

DURHAM COUNTY COUNCIL

At a Meeting of **County Planning Committee** held in Council Chamber, County Hall, Durham on **Tuesday 25 July 2017 at 1.00 pm**

Present:

Councillor J Robinson (Chairman)

Members of the Committee:

Councillors A Bell, H Bennett, J Clare, D Hicks, I Jewell, C Kay, H Nicholson, G Richardson, A Shield, F Tinsley (Vice-Chairman) and M Wilkes

1 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors A Laing and P Taylor.

2 Substitute Members

Councillor H Bennett as substitute Member for Councillor Laing.

3 Declarations of Interest

Councillor J Robinson declared an interest in Agenda Item 4 (c) – Land to the South of Eden Drive, Sedgfield because he had previously spoken on this application and had also spoken at the Planning Appeal. He would leave the room during discussion of and voting on the Item.

During the discussion of Agenda Item 4 (a) – Land at the North of Woodhouses Farm and South of Etherley Moor, Wigdan Walls Road, Woodhouses Councillor A Bell informed the Committee that he had come to realise he potentially knew the owner of the land the subject of the application because he rented a property from him. Councillor Bell was advised to leave the meeting during discussion of and voting on the Item.

4 Applications to be determined

a DM/17/01765/FPA - Land At The North Of Woodhouses Farm And South Of Etherley Moor, Wigdan Walls Road, Woodhouses, DL14 0ST

The Committee considered a report of the Senior Planning Officer regarding a resubmission of application DM/16/03249/FPA, a hybrid application for full planning permission for the erection of 123 dwellings and outline planning permission with landscaping reserved for up to 111 dwellings on land at the north of Woodhouses Farm and south of Etherley Moor, Wigdan Walls Road, Woodhouses (for copy see file of Minutes).

A Inch, Team Leader, Strategic Team gave a detailed presentation on the application which included a site location plan, aerial view of the site, site photographs from along Etherley Lane, Rockingham Drive and Wigdan Walls Road and a site layout plan. Members of the Committee had visited the site the previous day and were familiar with the location and setting.

Councillor Kay informed the meeting that the site of the proposed development was in the proximity of where he lived and sought advice on whether he should declare an interest. C Cuskin, Planning and Development Solicitor replied that providing Councillor Kay approached the application with an open mind, did not know the applicant and had no interest in the land then there would be no need to declare an interest.

The Team Leader, Strategic Team continued the detailed presentation of the application with details of proposed entrance arrangements, 3D images of house types and street scenes and details of the proposed SUDS area.

Since the publication of the report two additional letters of objection had been received but the issues raised were similar to those lodged by other objectors.

Councillor C Wilson, local Member, addressed the Committee to object to the application. Councillor Wilson informed the Committee that she was speaking on behalf of the Kent Brothers of Wigdan Walls Farm and local residents who were concerned about the development. Wigdan Walls Road was twisty and was narrow in places which made it difficult for two cars to pass. Local residents were concerned that this would be made worse by this development which would bring more traffic onto the road. The road to Woodhouses through Tindale Crescent currently experienced horrendous traffic problems because of the shops which were there. Traffic was also bad on Cockton Hill and Councillor Wilson was concerned about the impact extra traffic would have on these local junctions.

The proposed development would have an impact on demand for local school places and would add to pressures on GP surgeries and the local hospital and Councillor Wilson asked how these services would cope with the extra people from the development. There was a brownfield site ½ a mile from the application site which should be developed before this site.

The impact of the development on Wigdan Walls Farm would be immense. The Kemp family had lived and worked on the farm since the 1960s and were successful breeders of speciality cows. However, the farm produced smells and noises from the cows. Some of the properties on the proposed development would be situated near to the farm and Councillor Wilson was concerned how these properties would cope with such noise and smells.

Councillor Wilson asked the Committee to refuse the application.

Mr T Kemp of Wigdan Walls Farm addressed the Committee to object to the application. W R Kemp and Sons were among the top breeders of Hereford cattle in the United Kingdom and had plans to expand their business to cope with

demand. A new cattle housing would be erected within the next few years and this, by its very nature, would produce odours and noise. The cattle were mucked out every morning at 5 a.m. and this could lead to future conflict with properties proposed for the new development.

Wigdan Walls Farm had plans to diversify their business and feared that this proposed development would lead to potential future conflict with the farm, for reasons of noise and odour.

Mr Kemp asked the Committee to refuse the application.

Mr D Stephenson-Newby addressed the Committee to object to the application. Mr Stephenson-Newby informed the Committee there was little new evidence to approve this application over that which was previously refused other than it being on a smaller scale. The proposed development was on the wrong side of Bishop Auckland and traffic travelling west to east, rather than accessing the bypass, would pass through the existing 'Wimpy' housing estate.

Mr Stephenson-Newby informed the Committee that there were brownfield sites nearby which should be considered for development before this site, which was prime agricultural land. The site was home to lapwings, starlings and grouse, all of which were declining in numbers.

Mr Stephenson-Newby asked the Committee to refuse the application.

Mr Stickells, local resident, addressed the Committee to object to the application. Mr Stickells informed the Committee that there was a stronger reason now to refuse the application because, since the first application was refused, planning permission had been granted for development on the north side of Etherley Moor which would generate 300-400 vehicle movements to the site. This would result in a vast increase in traffic in the area and also to a vast increase in air pollution. Hospitals, schools and doctors were all full to capacity.

Mr Stickells considered that the benefits of the development were outweighed by the disadvantages and asked the Committee to refuse the application.

J McGargill, Highway Development Manager informed the Committee that the previously refused application had been considered acceptable in transport terms. This application had been looked at afresh taking into account the recently granted planning permission on the north side of Etherley Moor.

Consideration had been given to traffic generated and the distribution of the traffic. It had been calculated that 84% of traffic would travel towards Bishop Auckland Town Centre and 16% would travel west. This equated to 33 2-way trips to the crossroads on Wigdan Walls Road and 10-15 additional trips along Wigdan Walls Road during peak periods.

It was accepted that the Tindale Crescent and Cockton Hill Road junctions and two roundabouts on the A688 were operating at saturation point. However, mitigation was proposed for Cockton Hill junction where the road would be widened where

possible and also software installed to control the traffic signals and Tindale Crescent junction would be improved.

There would be a distribution of traffic to the highways network which the proposed contributions by the developer would help to mitigate.

The Team Leader, Strategic Team informed the Committee that particular scrutiny had been made of the noise and odour impacts from Wigdan Wall Farm on the proposed development. A detailed noise and odour assessment had been carried out and advice sought from Environmental Health Officers. Although odour on the farm was not pleasant at times, as distance increased this odour effect reduced. The nearest property on the proposed development would be 150 metres from the farm where the impact of odour would not be significant.

There were two planning applications currently being assessed for brownfield sites in the area, but there was no policy that brownfield sites must be developed before greenfield sites.

With reference to services in the area the Team Leader informed the Committee that the NHS had been consulted on the proposed development. There had been no response to this consultation which might have been expected had there been any capacity issues in the area. The development would bring with it a financial contribution of nearly £700,000 to increase educational capacity in the area.

Mr P Jones of Lichfields, agents for Avant Homes, addressed the Committee. The Committee report was comprehensive and balanced and the application had received no objections from statutory or County Council consultees. The applicant had worked hard to ensure that the impacts of the development were acceptable and had re-submitted the application to address the issues raised by the previous application.

The development would bring 234 executive style homes, 10% of which would be affordable housing and proposed highway improvement works to mitigate the impact of the development. A landscape visual impact assessment had been carried out and trees and hedges would be retained. An additional odour assessment had been carried out for potential odours from Wigdan Walls Farm.

A financial contribution of nearly £700,000 was proposed towards education provision and the public right of way through the site would be maintained and resurfaced. The economic impacts of the development were not insignificant with a proposed community contribution of £300,000 and targeted local recruitment during construction.

The development proposed a scheme of mitigation for the impact it would have on highways and junctions and this scheme had been agreed by Council highways officers.

Councillor Wilkes referred to the housing land supply figure in paragraph 71 of the report, which was as of April 2017. However, since April 2017 planning permission

had been granted for housing developments and Councillor Wilkes therefore considered the housing land supply figure in the report to be out of date.

The Strategic Team Leader replied that the housing land supply figure was up to date and that the figure in the report was that used at planning appeals. The Council could not demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply, and in the absence of this, NPPF part 14 would apply.

Councillor Wilkes informed the Committee that another planning application on the agenda for consideration quoted the same housing land supply figure and therefore could not be up to date. He questioned the accuracy of the figure because of the number of planning applications approved since April 2017.

Councillor Tinsley reminded the Committee of the need for consistency. At a planning appeal held this week the Council was unable to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply. However, Councillor Tinsley accepted there was a need to re-visit this figure in view of planning applications which had been approved since April 2017.

Councillor Tinsley sought clarification on the outline element of the application and asked whether access, layout, scale and appearance had been agreed and the only reserved matter was landscaping.

Councillor Robinson informed the Committee that he would request Legal and Democratic Services to produce an up to date figure for housing land supply for the next meeting of the Committee in September.

The Planning and Development Solicitor informed the Committee that the housing land supply figure in the report was the most up to date assessment and that NPPF 14 applied.

Councillor Kay informed the Committee that whether the housing land supply figure of 4.91 years was correct or not, this was a greenfield site which was not identified in the SHLAA. Councillor Kay considered that nearby brownfield sites should be developed before this site.

Councillor Kay informed the Committee that he was aware of levels of traffic in the area. The junction at Cockton Hill traffic lights was already at saturation and Escomb Lane Ends was chaotic at Escomb Primary School. Councillor Kay reminded the Committee that the previous application for this site had been refused on the grounds of the impact on the highway network.

The Strategic Team Leader informed the Committee that the application site was greenfield but not green belt and that applications for development of brownfield sites were currently being assessed.

The Highway Development Manager informed the Committee that the junction at Tindale Crescent was saturated, as was Cockton Hill Road. The additional traffic generated by this development would add, at peak times, 41 additional trips to an already saturated junction which would add to significant queues and delays.

However, a deliverable mitigation scheme had been identified, and such mitigation was not being currently undertaken because of resources.

Councillor Shield informed the Committee that he had voted against approval of the previous application for this site and was not convinced that the increased highway mitigation proposed would outweigh the harm from the development. He asked what the housing land supply level would be if this application was approved and considered that developers were landbanking development sites. Councillor Shield was not prepared to support the application which was contrary to Policies GD1, ENV1, H3 and T1 of the Wear Valley District Local Plan.

Councillor Wilkes informed the Committee that officers had already stated that there were highways issues in this area. There were additional applications being considered for brownfield sites in the area, which would be more expensive to develop. If the highway mitigation works from the development of this greenfield site were not sufficient to alleviate the highway problems, then a larger levy for mitigation would need to be placed on the brownfield site applications, which may rule out their being able to be developed.

Wigdan Walls Road was narrow and winding and Councillor Wilkes informed the Committee that he could not support this application without significant highways improvements taking place.

Councillor Tinsley informed the Committee that the previous application for this site had been refused and that he had good knowledge of the area and the site. The applicant had resubmitted the application and officers now considered that the resubmitted application addressed previous refusal matters. He had previously voted against the application because the development was separated from the surrounding area, but this application now had better connectivity; the traffic impact on Cockton Hill junction for which mitigation was now proposed; Tindale Crescent junction was at saturation, but again mitigation was now proposed.

Councillor Tinsley informed the Committee that he previously had concerns about landscaping as there was a large element of the previous application where it was not identified what would be put onto areas of space. This application had significantly changed because it detailed appearance, access and location of properties.

Councillor Tinsley was more comfortable to support approval of the application because of the steps the applicant had taken to address issues identified on the previous application. He considered that on balance the application should be approved and **moved** approval.

Councillor Robinson referred to the highways mitigation works proposed and asked when the funding for these would be released if the application was approved.

The Planning and Development Solicitor replied that the Council could ask for the funding ahead of the development commencing, however, this could have an impact on the ability of the developer to pay. The Strategic Team Leader informed the Committee that the highways and school places mitigation proposed was

through a Section 106 agreement and was considered necessary to make the development acceptable. A draft Section 106 agreement had been prepared and all of the highway mitigation money would be paid when approximately half of the site was occupied, which was relatively early.

Councillor Jewell informed the Committee that the location of the brownfield sites which had been referred to was unknown, and therefore how they may impact on highways in the area was also unknown. There were currently problems at the road junctions and the applicant was proposing to mitigate the impact of the development at these junctions, however the developer could not be expected to rectify problems which already existed.

Councillor Richardson expressed concern about two protected right turn lanes on Etherley Lane. Although distance from the farm would help with odour, if the farmer was to diversify and keep pigs then the odour would be year-round and would not dissipate. The farm was in this location before the houses and the development would lead to the loss of good agricultural land. Councillor Richardson could not support approval of the application.

Councillor Clare informed the Committee that brownfield sites elsewhere were irrelevant to this application and that the application could not be refused on the grounds of future applications for other sites. It was too soon to consider cumulative impact of development because planning permission had only been approved for one site to the north of this site. The application proposed an additional £130,000 for highway mitigation works, which professional highways officers advised was sufficient.

Under NPPF 14 the effects of a development had to be demonstrably and significantly worse rather than slightly worse to warrant refusal. Councillor Clare questioned whether the reasons suggested for refusal of the application would be powerful enough to persuade an Inspector if the matter was taken to a Planning Inquiry.

While Councillor Clare had concerns regarding Wigdan Walls Farm, this carried no weight in planning terms because officers had advised that at 36 metres the issue of odour was negligible and at 150 metres there was no significant impact. Councillor Clare **seconded** approval of the application.

Councillor Nicholson informed the Committee he had heard nothing to overturn NPPF 14 and considered that the application should be approved.

Councillor Wilkes commented that the application was both for full planning permission and outline planning permission and asked whether the highway mitigation money from the Section 106 agreement could be requested when half of the 123 dwellings had been completed, on completion of the 62nd dwelling.

Councillor Clare commented that proposed Condition 4 required highway works to be fully completed prior to the occupation of the 30th dwelling. The Strategic Team Leader clarified that this was in relation to the site access junction. The contribution

to offsite highway mitigation works would be paid to the Council before half of the dwellings proposed were occupied.

Councillor A Bell left the meeting.

Councillor Shield **moved** that the application be refused on the grounds of landscape impact, highway impact and the impact on the adjacent agricultural operations. The proposed development would have a significant and demonstrable impact.

The Strategy Team Leader advised the Committee that the previous application had been refused only on the grounds of landscape impact and highways impact, not on the impact on agricultural operations. The Planning and Development Solicitor endorsed the advice given by the Strategy Team Leader. A very specific and detailed technical assessment had been produced which demonstrated there would be no adverse impact and this would be questioned if the matter was taken to a Planning Appeal.

Councillor Shield informed the Committee that he did not believe the balance had been outweighed and that the development would have a significant and demonstrable impact.

The Planning and Development Solicitor advised that the Council would risk having costs awarded against it if the application was refused on the impact of noise and odour.

Councillor Tinsley informed the Committee that when the previous application was considered the impact on the farm did not arise, this was a new issue which had now been raised. There was a significant landscape buffer to the south of the development site and a significant distance from the farm to the nearest dwelling. The layout of the site showed that the nearest house would be some 100 – 150 metres from the farm.

Moved by Councillor Tinsley, **seconded** by Councillor Clare.

Resolved:

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

- 11 Affordable Housing units in Phase 1;
- 13 Affordable Housing units in Phase 2;
- £496,012 for offsite highway mitigation works;
- £695,389 education contribution;
- £43,168 for offsite habitat creation;
- Securing pedestrian links over Coal Burn; and,
- Provision of a voluntary targeted recruitment and training/local labour scheme.

and the completion of a Unilateral Undertaking given on a voluntary basis to secure a community contribution of £300,000; and the Conditions contained on the report.

Councillor A Bell rejoined the meeting

b DM/16/02426/OUT - Land To The South Of 100 To 106 Dean Road, Ferryhill, DL17 8ES

The Committee considered a report of the Senior Planning Officer regarding an outline application including means of access (all other matters reserved) for up to 161 dwellings (amended description) on land to the south of 100 to 106 Dean Road, Ferryhill (for copy see file of Minutes).

A Inch, Team Leader, Strategic Team gave a detailed presentation on the application which included a site location plan, aerial photographs, site photographs, an indicative layout and detail of the site access. Members of the Committee had visited the site the previous day and were familiar with the location and setting.

Mr J Wyatt of WYG, representing the applicant, addressed the Committee. The officer report presented a balanced and considered view of the application and he supported the recommendation that the application be approved. The site was a sustainable location and was well related to the town of Ferryhill. The site was allocated for 200 dwellings in the County Durham Plan and there were no adverse significant and demonstrable impacts from the development. There were no objections from statutory consultees and the proposed access junction was considered by highways officers to be acceptable. The development would bring significant economic and other benefits and would include 10% affordable housing.

Councillor Shield sought clarification on the proposed access onto the A167. The Strategic Team Leader replied that access from the site would be from a T junction, and there would be a protected right turn to gain access to the site from the A167. The 40 m.p.h. speed limit would be relocated to the south in advance of the development.

Councillor Shield expressed concern about vehicles from the development turning right onto the A167.

Councillor Clare informed the Committee that the Ferryhill Town Council had objected to the proposal on the grounds that the site access proposals were not in accordance with acceptable standards. However, the highways authority raised no objection subject to appropriate mitigation. There were no grounds to refuse the application on the grounds of site access. The proposed junction would be at least as safe as the next junction to the north where there was also a petrol filling station and the next junction up to that where there was no protected right turn. Councillor Clare **moved** approval of the application.

Councillor Tinsley informed the Committee that the policies in the saved Sedgefield Borough Local Plan were out of date and the application fell to be considered under NPPF 14. He had visited the site the previous day and considered that it fitted in well with the existing structure of Ferryhill and would be an extension to the built up area. When approached from the south the development had the potential to

improve the visual entrance to Ferryhill. The development was low density and would fit in with the topography. Councillor Tinsley **seconded** approval of the application.

Councillor A Bell informed the Committee that he considered the proposed development would be a natural extension to Ferryhill. He referred to the s106 payment towards open space and sporting provision and asked whether an on-site play area was being proposed.

The Highway Development Manager replied to the highways concerns which had been raised. The A167 was a busy road which operated at 1500 vehicles both ways during peak hours. A computer design programme showed that traffic would have the opportunity to egress from the development and that the junction would work quite well in terms of capacity. The junction had been designed to high standards.

The Strategic Team Leader informed the Committee that the s106 contribution of £213,000 was towards open space and sporting provision within the electoral division. On site there would be informal play areas and there were more formal play areas within proximity of the site.

Councillor Wilkes referred to paragraph 136 and expressed concern that there had been no response from the NHS in relation to GP capacity within existing facilities in the area and therefore this was unknown. The Strategic Team Leader replied that the application was submitted a number of months ago and NHS consulted at that time. If the NHS had concerns about GP capacity they had been afforded sufficient time to respond.

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 the provision of:-

- 10% Affordable housing
- £213,480 towards open space and sporting provision within the Electoral Division
- £45,143 towards highway infrastructure capacity improvements at Rushford roundabout.
- £36,200 towards cycle network infrastructure in the area.
- £32,968 to deliver targeted biodiversity enhancements in the area.

and subject to the conditions contained in the report.

Councillor Robinson vacated the Chair and left the meeting.

Councillor F Tinsley in the Chair

c DM/17/01322/RM - Land to the South of Eden Drive, Sedgefield

The Committee considered a report of the Senior Planning Officer regarding an application for reserved matters (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) for the erection of 197 dwellings and associated works pursuant to planning permission DM/15/03808/OUT (for copy see file of Minutes).

A Inch, Team Leader, Strategic Team informed the Committee that the reserved matters application related to an outline planning application which gained permission at appeal in October 2016. The outline application was for the erection of up to 220 dwellings, the reserved matters application was for the erection of 197 dwellings.

The Strategic Team Leader gave a detailed presentation on the application which included a site location plan, aerial photographs, site photographs, design code illustration, layout and streetscene images.

Councillor Tinsley informed the Committee that neither the Sedgefield Town Council nor the local Members had requested to speak on the application.

Ms J Bowles of the Sedgefield Village Action Group addressed the Committee. Ms Bowles informed the Committee that she was a resident of Sedgefield and that the Action Group represented the views of the majority of the community.

Ms Bowles informed the Committee that the Action Group had concerns about the proposed road which would pass through the development which was too narrow for heavy traffic. There were concerns regarding potential flooding and also about sewerage capacity in the area.

There were also concerns regarding the new spur from the roundabout on the A689/A177. The new road through the development would become an access road into Sedgefield centre and the number of drives which would face onto this road would create a hazard.

The loss of open countryside was causing distress to many residents in Sedgefield and Ms Bowles reported that works on site had already commenced, something she hoped the County Council would look at.

Mr J Foster, representative of Taylor Wimpey, addressed the Committee. He informed the Committee that the site had outline planning approval for the erection of dwellings and that he supported the officer recommendations in the report. Mr Foster informed the Committee that the 10% affordable housing, which equated to 20 dwellings, had been moved following concerns which had been expressed, and these were now in the north-west and south west corners of the site.

Mr Foster informed the Committee that he had met with the Sedgefield Village Action Group and they had his contact details if needed. Mr Foster added that he would also give the Action Group the contact details for the site manager. Works were programmed to start on site in September, the works which had been taking place on site were architectural investigations.

Councillor Tinsley reminded the Committee that access had been approved at the outline application. The reserved matters application was to consider appearance, layout, landscape and scale.

Councillor Clare informed the Committee that he had voted against approval of the outline application. He had listened to the issues raised at the meeting but most of these had already been decided when outline approval was granted.

The Strategic Team Leader indicated the position of bus stops on the site and informed the Committee that Condition 16 of the outline planning permission gave details of the water attenuation scheme. The Council's drainage officers were satisfied that the development would not lead to an increased risk to off-site flooding. Northumbrian Water had confirmed there was adequate foul sewerage capacity in the area.

Councillor Clare informed the Committee he considered the appearance, layout, landscape and scale of the development to be appropriate and **moved** approval of the application.

Councillor Wilkes referred to the number of bungalows proposed for the site, which at 7 properties only represented 3% of the dwellings proposed and did not seem to be many. The Strategic Team Leader replied that there was no policy basis for requiring bungalows and it was fortunate that the developer had offered to provide them.

Councillor Shield expressed concern about the road through the development and asked whether this was an estate road or a normal sized road. He considered that there was a danger of it becoming a rat-run and suggested that the Council should have a policy of 20 m.p.h. speed limits on such roads.

The Highway Development Manager replied that the road had been designed to accommodate public transport and that the Council had a policy for 20 m.p.h. zones on all new developments.

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

Resolved:

That the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the report.

Councillor Robinson rejoined the meeting and resumed the Chair.

Councillor J Robinson in the Chair

d DM/17/00599/WAS - Hulam Farm, Hutton Henry, Hartlepool, TS27 4SA

The Committee considered a report of the Senior Planning Officer regarding an application for a proposed anaerobic digestion plant at Hulam Farm, Hutton Henry, Hartlepool (for copy see file of Minutes).

C Shields, Senior Planning Officer gave a detailed presentation on the application which included a site location plan, aerial photographs, site photographs, proposed layout and proposed elevations. The Senior Planning Officer indicated the location of the four nearest properties to the proposed development, two of which were owned by Hulam Farm and two of which were privately owned by individuals.

Since the production of the report a letter of objection had been received from one of the residents of the privately owned properties.

Mr R Hepplewhite, agent for the applicant, addressed the Committee. Mr Hepplewhite informed the Committee that the applicant welcomed the officer recommendation in the report and was content with the proposed conditions, adding that conditions 10 to 13 had been volunteered by the applicant. There had been positive work with the planning case officer and all material planning considerations had been satisfied. There were no noise or odour issues and no highways issues. The concerns raised by Castle Eden Parish Council and by residents were not of such significance to refuse planning permission.

Councillor Wilkes referred to a previous application for a waste transfer station which had been refused because the Council had a policy of not bringing waste into the County and asked whether the policy would be relevant to this application.

The Senior Planning Officer replied that Policy W2 of the Waste Local Plan was the Policy being referred to. Policy W2 related to the unnecessary transport of waste into County Durham, and the application referred to involved waste being processed and then brought back into the County again.

Councillor Wilkes **moved** approval of the application.

Councillor Kay informed the Committee that he was supportive of anaerobic digesters which reduced waste going into landfill sites and lowered the carbon footprint. Councillor Kay **seconded** approval of the application.

Councillor Clare considered that concerns about anaerobic digesters arose from potential odour issues, which came from the bays where the digester material was held and asked whether such bays at this development would be indoors or outdoors. Councillor Clare also asked whether the proposed condition 7 in the planning permission would apply to storage arrangements.

Councillor Tinsley expressed concern that four residential receptors were close to the scheme, one of which had lodged an objection. Councillor Tinsley was less concerned about odour nuisance than about noise nuisance from the digester.

The Senior Planning Officer replied that the gas equipment which would generate the most noise had been located as far away from the properties as possible. The shed which would accept the waste would operate under negative pressure to ensure there was no leakage of odours. The process would be a completely sealed system.

Resolved:

That the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the report.

5 Neighbourhood Plans

The Chairman informed the Committee that this presentation would be given at a future meeting.