concerns with East Bedlington Parish Council, who would have taken them forward and he made a plea that the car parking remained free for the lifetime of the station.

Ch.'s Initials.....

A vote was taken on the motion to approve the application as outlined in the report as follows:- FOR 11; AGAINST 1; ABSTENSION 0.

RESOLVED that the application be **GRANTED** for the reasons and with the conditions as outlined in the report.

A short recess was held at this point.

49 **21/03060/CCD**

Construction of parking for cars, electric vehicles, and other associated works. Modifications to existing highways including pedestrian footways and new highways access.

Land North of 6 Liddle's Street, Ravensworth Street, Bedlington, Northumberland

G Halliday, Planning Consultant provided an introduction to the report with the aid of a power point presentation. He advised that a late observation had been received from East Bedlington Parish Council which stated that they supported the application and would welcome additional electric vehicle charging points if possible. Members were advised that 10% of the total number of spaces were utilised for electric vehicle charging points which was over the 6% which was normally requested.

In response to questions from Members of the Committee the following information was provided:-

- In response to comments made by Councillor Foster in relation to the parking of cars and the existing only for access sign being ignored, it was confirmed that a condition was imposed which could look at the introduction of parking restrictions on Ravensworth Street and as the signage was also to be looked at then the only for access sign would be repositioned with better sight lines.
- The loose surface outside the commercial premises did not form part of the public highway, however it was within the red line application boundary and if required then it could be looked at securing the resurfacing of this as part of a condition.
- Condition 17 advised that if any change in the charging strategy were proposed then details of mitigation would need to be provided and approved by the Local Planning Authority.
- The current speed limit on Ravensworth Street was 30 mph. If an access had the correct width and visibility splays in both directions then increased levels of traffic would not make the junction unsafe. If there was a need to ensure that the junction was kept clear then this could be secured through a condition.

Councillor Foster proposed acceptance of the recommendation to approve the application which was seconded by Councillor Flux.

In response to road safety concerns, Councillor Wallace highlighted that there was a speed unit which had been put in by a joint initiative by ex-Councillors

Ch.'s Initials.....

Gobin and Crosby in response to a fatal accident in another part of Bedlington. He advised that the site had previously housed over 100 HGV vehicles.

A vote was taken on the proposal to approve the application in line with the recommendation in the report and it was unanimously:

RESOLVED that the application be **GRANTED** for the reasons and subject to the conditions as outlined in the report.

50 **SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS**

During consideration of the following item as the time approached 5.00 pm and to allow the meeting to continue it was :

RESOLVED that Members agreed to the suspension of Standing Orders to allow the meeting to continue after the 3 hour limit.

51 **21/02253/CCD**

Construction of a new single platform railway station including new highway access and signalised junction; modifications to existing highways including pedestrian footways; provision of parking for cars, electric vehicles, motorcycles, cycles, and taxis; works to public rights of way. Construction of: facilities ancillary to the station including, lighting, soft and hard landscaping, surface and subsurface drainage, utilities and other services, boundary treatment and other associated works.

G Halliday introduced the report with the aid of a power point presentation. An addendum report had been circulated in advance of the meeting and had been uploaded to the Council's website which provided details of amendments and additional conditions to be attached to any permission granted. He also advised that two further emails had been received from Mr R Billingham regarding the proposed layout of the car park and omissions from the officer report which had also been circulated to Members of the Committee in advance. Paper copies of both were also made available at the Committee.

D Moy addressed the Committee speaking on behalf of residents of Whytrigg Close in objection to the application. His comments included the following:

- Residents were not opposed to the opening of the rail line or the proposed car park but wished to see changes to its proposed layout and size which they considered would improve the impact of the proposals without any detriment to its users.
- The current proposals would have a major impact on the lives of residents and they were entitled to further consideration. The current proposals would increase antisocial behaviour and the residents proposals would minimise problems.
- The layout of the car park forced all cars to pass close to their properties unnecessarily on the outer road which would encourage speeding. There was already a problem with anti-social behaviour and the Police had challenged the application stating that antisocial behaviour should be designed out at the design stage.

Ch.'s Initials.....

- The solution would be to change the traffic flow and route it away from the back of their houses. Virtual meetings had been held with the local MP and all present had agreed that the direction of travel should be changed to alleviate the serious issues but NCC had not taken notice of this. A direction change to the platform would also reduce antisocial behaviour and break up traffic flow and these changes were easy wins.
- NCC had not demonstrated in the design modelling analysis could be defended from serious criticism. A large proportion of residents to the south of Seaton Delaval would use the metro rather than travel and use the Seaton Delaval station. SENRUG had also confirmed this in a report which had been prepared many years ago.
- The long term effects of the Pandemic had been ignored and the reduction in the use of public transport due to changes in working practices such as more working from home had not been taken into consideration.
- It had not been fully explained why there had been a 211% increase in the number of spaces since 2019/2020. Phasing of the construction of the car park would allow for the uncertainty of numbers of bays required over the next few years. This would also have the benefit of saving unnecessary costs; avoid the use of Green Belt land and reduce the damage to the environment; reduce the impact on residents and would benefit everyone in the surrounding area. If additional capacity was required the car park could be extended or it could be that a station could be built at Seghill.
- They opposed the use of tarmac on the Green Belt and the destruction of the biodiversity of the site.
- The long straight space used for access would be to the detriment of the residents of Whytrigg Close and the reversal of the flow of traffic and providing the access road inside would provide more space closer to the station.

P Scott, Local Ward Member addressed the Committee. He advised that he supported the application which would bring the reintroduction of passenger trains following their removal in 1964. The service would allow residents to travel to Newcastle in less than 20 minutes or connect to the metro. The benefits of the proposals were clear and he recommended that the application should be granted, however there were valid concerns which needed to be addressed regarding the car park, the details of which had been provided by Mr Moy in his speech. He stressed that the concerns were from a group of residents who were in support of the station but believed the car park should be looked at again. He agreed with this position and if Members were minded to agree the application then a reserved matters condition could be added linked to the provision of the car park, this would allow more work to be undertaken before a final scheme was agreed including the possibility of moving the access road to the middle of the car park which would remove traffic from behind the properties and prevent it running close to the station platform itself.

P Gillon, Chartered Planner addressed the Committee speaking on behalf of the applicant in support of the application. His comments included the following:-

- The station was one of six proposed as part of plans to reintroduce passenger services between Newcastle and Ashington.
- The application had been the subject of extensive consultations with officers and other stakeholders both before and after the planning submission.

Ch.'s Initials.....

- The application had also been the subject of a significant public consultation exercise with over 139 respondents specifically supporting the proposals at Seaton Delaval. Such support confirmed there was a significant public interest in the development of a new railway station at Seaton Delaval.
- Following consultation in December 2020, changes to the scheme were made to respond to those concerns raised by residents and included increasing the area of planting and screening between residential properties and the proposed access road; re-aligning the access road to minimise the straight sections of road to address concerns this would encourage speeding; and re-aligning the pedestrian access to the east away from the property boundary.
- Work had continued with Officers and other stakeholders to address concerns wherever possible during the determination of the application, culminating in this scheme. The application and the submitted documents provided a robust case which demonstrated the application was in accordance with all relevant and national and local planning policies.
- The proposed railway station would deliver significant economic, social and environmental benefits, precise details of which could be found within the planning application submission.
- The submitted Transport Assessment and the passenger demand modelling which underpinned that assessment had informed the design of the scheme and was supported by Highways Officers.
- The station and wider scheme would deliver the transport infrastructure which was required to attract inward investment, create additional employment opportunities and encourage further economic growth in Seaton Delaval and the South East of Northumberland.
- Policies within both the adopted Blyth Valley Local Plan and Core Strategy and the emerging NLP identified Seaton Delaval as a safeguarded location for a future railway station.
- The station was a sustainable development which policies confirm should be supported and there were no objections from Statutory Consultees and when balanced against the objections the significant economic, social and environmental benefits, the scheme should be approved.
- The application had been thoroughly assessed and had been found to be in accordance with the relevant planning policies and he respectfully urged Members to accept the Officer's recommendation to approve the application.

In response to questions from Members of the Committee the following information was provided:-

- There was a condition related to the management of the car park and Mr Halliday had set out the logic of the proposed layout. There were some physical issues in relation to the design and circulation of traffic in the car park which needed to be taken into consideration such as to avoid cars passing in large numbers between where people were parking and walking to the station, for safety reasons. Some fine tuning of the operation of the car park could be undertaken as part of the management strategy however it would not be possible to change the total layout of the car park at this stage without deferring the application and if a changed layout went outside the red line boundary then a whole new planning application would be required. There were a number of conditions to be attached to any permission granted and when these were read as a whole with the report, such as those which required a detailed landscape plan, which it was thought could address some

Ch.'s Initials.....

of the concerns of the residents. There had been a need to balance issues such as noise, ecology, lighting, constraints of the site and if any changes were proposed then there would be a need to go back to all consultees. A lot of work had been undertaken to satisfy conditions and the application before Members provided the best balance of the requirements of other consultees.

- Work could be undertaken as part of the landscaping scheme to be submitted to look at the type of screen planting taking into account all angles and the openness of the area and the distance between the properties and the car park.
- There would be a light traffic controlled access to the car park and extensive modelling to show capacity and the safety improvements which would be required had been undertaken.
- There was to be some modest landscaping and SUDs areas incorporated into the car park to break up the visual impact and would also provide a drainage function, however it had been made clear by any operator of the car park that due to maintenance issues, it should not be shrub planting and was likely that any planting would be low level.
- There was an active policy to promote the use of sustainable transport and in this instance the level of car parking provision was appropriate as, whilst it encouraged the use of cars, it would result in shorter car journeys with residents parking at the station and then travelling the rest of their journey by train. If the number of spaces were reduced then there was the risk of people being put off using the rail line or displacing parking into neighbouring residential areas. Any phasing of the use of the car park could be proposed as part of the management plan.
- An RAC Foundation report had advised that between July and September 2021, the levels of traffic within urban centres had returned to pre-covid levels with people doing less walking/cycling than they had during lockdown.
- Neighbouring housing estates could be used by cyclists to access the station.
- There were no buildings to be provided at any of the stations only some wet weather protection.

Councillor Hutchinson proposed acceptance of the recommendation to approve the application subject to the conditions as outlined in the report and additions and amendments contained in the addendum report which was seconded by Councillor Flux.

Members considered that the points raised in Mr Billingham's email had been addressed in the report. It was suggested that details of the car park management plan and the landscaping plan could be agreed with the Chair to ensure that the final schemes reflected the concerns of the Members. Councillors Hutchinson and Flux advised that they would be happy for this to be added to the proposal to approve the application. A vote was taken on the proposal to approve the application as outlined and it was unanimously

RESOLVED that the application be **GRANTED** for the reasons and with the conditions in the report and amendments and additional conditions outlined in the addendum report with the Car Park Management Plan and Landscaping Plan to be agreed by the Chair of the Strategic Planning Committee.

52 APPEALS UPDATE

Ch.'s Initials.....

RESOLVED that the information be noted.

53 **S106 AGREEMENTS UPDATE REPORT**

RESOLVED that the information be noted.

CHAIR.....

DATE.....

Ch.'s Initials.....