

## **DURHAM COUNTY COUNCIL**

At a Meeting of **County Planning Committee** held in Council Chamber - County Hall, Durham on **Tuesday 30 July 2019 at 1.00 pm**

### **Present:**

**Councillor J Robinson (Chair)**

### **Members of the Committee:**

Councillors J Atkinson, A Bell, J Clare, K Corrigan, J Higgins, E Huntington, I Jewell, A Laing, G Richardson, A Shield, J Shuttleworth, A Simpson, M Wilkes and S Wilson

Councillor Robinson advised that the meeting was starting slightly late because legal advice regarding declarations of interest had needed to be obtained for both applications on the agenda.

### **1 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Hawley, Kay and Tinsley.

### **2 Substitute Members**

Councillor Higgins as substitute Member for Tinsley and Councillor Huntington as substitute Member for Councillor Kay.

### **3 Declarations of Interest**

Dave Wafer, Strategic Highways Manager informed the Committee that he was a Director of Forest Park, the applicants for the first agenda item and he would not give any advice to the Committee on this item.

Councillor Clare, under significant protest, declared an interest on the Forest Park application having received advice that his membership of the Friends of Darlington and Stockton Railway might appear to an impartial observer as compromising his impartiality, something which he absolutely disputed, but he would withdraw from the meeting. He noted however that he would be allowed to speak on the application as a local Member.

Councillor Robinson informed Councillor Clare that the County Solicitor had advised that he could not speak as a local Member and he would need to withdraw from the meeting.

Neil Carter, Planning and Development Solicitor confirmed that the advice received from the Head of Legal was that because Councillor Clare was declaring an interest on the item he could not speak as Ward Member, the interest precluded participation as Ward Member as well as a Member of the Committee.

Councillor Clare requested that the minutes indicate that he was absolutely furious with this decision. This was a major issue for Newton Aycliffe and he was elected to represent his residents on matters such as this and that was why he was a Member of the Committee. To be deprived of a voice was outrageous. Councillor Clare asked that this also be included in the minutes.

Councillors Clare and Atkinson withdrew from the meeting. Councillor Atkinson agreed with all matters raised by Councillor Clare.

#### **4 Minutes**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 2 July 2019 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

#### **5 Applications to be determined**

##### **a DM/19/00283/OUT - Land to the north of Newton Park Services, Newton Park, Coatham Mundeville, DL1 3NL**

Prior to consideration of the item Councillor Laing asked whether Councillor Atkinson had declared an interest in the item before he withdrew from the meeting. The Planning and Development Solicitor replied that Councillor Atkinson had reiterated the points raised by Councillor Clare and it was therefore understood he was declaring the same interest.

The Committee considered a report of the Principal Planning Officer regarding an outline planning application (all matters reserved) for an Industrial and Trade Park (Class BI(c)/B2/B8) with ancillary open space, hotel (Class C1), pub (Class A4) and roadside restaurant and retail units (Class A1/A3/A5) with petrol station (sui generis) and associated infrastructure, parking and landscaping on land to the north of Newton Park Services, Newton Park, Coatham Mundeville (for copy see file of Minutes).

H Jones, Principal Planning Officer provided a detailed presentation of the application which included a site location plan, aerial photograph of the site,

site photographs and site layout. Members of the Committee had visited the site the previous day and were familiar with its location and setting.

Mr N Hammond of The Friends of Stockton and Darlington Railway (S&DR) addressed the Committee to object to the application. The Friends of S&DR was a registered charity whose objectives were the conservation and celebration of the Stockton and Darlington Railway of 1825, which was the birthplace of the modern railway and a heritage asset of national and international significance. The Heritage of the of the Railway had huge potential for inspiring education, volunteering and community pride along with significant economic regeneration and growth of the tourism industry and would be the focus of international attention in the lead up to the bicentenary in 2025. The comments of the Friends were summarised in paragraph 84 of the Committee report and while being supportive of the economic benefits of application, the Friends would raise the following in support of their objection.

There was inadequate provision for the Railway walking and cycling heritage trail which was intended to run from Witton Park to Stockton as near as possible to the 1825 line. The Friends had engaged with the design of the scheme some 18 months ago and it was disappointing that little consideration had been given to the Friends concerns in the proposed design to ensure that the heritage trail ran adjacent to the historic track on a landscaped route which visitors and tourist would value rather than being sent through an industrial park. The Friend believed that paragraph 56 of the Committee report should be updated to allow some weight to be attached to the policies of the emerging local plan which identified the values that the S&DR heritage could bring. The County Durham Plan had been approved by the Council, submitted to the Secretary of State, an Inspector appointed and a timetable for the examination in public had been announced. The policies relevant to this application had been well received during consultation and were likely to be included in the adopted Plan. Some weight should therefore be given to them in conformity with paragraphs 48 and 192 of the NPPF.

Whichever policies were applied, the Friends agreed that development should be designed to avoid adverse impact on the non-designated S&DR heritage asset. This could be achieved by providing a 15 metre wide suitably landscaped corridor with tree belt between the development and the railway. The corridor could be designed to carry a 3 metre path for the heritage trail, and the path would not adversely affect the viability of the developable area and would not sterilise the intended rail freight interchange. It would be some years before the developers through site path could be provided and there was no guarantee it would be provided in time for the 2025 celebrations. The Friends therefore suggested that a temporary path be created in the landscape corridor, to remain until such time that firm proposals were put forward for the rail served use for Unit 6, whichever form that may take. Only then would it be known where or how the rail link was to

be provided and what the implications would be for the path to cross it. If there were insurmountable problems the path could be redirected to the through site option required by proposed Condition 5. If the lineside route could be delivered the work to create the through site route would not be abortive as this would be required in any event.

Consultants WSP had been appointed by the Rail Heritage Board on which the County Council had representation along with Darlington and Stockton Councils and the Tees Valley Combined Authority to design the heritage trail. As of last Friday the project team had confirmed that the lineside route was their current preferred option. With some little thought and design work the County and region could benefit from both this development and the S&DR heritage trail along its preferred lineside route. This was not an either/or decision. The Friends requested that final sentence of proposed Condition 5 be amended to read 'a specific route through or alongside the site for the Stockton and Darlington Railway heritage trail' and that the reason for this Condition be to comply with policies in the emerging County Durham Plan as well as existing national and local policies.

The Friends offered their assistance and expertise in the development of the required landscape masterplan and strategy and trusted they would have an opportunity to be involved.

On behalf of the Friends of the S&DR Mr Hammond thanked the Committee for the opportunity to speak.

Jon Robinson of Barberry and Andy Palmer, Head of Transformation, Durham County Council addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Mr Palmer explained that he was attending the meeting as Chair of Forest Park Ltd. The application was a 48 hectare development on the southern border of Newton Aycliffe Industrial Estate and would effectively extend the business park to the south to become one of the largest business parks in the region. The development would offer complimentary employment land adjacent to Hitachi trains and also would benefit from the engineering companies on Aycliffe Industrial Estate.

The development would significantly contribute to the employment land requirement of County Durham. The main site would comprise industrial and trade park uses with ancillary office space and the smaller front plot could be used for trade counter type activity as well as a hotel. The enabling infrastructure works of gas, drainage, power were already on the site by using a grant from the North East LEP and the grant conditions cemented the planning uses for the site. The strategic context of the application was that it fully supported the North East LEPs vision of more and better jobs, the

County Durham Economic Partnership's aim of improving the employment rate and the County Council's aim of creating an altogether wealthier Durham.

The development would see significant job creation of high-quality jobs with a high gross value added into the local economy. The development would create 96 direct and 75 indirect jobs within the construction period and over 3,100 higher quality jobs once the site was fully operational. The site would also generate significant business rates which would contribute to public services in the County.

The proposed development would retain the existing ecological corridor and watercourse through the site and would introduce additional species and biodiversity on the site. The site was sustainably located with additional bus services proposed to create sustainable travel planning. There had been significant pre-application engagement with the local business community and the site had been well received.

The proposed development contributed to delivering sustainable economic and social benefits for the area and was environmentally sound and was therefore in line with both national and local policy objectives. Mr J Robinson of Richardson Barberry addressed the Committee. Mr Robinson thanked the planning officer for supporting the application and recommending it for approval.

Working alongside the County Council, Forest Park Ltd and the Local Enterprise Partnership the vision was to provide a business park that provided a wide range of high quality accommodation which attracted inward investment to County Durham from regional, national and international businesses. This would stimulate economic growth, create over 3,100 high quality jobs for the region, allow businesses to flourish, retain local talent, and build opportunities for future generations.

Richardson Barberry were committed to delivering one of the region's premier business parks that would extend the offering at Aycliffe Business Park and when combined would be the largest business park in the north-east.

If the application was approved there would be further discussions with several key occupiers on the basis there was a prominent motorway connected site, fully serviced with planning consent.

The Principal Planning Officer replied to the points raised. The paragraph in the Committee report which referenced the County Durham Plan was considered up to date and the Council was currently not attributing any weight to the County Durham Plan.

With reference to the impact of the development on the setting of the railway line, which was a non-designated heritage asset, the Principal Planning Officer informed the Committee that Design and Conservation had raised no objections to the impacts of the development on its setting as a heritage asset. With reference to the actual route for the enjoyment of the non-designated heritage asset and the suggested modification of Condition 5 relating to this, it was highlighted that the application was an outline application and there were still quite a lot of unknowns regarding the layout and potentially at the reserved matters stage as different units came forward then there could be quite a lot of change and there would be ways and means of devising a route through the site for the purposes of the S&DR railway line. At this stage, because unit 6 had a particular potential future use a precautionary approach had been adopted that, if under this planning application there was a specific designation of an easement of a 15 metre corridor along the route there were concerns that this would potentially sterilise that potential future use from coming forward, There was a condition that a route would be found which could, in some scenarios, address more of the requirements of the Friends of the S&DR than currently. There was no need to amend the wording of the condition in the manner requested as the current wording could cater for all eventualities in relation to the route.

Councillor Jewell thanked all those who had contributed to the debate. This was a clear and positive application with many positive aspects and many benefits to the area. While there were some small issues these had been mitigated by the suggested planning conditions. While Councillor Jewell **moved** that the application be approved he hoped that in the future the suggestions made by the Friends of S&DR could be taken on board.

Councillor Laing agreed with Councillor Jewell had no hesitation in **seconding** approval of the application. The application would enhance the site into an industrial trade park and attract over 3,00 jobs.

Councillor Shield considered the report to be well presented and gave credit to those who had been involved in establishing this opportunity which he wished there were more of in his area of County Durham.

Councillor Shield expressed caution and referenced paragraph 69 of the report. There was the potential for Great Crested Newts and the trapping and translocation, not relocation, had to be undertaken at specific times, not when they were hibernating.

Cllr Shuttleworth stated that while the 3,000 jobs were welcome he requested clarification. The two local Members had not been allowed to speak on the application yet nearly all of the directors of Forest Park Ltd were local government officers.

The Planning and Development Solicitor replied that it was a matter of the rules contained in the Members Code of Conduct because Members were at Committee to make decisions, the officers were not.

Councillor Shuttleworth sought clarification on what interest the County Council had in the company because a lot of council officers were involved with it. The Planning and Development Solicitor replied that although he did not know the answer to this, the applicant could be asked for clarification. However, he was not sure how this was of direct relevance to the decision which the Committee had to make and requested that the applicant clarify this.

Councillor Robinson reminded the Committee that at the beginning of the meeting both officers and Members had declared an interest. Councillor Shuttleworth believed that the local Members, even if not allowed to vote, were entitled to speak on behalf of their constituents. Councillor Robinson replied that he had asked this very point but had been advised by the County Solicitor that the Members could not speak.

Mr Palmer informed the Committee that Forest Park Ltd was established with the land owner, the Forest family, as a delivery vehicle to ensure that the site was delivered. Once the site was delivered the partnership would be dissolved. A development agreement was being signed with Richardson Barberry today. The Council's interest was as a delivery vehicle to ensure the site could be developed out.

Councillor Wilkes agreed with the points raised by Councillor Shuttleworth. He was concerned that officers had been allowed to speak but there was nothing in the report from the local Members to express their view. Councillor Wilkes was concerned about the impact of the development on the environment and asked that the map showing the proposed layout be shown. This showed an extremely dense site being built in open countryside with a stream currently running through the site with mature trees on either side. The density of the proposed development was excessive. The site would employ hundreds of people and Councillor Wilkes did not consider that there was sufficient open space. The development would take away good agricultural land and replace this with a high density of buildings. The policies of the Great Aycliffe Neighbourhood Plan mentioned replanting to encourage biodiversity at policy E4 and with this kind of density this could not be done. Policy CH1 of the Neighbourhood Plan and policy E15 of the Sedgefield Borough Local Plan required that the existing hedgerows on site and woodlands should be retained. Policy E1 of the Sedgefield Plan mentioned landscape protection and enhancement, the density of these proposals made that impossible.

NPPF 15 stated that the planning system should contribute to the enhancement of the natural environment and Councillor Wilkes asked how this development could do that.

The development would remove fields and open land, removing trees, divert and remove a waterway, impact on wild bird sites and impact on a heritage site. Councillor Wilkes could not see how this development could be contributing to the enhancement of the natural environment. Policy D1 of the Sedgefield Borough Plan required proper landscaping and a decent relationship to the open space. Proper landscaping was not possible on this development due to the density of it.

The report referred to £1/2 bn of benefit to County Durham, but the mitigation proposed was £170,000 worth. If the application was from a private developer with no interest at all from the County Council Councillor Wilkes would find it impossible to believe that the only mitigation would be £170,000 worth.

Councillor Wilkes considered that the Committee should only have been asked to be minded to approve the application because of the level of influence of the Council in Forest Park Ltd.

The Principal Planning Officer considered that many of the points raised by Councillor Wilkes drew a different conclusion on the same matters. It was accepted that there was a degree of landscape harm and that best and most versatile agricultural land was being lost. It was added that whilst the site was beyond the built up boundary of the settlement the site was bordered by an employment site, motorway and services so the surrounding area was a developed one rather than one of a particularly rural nature. In regards to the queries raised on the mitigation monies to be obtained by a s106 contribution it was advised that contributions could only be obtained from a development that met the CIL tests.

The Planning and Development Solicitor advised the Committee that there was nothing to preclude the Council from determining an application in which it has some interest. This was not a situation where the application needed to be referred to the Secretary of State.

Councillor Richardson informed the Committee that he had attended the site visit. He shared Councillor Wilkes concerns and also would have liked to have heard the views of the local Members.

Upon a vote being taken it was

**Resolved:**

That the application be approved subject to the completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement to secure:

- £173,668 towards off site biodiversity mitigation works.
- £100,000 towards providing a temporary bus service from the site.
- The provision of a targeted recruitment and training scheme on a voluntary basis.

and subject to the conditions contained in the report.

Councillors Atkinson and Clare re-joined the meeting.

**b DM/19/01084/FPA - Land south of The New Inn Junction along South Road to Mount Oswald and Hollingside Lane to Upper Mountjoy, Durham City**

Councillor Corrigan informed the Committee that she was a Council appointment to the Durham City Access for All Group which was mentioned at paragraph 81 of the report but had not attended any meetings which had discussed this application.

The Planning and Development Solicitor informed Councillor Corrigan that this would be noted for the Minutes but that there was no need to leave the meeting.

The Committee considered a report of the Principal Planning Officer regarding an application for infrastructure works including the provision of a new footpath route, highways works including new signalised crossing works at Hollingside Lane/South Road and Howlands Lane/South Road junctions and the creation of a car park of up to 215 spaces at Upper Mountjoy on land south of The New Inn junction along South Road to Mount Oswald and Hollingside Lane to Upper Mountjoy (for copy see file of Minutes).

H Jones, Principal Planning Officer provided a detailed presentation of the application which included a site location plan, aerial photograph of the site, site layout, existing photograph of the pedestrian route and proposed images. Members of the Committee had visited the site the previous day and were familiar with its location and setting.

The Principal Planning Officer informed the Committee that since the publication of the report three letters had been received from the Durham Access for All Group, the Durham Bicycle User Group and the City of Durham Trust. While there were several points of overall support the following key points were raised:

- That a Condition should be added to ensure that the proposal meets the Equalities Act as informed by an independent accessibility audit;

- A chicane barrier on the proposed cycle route through Little High Wood must be carefully designed so to ensure that it did not prevent access for all users;
- Some detailed cycling and footpath improvement proposals were raised – a section of path in the vicinity of the Hub at the bottom of Hollingside Lane is unnecessarily narrowed and it reiterated the need for dropped kerbs throughout the development
- Objection was maintained to the proposed 215 space car park and that element of the proposal should be refused;
- The scheme should be accompanied by an updated University Travel Plan.

In response, the Principal Planning Officer proposed that the County Council add, in the event of approval, two Conditions:

- One to resolve the final detail of the chicane feature to ensure it did permit as many users as possible through it, and
- There was a specific landscape feature within the Hub design which seemed unnecessarily to narrow one of the footpaths and a Condition was proposed to ensure the final landscaping did not narrow this route unnecessarily.

Councillor J Ashby of the City of Durham Parish Council addressed the Committee.

The City of Durham Parish Council considered that the University's application for a new "super route" for pedestrians and cyclists was most welcome in principle and represented a major investment to tackle longstanding problems. It was further welcome that the new alternative routes, whilst in University land, would be available for the general public to use.

In considering and welcoming this footpath and cycling scheme in principle, the Parish Planning Committee drew attention to particular concerns with the original application, and requested that the application as submitted should be referred back to the University to address these concerns.

The revisions as set out in the DPP letter to DCC dated 4 July 2019 and accompanying documents met most of the concerns expressed by the Parish Council. Cyclists and pedestrians would generally have separate paths, wheelchair users would have a step-free route, and adverse impact on trees had been significantly reduced. The positive response of the University to those concerns was to be applauded.

Having said that, the Parish Council continued to believe that the Masterplan had very significant economic, social and environmental impacts on the city and beyond, and should be subject to a comprehensive assessment in its

totality instead of being advanced piecemeal through individual applications and assessments. The Parish Council had advised the University of this view.

There remained an important point of concern with the revised super route application. The application still included provision of a 215 space car park. This involved far greater vehicular use of Hollingside Lane and would significantly worsen conditions for pedestrians and cyclists on this at present relatively quiet lane. The Parish Council considered that the 215 space car park element of the current application should not be approved and instead should be part of an updated comprehensive sustainable travel plan that addressed ways of influencing modal shift away from car usage. The County Council's own Durham City Sustainable Transport Delivery Plan recognised that, *"of great relevance to demand management through car parking policy, is the extensive parking that is available free of charge at major employment sites across the city. This represents an opportunity to control both the quantity and price of parking available to people working in Durham City, with the consequent potential to influence peak hour travel in particular."*

The Parish Council considered that the University, as a major employer in the city, should play its part in significantly reducing car usage through such measures as pricing, sharp reductions in the overall quantity of staff parking space, and a ban on students, other than on disability grounds, bringing cars to Durham city.

The Parish Council therefore considered that the car park component should await a comprehensive Travel Plan that demonstrated a significant shift away from car usage and much reduced need for car parking capacity.

Mr Lowe of the City of Durham Trust addressed the Committee. The Trust welcomed the application to improve pedestrian and cycle routes within the University's estate because this would help to accommodate its planned significant increase in student numbers. It was essential to ease the pressure on existing public pavements that were already heavily congested in this area and elsewhere in the City. The Trust also welcomed the revisions to the application that now provided for a route suitable for cycling and motorised wheelchairs via a footpath just inside Little High Wood. This would also provide segregation between cyclists and pedestrians for that part of the route.

The written submission of the Trust made some detailed suggestions about further improvements to access segregation that would be desirable on particular parts of the route which the Trust hoped the University and County Council would address during the implementation of the scheme. Mr Lowe welcomed the proposed additional Conditions suggested by the Principal Planning Officer during his presentation.

The objection of the Trust to the application focussed on the proposal to provide car park spaces at Upper Mountjoy. For such a significant car park proposal it was unacceptable that the application was not accompanied by a current travel plan and proposals for demand management. The latest available version of the University's travel plan only ran up until 2020. Without an up to date travel plan it was not possible to make a proper assessment of the need for the car park and access road. The Durham City Sustainable Transport Delivery Plan noted that the principal opportunity to reduce the amount of car parking provided by employers was likely to be as part of new developments where opportunities to better manage car as part of a wider travel plan could be investigated. This needed to be done in conjunction with the County Council and in conjunction with an assessment of the possible impact on neighbouring on-street parking.

In conclusion, while generally welcoming the new cycle and footpath provision the Trust requested that the car parking and access road elements of the application should be deferred pending further information from the University about its future travel plan and car parking demand management.

Mr Loudon, Director of Estates, Durham University addressed the Committee.

Durham University was seeking to improve the existing infrastructure provisions along South Road and Hollingside Lane in response to concerns raised by public consultations on its masterplan which had identified existing pressures on pedestrian and road user provision on around Durham sites. The project had been driven through safety concerns, not just for the University community but also the wider Durham community.

Significant consultations had taken place with members of the public, the local planning authority and various statutory and Durham County Council consultees. A consultation event had been held in the Pallatine Centre which members of the public were invited to attend and comment on the plans.

The proposals would result in an investment by the University of £8m in Durham City and into the University's academic estate which already made a significant contribution to the economic success locally, regionally and the UK economy. The scheme would improve the safety of all pedestrians and cyclist users and would ease congestion which was recognised to be an existing problem on South Road by improving the efficiency of movement and the permeability by pedestrians and cyclists in the north, south and east-west direction in the Elvet Hill/South Road area.

The proposed development would bring significant benefits by bringing about implementation of improvements to alleviate identified and recognised health

and safety issues related to movement in the South Road area and as a result would address the existing and future capacity constraints of the existing network. The scheme represented the implementation of a key component of the Durham University Masterplan 2017-2027 and was consistent with the University's academic plans. Investment in infrastructure around the University's Mountjoy estate would support the delivery of improved and desired future schemes in line with the Masterplan including two new colleges a new teaching building coming on stream in September 2019 and the new thematic computer science building which was under construction.

With reference to tree loss the University had spent considerable time and expense to ensure that no dig construction techniques were used to minimalise the impacts on existing trees with appropriate and considered mitigational planting. Mr Loudon assured Members that the University had listened to consultations and had changed the design to take into account comments from the local community. The scheme fell within the definition of sustainable development.

The University had discussed the proposed car park at length, which was seen as being important to the delivery of this project.

J McGargill, Highway Development Manager informed the Committee the Council had been advised that the proposed car park would replace existing car parking within the City. Placing a car park which was at the periphery of the City was preferable to having car parking space which was in the centre of the City.

Councillor Wilkes was pleased that the application had finally been submitted. He had raised concerns repeatedly about the expansion of the University without pedestrian and cycle safety being addressed. Councillor Wilkes thanked Council officers and University staff for their work in bringing the application forward.

Councillor Wilkes had concerns about the junctions and crossing signalisation which it was suggested was dependent upon some surveys. Councillor Wilkes sought assurance from highways that what was proposed would happen. Councillor Wilkes concurred with the Parish Council and the City of Durham Trust that an updated travel plan was needed as part of this application and Councillor Wilkes asked if this could be conditioned if the Committee supported this.

A huge number of trees were being removed as part of the application and Councillor Wilkes asked whether the proposed tree planting could take place in the autumn/winter of 2019.

Councillor Jewell informed the Committee that he had considered the application in detail. If car parking was not provided, cars would still come in to the City which would result in a worse situation. This scheme was an improvement on what was there prior. This was a positive scheme and Councillor Jewell **moved** approval of the application.

The Principal Planning Officer referred to the request for a travel plan and informed the Committee that there had been no objections in principle from the highway authority to the proposed car park and no objections had been received from the Sustainable Travel team and that was why there had been no request for an updated travel plan to accompany the application. If the Committee was not satisfied then the applicant could be asked how feasible it would be to resolve an updated travel plan under a Condition. Referring to tree loss there was a Condition to ensure that there was a compensation scheme for the tree loss. The University was keen to progress the scheme if permission was granted and therefore there was a requirement to agree what the landscaping compensation would be early in the application process.

Ged Lawson, Principal Landscape Officer informed the Committee that there was a Condition which required a scheme to be submitted for mitigation prior to the development. As part of that the Council would look to identify which elements could take place as soon as possible in advance sites which were well clear of the actual construction works and which would need to wait until the construction works took place. Discussions would take place with the University to progress as much as possible and then phase the work as the site progresses.

The Highway Development Manager, referred to the signalised junctions and informed the Committee that a Condition had been requested regarding the junctions because modelling work had been carried out to ascertain how the junctions would operate and the modelling exercise submitted by the applicant failed to prove that the junctions could be delivered in the way that was suggested. The signalised junctions performed the tasks of controlling traffic running through them and providing crossing facilities for the cycle/pedestrian routes. There were no doubts that crossing facilities could be provided for cyclists and pedestrians the concerns were could the signals be introduced to control the flow of traffic. However, the flow of traffic at Hollingside Lane was so low that a traffic signalled junction may not be necessary.

Councillor Richardson informed the Committee that the application proposed a long and winding footpath/cycleway and asked whether there were any areas where users may feel concern for their safety, particularly on dark evenings. The Principal Planning Officer replied that a lighting scheme was proposed and the police had raised no issues during the consultation on the

application. Additionally, this was an alternative route to the existing footpath on South Road with its adopted lighting columns which could be used.

Councillor Laing **seconded** approval of the application.

Councillor Wilkes sought clarification in terms of the updated travel plan. The intimation from the Principal Planning Officer was that if the Committee was minded to support the proposal then it could ask for this to be Conditioned. Councillor Jewell, the mover of the report, informed the Committee that he agreed for this to be included.

The applicant informed the Committee that the University already had a sustainable travel plan which was due to be revised next year.

Upon a vote being taken it was

**Resolved:**

That the application be approved subject to the Conditions contained in the report and those Conditions proposed by the Principal Planning Officer and the submission of an up to date travel plan.