

**THE MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING  
OF THE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL AND REGULATORY PANEL  
HELD ON THURSDAY 15 NOVEMBER 2007**

- Present:** Councillors M Routledge (Chair)  
Councillors B Bates, Mrs M Baird,  
Mrs G Bleasdale, R Davison, Mrs A E Laing,  
Mrs J Maitland, D Milsom, D J Taylor-Gooby  
and C Walker
- Objectors:** J Barnes, J Hillam, T Butler, E Jones,  
M Brown, P Bloomfield, J. Horne,  
M McBain, B Beavis, T Cowan,  
I Rosenvinge, J Graham
- Supporters:** Mrs Osborne, Mr F Musgrave, Mr H Musgrave

1. **APPLICATIONS UNDER THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACTS  
TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990  
PLANNING (LISTED BUILDINGS AND CONSERVATION AREAS) ACT 1990**

**2007/0433 SHOTTON (HASWELL AND SHOTTON) - 2 NO. WIND  
TURBINES, ACCESS ROADS AND SUB-STATION BUILDING AT  
EDDER ACRES FARM, SHOTTON COLLIERY FOR MR. A.  
HENSHER, A7 ENERGY LIMITED**

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control Services which recommended refusal as the proposals by reasons of their scale and location in relation to Shotton Airfield, were likely to adversely affect the current operations and future expansion prospects of the airfield, thereby jeopardising the continued operation of the airfield as an important local resource and sporting facility, contrary to Policies 1, 35 and 90 of the District of Easington Local Plan. Insufficient information had been provided to allow the Local Planning Authority to consider whether or not the proposed development would have an adverse effect on species, especially protected by law. The proposal was therefore considered to be contrary to Policy 18 of the District of Easington Local Plan.

The Senior Planning Services Officer explained that Members had visited the site that day, were familiar with the location and setting and gave a detailed presentation on the main issues outlined in the report. Since the report was prepared, five further representations had been received, two objecting to the proposals and three letters in support on the grounds of supporting green energy and the use of renewables.

The Principal Planning Services Officer outlined the main planning considerations, the previous decision and Planning Inspectors' report, impact on Shotton Airfield with regard to the

## **Special Development Control and Regulatory Panel - 15 November 2007**

submitted risk assessment and the impact on protected species.

Mr Barnes, an objector, explained that he had worked at Sunderland Parachute Centre before it closed and moved to Shotton Airfield 22 years ago and they had received a lot of support from the District Council. The Council had supported them in the last application for wind turbines and hoped that they would support them once again.

Mr Hillam, an objector, explained that he was now an instructor at Peterlee Parachute Centre and previously at Border Parachute Centre in Northumberland until it closed. He had tried to find an alternative site in Northumberland and had looked for over two years for land and it had been extremely difficult to find a suitable site. Land was eventually found in Acklington and he had spent thousands of pounds only to be refused planning permission. Another site had been found north of Berwick but that was not suitable for students and without students a Parachute Centre would not be viable. There was a demand for parachuting and if the centre closed it would be a great loss to the region and the area.

T Butler explained that he was National Coach and Safety Officer for the British Parachute Association (BPA). He had been employed for more than 25 years giving technical expertise on sport parachuting. There was a duty to audit parachute centres and parachuting could not take place without permission from the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA). The CAA delegated responsibility to the BPA and he used his technical expertise to make recommendations to them as to whether the centre was suitable for parachutists. He had made in excess of 300 recommendations to the CAA and they had always accepted his recommendation.

The main consideration was the safety of the parachutists and the public. There needed to be a large open space, level ground, 500m diameter and there should be an adequate overshoot area. The hazards were also considered in drop zone areas. The risk assessment that had been completed by the applicant was by an individual who had no training, expertise or qualifications in sport parachuting. The report had been prepared by an expert in the wrong field.

In the last two years, a parachutist had struck a wind turbine in Germany. Sometimes parachutists had to deploy their reserve parachute and may not be able to out manoeuvre the wind turbine if the parachute opened at the same height. In 2004, he was a Member on the Board of Enquiry at a fatal accident in Peterlee and the parachutist had made the wrong decision. If this application was approved he would reluctantly recommend that serious restrictions be placed on the airfield which would affect its viability.

Mr Jones explained that he was Chairman of the British Parachute Association (BPA). If approved this would likely to

## **Special Development Control and Regulatory Panel - 15 November 2007**

result in safety restrictions on the airfield which inevitably would force it to close. It would deprive the North East of the one and only parachute facility. Peterlee was the only affiliated centre serving the North East and parachutists would have to travel to his centre, north of the Firth of Forth or Grange Over Sands, both of which were more than two hours drive away.

Parachuting improved health and gave young people a diversion. There had been over 1000 student parachute jumps and there were numerous clubs that used Peterlee Parachute Centre including the colleges, TA units, Police and Prison Officers. If the Parachute Centre closed, how many champions that would have been from the North East would be lost. He added that approval to the proposals was signing a death warrant for sport parachuting in the North East.

Nick Brown explained that he was representing the Universities and Peterlee Parachute Centre trained over 70 students per year. The Club was thriving and formed part of the social aspect for students. If the centre was to close there would be a drive of over two hours which was not viable for students. The club had produced a world champion sky diver, a formation team and a sector of the Army parachutists had been trained at the centre.

John Horne explained that he had recently retired from the Army after 32 years service and had been the commandant of the Parachute Centre in Wiltshire and Chair of the Army Safety Parachute Committee. The Army used adventurous training methods such as canoeing, scuba diving and sky diving. This was designed to prepare soldiers for operations in war by using an unfamiliar challenging situation to make them think clearly and act under pressure. Catterick Garrison was one of the largest UK Garrisons and many of the soldiers from Catterick were encouraged to use Peterlee Parachute Centre.

The army parachutists had existed since 1962 and were familiar with student drop zones. He did not concur with the risk assessment as this would compromise the safety of a drop zone and he felt that it would be a matter of time before parachutists collided with the turbine.

Paul Bloomfield explained that he was a local resident and parachutist. He had lived in the District for over 34 years and had done 67 jumps but was still inexperienced. If the turbine was built he would be faced with several hours of travel to participate in his sport and depending on the weather conditions may not be able to jump. Easington District had found itself in the media for several negative reasons including unemployment and obesity and he felt that Peterlee Parachute Centre put Easington District on international maps.

Malcolm McBain explained that he was Chief Pilot at Shotton Airfield. If the turbines were situated at Edder Acres it would have an effect on the approach pattern. The profile of the

## Special Development Control and Regulatory Panel - 15 November 2007

parachute flying was different to what was expected, in the last year there had been £120,000 raised for charitable causes.

Bill Beavis explained that he was a retired professional pilot and had been flying for 37 years. There were reports that the turbines stopped when faults developed but the turbines near the Nissan factory that caught fire did not stop operating until the blades burnt out. He referred to the fixed red obstruction light and queried how this could be placed on the turbine. The turbines did prove to be significant obstructions and the circuit patterns would have to be changed.

The blades of the turbines were pale grey in colour and would not be visible on a grey day. He referred to the vortex from the blades and explained that it was sometimes visible as a spiral trail and could persist for a long distance. The CAA recommended that light aircraft should be spaced six miles away. The light aircraft operated between 50-70 mph on landing and sometimes needed control and stick deflection. The pilot had little time to fly out of turbulence and recover. He queried if the Council felt that the risks with the turbine outweighed the hazard to pilots and passengers.

Tony Cowan explained that he was a military and civil pilot and had flown the police aeroplane for seven years and the Air Ambulance in Scotland. Sky Watch had 40 years of aviation experience and knew what was safe. He explained that there should be no significant obstructions in the vicinity of an airfield that would endanger aircraft using it. Parachutists and aircraft using Shotton Airfield were protected by a parachute zone 1½ mile radius from the centre of the parachute dropping area and up to 15,000 ft above the airfield. He circulated a map to Members showing the area. The proposed wind turbines at Edder Acres Farm had an elevation of 365 ft and may be considered to be significant obstructions. The natural flight path for aircraft approaching Shotton Airfield from the South to land on runway 30 was from the junction of the A19 and the B1281 to the runway threshold and between the residential areas of Peterlee and Shotton Colliery.

The proposed wind turbines would be at a position when aircraft may be expected to be at 400 ft above ground level when landing on runway 30 and would present a serious danger to flight safety. Wind turbines were a renewable source of energy but relied on the vagaries of the wind. They must be backed up by conventional power stations. The proponents of wind turbines presumed that each wind turbine would produce electricity at 30% of capacity sufficient to supply 500 homes. There were 24.5 million homes in the UK.

Mr Cowan referred to other wind turbines in the area and gave statistics on their efficiency. Four wind turbines at Windmill Hill near Hetton le Hole were no longer in use and one had a blade missing. The two offshore wind turbines in Blyth were dead in the water. It could only be argued that low wind speeds did not favour the North East for the deployment of wind turbines. The

## Special Development Control and Regulatory Panel - 15 November 2007

airfield at Shotton was a community facility and had been recommended for the location for a unit of the Sky Watch Auxiliary Air Service. Sky Watch used light aircraft including those aircraft that belonged to the Peterlee Parachute Centre to search for missing persons, patrol areas of potential danger, such as railway lines and beaches, and to assist the community with aerial observation in the event of a national emergency.

Mr Rosenvinge explained that Susan O'Connor could not attend that evening and she ran an Aerosports Club which employed three people.

Louise Cliff explained that she was a parachute rigger at Peterlee Parachute Centre, although this was a part time job. If Peterlee Parachute Centre was to cease, then the business would go with it.

John Graham explained that he was a resident of Castlegate estate in Peterlee and was registering his objection to the visual impact the turbines would have. They would be 30 ft bigger than the turbines located at Harehill and would be three quarters the size of Blackpool Tower. The proximity to homes would blight the properties. Five estate agents in the area had explained that the properties would devalue by approximately 25-30%. People had bought their properties as an investment. If the turbines were built people would not be attracted to executive housing and the District would lose out in industry.

Mr Graham explained that there would be noise pollution from the blades and the turbines would be loudest when the wind was blowing hard. When there was no wind, turbines were fitted to use radiation cooling and there could be no wind at ground level.

Mr Graham explained that residents would suffer lack of sleep which would affect their health due to the noise pollution. When the sun sets in the west, shadow flicker would occur which would create a pulsating light effect in rooms. TV signals, mobile phones and other electronic equipment would all be affected by the spinning blades. British Wind Energy proposed that turbines should be at least 800 m from any human dwelling, the closest house was 500 m away.

Ian Rosenvinge explained that he was the Chief Instructor at Peterlee Parachute Centre and owned the company that operated the airfield. If the turbines were to be built then the airfield would have stringent restrictions placed on them and they may no longer become economically viable. Aircraft would be forced to change their approach and fly over a more residential area. He had invested £800,000 in the airfield's infrastructure with new tarmac to the runway, taxiway and access road and an underground fuel installation had been built. There had been some small financial investment from the private sector but this was largely funded by loans, which was unpinned by the Parachute Centre.

## Special Development Control and Regulatory Panel - 15 November 2007

Mr Rosenvinge explained that development of the airfield had been held up for three years because of the wind turbine application. He only objected to the turbine because it was within the 1½ mile drop zone.

Mr Rosenvinge queried the expertise of the person who had carried out the risk assessment. He had been advised that A7 Energy had approached a parachuting expert to carry out the risk assessment but they had refused. He felt that the person who had completed the risk assessment did not even know where Shotton Colliery was.

In an emergency situation, if a parachutist had to use his reserve chute then he would be unable to manoeuvre away from the turbine. One parachutist had to deploy their reserve chute twice in one day over Edder Acres.

The airfield brought in the business travellers and VIP's including the Royal Flight who occasionally refuelled at the airfield. Matt Baker, the Blue Peter presenter, went to school in Easington and had been to the airfield to fly over his old school. The airfield would not be financially viable and he would face personal ruin, possibly lose his house and assets. If the site was moved further to the south, then he would not be objecting.

Mrs Osborne, a supporter, explained that any statistics she quoted were from public sources. She explained that she was a resident of Shotton Colliery and a lecturer at Durham University and her loyalty lay with the people and farmers who were struggling to make a living. Unemployment was high, one figure was 7.7 in the District and 2.2 in some other areas. She was proud of the District Council with its strong policies. The District had come a long way in getting the message across. She had been disappointed that the factory AKS had their application for a wind turbine refused. Turbines were a lot more efficient than had been quoted earlier in one of the objector's presentations.

After the last refusal, she had written to John Cummings MP who had explained that the planning authority always faced difficult decisions but he was aware of a similar application near Nissan in Sunderland that had been approved. She explained that Nissan was 15 miles away where the previous parachute centre had been located.

Mrs Osborne explained that sustainable energy was a better way forward for all. The Government had set a target of 10% of electricity supplies from renewable energy by 2010. The Queen's speech included an environmental policy and she quoted from the Chair of the Public Accounts Committee. Local authorities must engage with obstacles that were put towards them. Factory units would never be filled if they were to be disadvantaged because they could not use wind turbines for efficiencies. Jobs were a priority in the area. The Parachute

## **Special Development Control and Regulatory Panel - 15 November 2007**

Centre blocked the turbines because it impinged on their drop zone. She felt the airfield was in the wrong place as the dangers were enormous, there were too many high industrial and residential areas and was also on the perimeter of the one of the biggest primary schools in the area.

Mrs Osborne explained that she lived over the road from the airfield and the noise pollution was horrendous. When Mr Rosenvinge wanted to expand the airfield, she had collected a petition of 400 signatures objecting to it. The students that used the airfield just passed through and did not contribute to the area. She added that her daughter had telephoned the airfield and had been advised that it cost £220 - £270 for a parachute jump. She felt that the airfield was for an elite group of planes to refuel. Mr Rosenvinge was a businessman and was there to make money. When he purchased the airfield he may not have realised that the area was growing and environmental changes were impacting on the way we lived.

Mr Hall had explained to her that she must try to stop the owners of the airfield because the parachute club was being turned into a community enterprise. Many houses had lost their value in Shotton simply because the airfield was located next to them. There were a lot of businessmen in the area and they all needed equal consideration.

Mr H Musgrave explained that he was a local resident and had lived in Shotton for 42 years and wanted to express his support for the wind turbines. The application had been in the development stages for over three years with the previous application and subsequent appeal. He queried if the District Council supported the Climate Change Programme and particularly their pledge to develop their renewable energy/low carbon technologies from poor to good by 2010. Poor related to a general understanding of these technologies, whilst good represented a positive attitude towards renewable energy. Would the construction and operation of two wind turbines located adjacent to high voltage cables and pylons materially impact on the operational constraints of Peterlee Parachute Club, directly leading to closure when located at a minimum 1,900 m and 2,100 m from the most extreme centre of the parachute landing area.

Mr Musgrave objected to the comment on the subjective and emotional comments made on the application from the large representation opposing the application. It was with interest when reviewing the official comments made, that the majority of objections had been tabled as a consequence of canvassing from the Parachute Club. The Club had to be congratulated on the press relations activities that had been undertaken over the last two years in respect of all applications that had been made to introduce wind turbines into Easington District, however, when the owner of the Club actively suggested the same phrases in chat rooms and web sites that then appeared in such objections, the authenticity of such support could be called into question. He was not surprised to note that Mr

## Special Development Control and Regulatory Panel - 15 November 2007

Rosenvinge had suggested some of the phrases that had been pasted and various objections submitted.

Mr Musgrave explained that it was clear that Mr Rosenvinge was intent on eliminating any possibility for development in the surrounding area that would impact on any aspect of the operational requirements of the airfield and had resorted to widespread canvassing of support for his cause against the application as well as AKS.

If the supporters of Peterlee Parachute Club had delved a little further, they would see that A7 Energy had submitted more detailed supporting information, environmental analysis and risk assessments than was required for such an application. A cursory review of the environmental report prepared by N Tech dated November 2004 provided clear unequivocal data analysis and conclusion that completely voided the arguments suggested in the majority of the objections noted, examples were:-

- \* Noise – a complete set of acoustic surveys were undertaken that stated that the construction and operation of the turbines would not surpass the statutory requirement of an additional 5dB over ambient day and night time noise levels.
- \* Ice throw – no recorded incidents had been made in the UK and the distance required for such turbines to properties or public rights of way was greater than the health and safety legislation.
- \* Flicker – in the worse case scenario a small number of dwellings would suffer shadow flicker for a maximum of 56 – 90 hours per year or less than 1% per annum. A7 Energy had committed to introducing natural barriers, hedges etc or programming the turbines to stop during these periods.
- \* Signal distortion – no interference of microwave signals would occur with the small risked dwellings using terrestrial receivers. A7 Energy had committed to providing booster receivers, relocating receivers or installing digital receivers. These would be required in 2012 when the digital transfer was undertaken in the area.

Mr Musgrave queried what the District Council's response to climate change was. In 2006 the Council published their Climate Change Community Action Plan 2006 with the support of Ian Pearson, Minister of State for Climate Change and the Environment, John Cummings MP and Alan Napier, Leader of the Council. Easington District Council pledged to reduce carbon dioxide emissions in supporting the development and integration of low carbon technologies within the District. To date, however, the District Council was ranked as poor in their performance indicator for renewable/low carbon technologies,



## Special Development Control and Regulatory Panel - 15 November 2007

with a clear statement indicating that the District contained no large scale renewable projects.

The application for two Siemens Bonus 2.3 turbines present the Council with a clear opportunity to rectify the position. The two turbines alone generate 4.6 mw of power per annum, enough to power 4,000 homes and would reduce carbon emissions as a consequence by 10,303 tonnes per annum. Over their lives they would therefore contribute 115 mw of power to the power grid and reduce carbon emissions by a staggering 258,000 tonnes.

The UK had over 40% of Europe's wind resource and therefore presented a huge opportunity to capitalise on this natural renewable resource. The British Government had made a clear stand on global climate change and the political and economic requirement to generate power requirements rather than relying wholly on volatile sources of energy such as Russia or the Middle East. As part of the policy, the Government required low carbon or renewable technologies to be implemented in order to achieve the renewable energy and reduced carbon emissions target set.

Mr Musgrave explained that he had reviewed many of the Club's literature and other media and deduced that the Club had in the order of 5,000 drops per annum, the majority of which were made using prevailing south westerly approach to the drop zone and would in an emergency take a parachutist beyond the drop zone into the adjacent factory business location, a situation that had already occurred.

In terms of the local economic benefit that Edder Acres Farm presented, which was measurable and real, compared to a limited local filling stations and retail stores, the construction alone of the turbines would contribute £1.2 m in construction work to local firms and suppliers. Additionally, landowners who were farmers truly produced for the benefit of the local community through natural produce, wheat, barley, hay, beef, chickens, potatoes, horse grazing as well as a natural habitat for birds which could not be measured in financial terms alone.

In conclusion, he felt that there was a clear environmental benefit of the application to both the local community and District and the lack of true impact on the airfield either recreational or economic provide little reason for the application to be rejected. A7 Energy and the landowners had provided supporting information and clear objective and unbiased analysis of the application.

Mr F Musgrave explained that he lived at Edder Acres Farm and had farmed the land with his father for 69 years. They supported the local community and paid council tax to the District Council. Mr Rosenvinge lived outside Easington District and Shotton and did not contribute to the local shops. Excessive noise and pollution had been referred to but the two turbines would generally be quiet, clean and give power 24

## Special Development Control and Regulatory Panel - 15 November 2007

hours per day. The site would be of no danger to any parachutist. The dangers were the North West Industrial Estate, Whitehouse Business Park and Brackenhill Business Park and 2½ acre fishing pond and woodland area. They would have to negotiate these obstacles first. Experts had calculated that it was a one in 25 million chance of a parachutist hitting the turbine. One of the biggest dangers would be if they landed near a school and injured a child. People who used the centre did not live there or in the surrounding villages.

Following the foot and mouth disease, DEFRA had advised farmers to diversify. He did not want to go down that road and wanted to keep on with family farming and the only way to achieve this was by installing the wind turbines to enable him to keep the farm. AKS had applied for a wind turbine and he felt that there should be a compromise, the turbine only required a few square metres of land and there would be not much farmland out of production.

Mr Musgrave explained that he had asked for the site visit to come into the farm that morning. He had been advised that they did not go into his farm but had viewed the site from distances at Shotton, Wingate and Peterlee and was very disappointed.

The Chair explained that Members had attended a site visit that morning and had completed a full circle of the area. They had felt that there was no benefit to be gained from visiting Edder Acres Farm or Shotton Airfield.

Mr Cochrane explained that he was a resident of Shotton and ran a business in Peterlee and had been kept up to date by press articles. The press had only been given objections to the application. He referred to the article in the Journal on 13 November when it was explained that 327 signatures of objection had been submitted against the application and that Easington District Council had recommended refusal. He had spoken to a lot of residents who would prefer to have the turbines and see Shotton Airfield closed. More people had signed the petition to close the airfield than to object against the turbines. There were no turbines located in Easington District and he queried what the opposition to them was as they posed no threat to wildlife. He queried what would happen if there was a power shortage.

Mr. Cochrane referred to AKS's application for a wind turbine and explained that Edder Acres turbines were further away than the Industrial Estate turbine. He referred to Cassop Primary School and they had been awarded a class A for carbon emissions, what would be the outcome if schools in the area wanted to go in that direction? He explained that he looked onto the turbines at Harehill and they were almost directly in line with the runway, whereas Edder Acres was south west of the runway. With the prevailing wind, there would be very few days in the year that it would be affected. He queried why Mr Rosenvinge and A7 Energy could not work with each other.

## Special Development Control and Regulatory Panel - 15 November 2007

Mr Cochrane explained that his company was due to be relocated from the North East Industrial Estate and most probably to the North West Industrial Estate which was located near the airfield. He was worried that if he was relocated there and had to use alternative forms of energy then he would be refused. He employed 30 people and did not want to lose employment. He congratulated Mr Rosenvinge on the charitable work he had done and hoped that an amicable solution could be reached. He added that he was a worried businessman and wanted to be a good neighbour.

The Principal Planning Services Officer explained that although the reasons for keeping the airfield open were important, they were not planning matters and what needed to be taken into consideration was how the development impacted on the local area and facilities. There had been a lot of detailed technical comments and he was in no position to either agree or disagree with them. The District Council consulted with relevant technical experts and all responses were incorporated in the report. The Planning Inspector had stated that the impact on local residents was not sufficient to refuse planning permission. With regard to renewable energy, the Council did support it but as a Local Planning Authority a whole range of factors had to be considered. The Council were dealing with a number of applications for wind turbines and they were all dealt with on their planning merits. Planning permission had been granted for two turbines near Seaton some years ago.

The previous planning application and decision had resulted in a planning appeal. Planning appeals had to be taken seriously. The Council had refused the application two years ago and it had also been refused on appeal. The Inspector had acknowledged it would affect the viability of the airfield. The Council's position had not changed since the previous application and was therefore recommended for refusal.

Mr Morton explained that he lived in Easington Village and most people had spoken that the airfield was an asset but he was concerned if they had to change the flightpaths regarding the noise pollution. He added that he was not for or against the application and queried if solar panels could not be used then there would not be a problem.

Councillor Maslin explained that she had nothing further to add to what had been said but she would urge the Panel to support the Officers' recommendation to refuse the application.

Mrs Whittle explained that she had moved to Shotton three years ago and it was very homely. Because of the two turbines at Harehill she couldn't watch her TV for the flickering and the TV jumping.

A Member queried who would impose the conditions on the airfield if the turbines were approved. Mr Butler explained that the BPA would suggest this on recommendation from himself or

## **Special Development Control and Regulatory Panel - 15 November 2007**

a colleague. There would be no student parachute jumps if the wind was blowing to or from the wind turbines.

A Member queried if the 1.5 m radius was a CCA regulation. Mr Butler explained that 1.5 radius was the notified airspace so other users knew that parachute activity was taking place.

A Member referred to the turbines at Warden Law and queried what provision was made if they were decommissioned. The Senior Planning Services Officer explained that there would be a maintenance programme and the turbines checked on a regular basis and any defects reported and repaired. It would be a condition that the turbine be removed if decommissioned.

A Member commented that the Council was supporting clean energy but this was also a sport facility in the region and thought this should be taken into consideration. To keep the sporting facility was equally beneficial as clean energy.

**RESOLVED** that the application be refused.

### **2. PLANNING APPLICATION NUMBER 2007/0493 - 14 HOUSES AND 36 NUMBER APARTMENTS AT JAMIE'S TILES, THE AVENUE, MURTON**

The Head of Planning and Building Control Services explained that on 4 September 2007, the Panel approved dual recommendation which sought to conditionally approve the application subject to completion of a Section 106 Agreement or to refuse the application should a satisfactory 106 Agreement not be received within the prescribed time period. In either case, authority was delegated to the Head of Planning and Building Control Services to issue the decision.

The application was a major application and the time period prescribed by Government for the determination of this type of application was 13 weeks. On this basis, the expiry date for the application was 15 October 2007. In the event the Section 106 Agreement was signed on 28 September and planning permission was granted on the same date under the delegated authority described above.

Since that time, a Freedom of Information request from a local resident had questioned the date by which the Section 106 Agreement should have been received by the Council. It had emerged that this was incorrectly specified in both the Panel report and the minutes of the meeting of 14 September 2007. The Head of Planning and Building Control Services had reviewed the case in consultation with the Monitoring Officer, concluding that delegated authority to determine the application was exercised in accordance with the wishes of the Development Control and Regulatory Panel i.e. that it was the intention of the Panel to approve the application should the Section 106 Agreement be received in the time period prescribed by Government which was 13 weeks.

The Panel was requested to note the delegated authority exercised by the Head of Planning and Building Control Services in relation to this planning application.

**Special Development Control and Regulatory Panel - 15 November 2007**

**RESOLVED** that the Panel note the delegated authority exercised by the Head of Planning and Building Control Services in relation to the planning application.

JC/KA/COM/DEV/071104  
5 December 2007