

DARLINGTON BOROUGH COUNCIL

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

COMMITTEE DATE: 28 OCTOBER 2015

Page

APPLICATION REF. NO:	15/00677/FUL
STATUTORY DECISION DATE:	11 September 2015
WARD/PARISH:	MIDDLETON ST GEORGE
LOCATION:	Durham Tees Valley Airport
DESCRIPTION:	Construction of 1.8km link road between Northside and Southside, erection of 2.8m high security fencing and associated infrastructure; and improvements and alterations to the existing highway (additional ecological information received 18 September 2015)
APPLICANT:	DURHAM TEES VALLEY AIRPORT

APPLICATION AND SITE DESCRIPTION

Planning permission is sought for the construction of a 1.8km link road between Northside and Southside at Durham Tees Valley Airport, the erection of a 2.8 metre high security fence along the length of the link road and associated infrastructure. Approximately 250 metres of the proposed link road is located within the Darlington Borough Council boundary (DBC) with the remainder of the road located with the Stockton Borough Council (SBC) boundary. It is also proposed to make improvements and alterations to the existing highway (within DBC boundary only) and for the change of use of agricultural land to ancillary operational airport land and for the reconfiguration of Plot 1 on the Southside Business Park to create an employment unit. Both of these elements are within the SBC boundary.

The application site straddles the administrative boundary of both Darlington Borough Council (DBC) and Stockton Borough Council (SBC). The majority of the site lies within the SBC boundary including the site of the proposed employment unit and most of the link road. In accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG), identical planning applications have been submitted to each local authority. Consideration of this application will be limited to those elements which fall within the administrative boundary of Darlington Borough Council. The Stockton Borough Council application was considered by their Planning Committee on 14 October 2015 when Members resolved to grant planning permission.

The application site (straddling both administrative boundaries) extends to approximately 12.5 ha in area and comprises three areas:

- The internal Airport access road and part of the adopted public highway. The site includes the entire width of the highway; and where widening is necessary, adjacent land is also included. This land is within the administrative boundary of DBC;

- An area of land at the end of the eastern end of the runway. This land comprises operational and agricultural land. The majority of this land is within the administrative boundary of SBC;
- An area of land to the south of the runway. This land comprises operational airfield equipment and the Southside development site. The land is entirely within the administrative boundary of SBC.

The new link road will be constructed around the eastern end of the runway to connect Northside and Southside. It will be finished to adoptable standards and will be suitable for cyclists. A new pedestrian access will also be provided alongside the new link road. The new link road will be bound by a 2.8m high security fence on the inner boundary to prevent access to the operational airport. The outer boundary will be demarked by stock proof fencing. No street lighting is proposed, except that which already has consent within the Southside Business Park. The new link road will begin on Northside. A new access will be provided into the Teesside Airport Railway station and the existing access road will be removed. The road will then extend to the south of the existing railway line and to the north of Taxiway B (maintaining the regulatory offset). This section of road has been carefully designed to ensure that a safe distance is maintained with the adjacent taxiway, but leaving sufficient land to construct the proposed railway siding (which is included within the Master Plan). This section will also include a surface water pumping station (with a parking space). This section of the road includes proposed works within both Stockton and Darlington Councils' administrative areas.

The new link road will then curve around the eastern end of the runway – alongside the boundary with the adjacent agricultural land. The road has been offset from the end of the runway to ensure the airfield safeguarding surfaces are not compromised and to ensure navigational aids are maintained. In any event, the road will be maintained as a clear way and will include two sets of traffic lights. Once the new road leaves the curved section it will access the Southside site and will intercept with the route of consented internal access road of the consented Southside Business Park.

The proposed development will relocate the fence line of the operational airport to the edge of the new highway which will be constructed in part across agricultural land which is not currently used as part of the Airport. This land will also include the compensatory habitat mitigation which will offset the loss of any species rich grassland. For completeness, the planning application also seeks consent for the change of use of this land to operational airport (*sui generis*).

The proposed link road and associated infrastructure is required to serve an extant planning permission for the development of Southside (within the SBC boundary). The application seeks permission for a first phase of building and would allow delivery of the remaining phases in accordance with the extant permission. The main difference between what is now proposed and what has planning permission is the route of the access. This application seeks permission for an alternative access around the eastern end of the runway. The majority of the route is within the current operational boundary of the Airport. A small part of it is currently in use as agricultural land.

The applicant states that the delivery of the redevelopment of the land known as 'Southside' stalled due to the prevailing economic conditions. Specifically relating to the link road approved as part of the extant permission it is understood that due to multiple landownerships and the presence of utilities within the area of the approved link road it was not economically viable to

provide the link road in this approved location. In March 2014 the Airport published a Master Plan to guide its development between now and 2020 and a key component of the Master Plan is the delivery of the Southside and ‘shows how this development site will be unlocked’. This includes creating a new link road that would connect Northside and Southside via a road around the eastern end of the runway. This would connect the proposed employment and railfreight uses at Northside and Southside (without the current need to cross the runway) and would facilitate access to the wider highway network via the existing roundabout onto the A67.

The Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) has recently allocated £5 million of Local Growth Fund which will fund this link road and provide a “kick start” to the delivery of the Southside Business Park. Alongside the new link road, the planning application also seeks consent to reconfigure the layout and design of the Plot 1 (of the extant Southside Business Park planning permission) to take account of the new link road and the proposals in the Master Plan for the future development of Southside (considered by Stockton Borough Council). Planning permission has been granted for Plot 1 and the wider Business Park. Therefore, this planning application solely relates to the revisions to the layout of Plot 1, and the remainder of the Southside Business Park will be implemented under the extant permission.

The following information has been submitted with the application:

- Design and Access Statement
- Ecology Report
- Flood Risk Assessment
- Noise Assessment
- Transport Assessment
- Travel Plan
- Heritage Statement
- Air Quality Assessment
- Airport Safeguarding Report

A request was made on 1 July 2015 pursuant to Regulation 5 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 for the local planning authority’s screening opinion on the matter of whether or not the development proposed is ‘EIA’ development within the meaning of the 2011 Regulations. This process has been undertaken and having taken into account the relevant criteria, the Local Planning Authority has determined that the proposal does not constitute EIA development.

The area surrounding the application site comprises the core facilities of the operational Airport, such as the passenger terminal, car parking, hangars, the aprons and the runway. In addition there are various buildings occupied by a mix of mainly employment uses including aviation related businesses and general employment uses. Alongside these is the International Fire Training Centre (IFTC) operated by SERCO and the Middleton St George Hospital which both occupy former RAF buildings. The wider area includes residential development to the north-west. The rest of the Airport is surrounded by open countryside, consisting of agricultural land and woodland. This land is subject to an extant planning consent for a new access road which would have provided access between the Southside development site and the A67.

PLANNING HISTORY

The application site has a length planning history, the most relevant of which is set out below:

04/01427/FULE – Extension and refurbishment of terminal building, development of cargo and maintenance building (Class B2 and B8), new and expanded airside apron including lighting, extension and reconfiguration of passenger and staff car parks and car hire facilities including lighting, access roads and fencing, construction of aircraft stands, airside hard standing and parallel taxiway including lighting, extension and reconfiguration of airport access road, pick up and set down areas including lighting, new bus stop and taxi stands, construction of new sewage treatment plant and associated pipework (part outline, part full application) accompanied by Environmental Assessment. GRANTED SUBJECT TO S106 AGREEMENT 2 JANUARY 2008

04/01428/OUTE – Development of site to provide a business park comprising up to 18,600m² (Use Class B1), 4,200m² 100 bed hotel (Use Class C1) and 560m² public house/restaurant (Use Class A3) associated car parking and structural landscaping (outline application accompanied by Environmental Assessment). GRANTED 21 FEBRUARY 2007

08/00703/FUL – B1 office development comprising 11 no. units, car parking, access and associated landscaping. GRANTED SUBJECT TO S106 AGREEMENT 2 DECEMBER 2008

11/00787/FUL – Extension of time for implementation of planning permission 08/00703/FUL dated 2 December 2008 for B1 office development comprising 11 no. units, car parking, access and associated landscaping. WITHDRAWN 16 APRIL 2013

PLANNING POLICY BACKGROUND

The following policies are relevant to consideration of the application:

Borough of Darlington Local Plan 1997

Saved Policy EP9 (Teesside Airport Employment Land – North)

Saved Policy EP10 (Teesside Airport Employment Land – South)

Saved Policy T49 (Teesside Airport)

Darlington Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2011

Policy CS1 (Darlington's Sub-Regional Role and Locational Strategy)

Policy CS2 (Achieving High Quality, Sustainable Design)

Policy CS5 (The Provision of Land for Employment Purposes)

Policy CS14 (Promoting Local Character and Distinctiveness)

Policy CS15 (Protecting and Enhancing Biodiversity and Geodiversity)

Policy CS16 (Protecting Environmental Resources, Human Health and Safety)

Policy CS17 (Delivering a Multifunctional Green Infrastructure Network)

National Planning Policy Framework

RESULTS OF CONSULTATION AND PUBLICITY

Highway Engineer – The application relates to the construction of a private road within the airport to link the Southside development to the remainder of the internal highway network. The Southside development has been granted consent by Stockton Borough Council and this application considers the small section of link road within our Borough. It has been

demonstrated that the generated traffic from the consented development can be accommodated on the adopted highway network and therefore I would raise no highway objection to the proposal. Would suggest that the link road be built to adopted industrial estate specification, however there is no intention to adopt this link at any time in the near future.

Transport Policy – The link road between Northside and Southside provides access to potential commercial developments within the Stockton Borough Council boundary. With this being the only access road for potential employees, recommend that a number of improvements are made to sustainable transport.

Environmental Health Officer - It appears that the majority of the application is situated within the boundary of Stockton Borough Council (SBC). The application has been submitted with a noise assessment which has looked at the impact of noise from the development on neighbours as well as noise from runway impacting upon the proposed new office and storage development which is located within the boundary of SBC. The report has concluded that the building development would be sufficiently distant from noise sensitive amenities, such that noise will not impact on these distant neighbours. I would agree with this assessment. The report also concludes that the level of aircraft noise will be modest and will not cause a disturbance for the occupiers of the new office building within the boundary of SBC. Agree with this conclusion as well but SBC would have to confirm their view to the applicant independently. The application is situated adjacent to the training area used as part of the fire training business. SBC will need to be satisfied that the fire training area does not impact upon the offices, both of which are situated within their boundary.

In terms of contaminated land, as the majority of the proposed link road appears to reuse existing hardstanding/paved roadways the likelihood of coming into contact with underlying soils is low and on this basis the Environmental Health team has no particular contamination concerns regarding the proposed link road development. However, the possibility that the link road development may disturb underlying soils (as part of proposed construction/maintenance works) which may be contaminated and/or hazardous, cannot be discounted, the Environmental Health team recommend contingency conditions be attached to any approval granted.

Ecology Officer – No objection to a controlling condition relating to the mitigation for the loss of the unimproved grassland.

Highways England – Offer no objection.

Environment Agency – No objections to the development, however in order to minimise flood risk, it is vital that any new development does not drain into the Lustrum Beck catchment.

Lead Local Flood Authority – The proposed development is in Flood Zone 1. The Environment Agency's flood maps confirm that part of the site is at low risk of surface water flooding. The proposed discharge points identified for discharging surface water runoff from the proposed development drain either into Lustrum Beck or the River Tees, both are Main River and are identified as Critical Drainage Areas in Stockton Borough Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. The applicant has not provided sufficient information regarding the management of surface water runoff from the proposed development therefore a condition requiring the submission of a scheme for surface water drainage is recommended.

Durham County Archaeology – No comments to make on the application. Support the recommendations of Tees Archaeology who are leading on this.

Tees Archaeology (Consultation response forwarded from Stockton BC, reported for information) – The Cultural Heritage Technical Note meets the requirements of paragraph 128 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) regarding heritage assets of archaeological interest. The Technical Note makes reference to several earlier field evaluations, the results of which are relevant to this application. The document concludes that the proposal may have a minor impact on medieval or post medieval ridge and furrow earthworks and possibly archaeological remains associated with WWII gun emplacements which are now demolished. The developer concludes that some level of mitigation may be appropriate depending on the level of survival of the remains which is not currently known. Am in agreement with the recommendations of the Technical Note and recommend a planning condition requiring the recording of any heritage assets that would be lost in whole or in part.

Tees Valley Wildlife Trust (Consultation response forwarded from Stockton BC, reported for information) – Withdraw its objection to the application if the condition is used, as described.

Network Rail – No objection in principle subject to a number of informatives.

Hurworth Parish Council – Support the application. We see this plan as being beneficial to Hurworth Parish and in the future creating job opportunities and work for Hurworth residents.

A total of 119 objections to the application have been received.

Of those objections 96 have submitted a standard objection letter which raises the following issues:

- *The planning statement states that the rationale for the proposal (and other full applications which will follow) is set out in the DTVA Master Plan, which the applicant states has been subject to considerable public consultation with the local community and key stakeholders and that the Master Plan proposals have received considerable support;*
- *For these reasons the applicant asserts that the Master Plan is an important material consideration to which weight should be attached when determining the planning application;*
- *By the applicant's own admission the consultation only received 130 written responses of which 71% (93) agreed with the airports vision and objectives;*
- *Numerous people commented that they were given no notification of the consultation;*
- *Many people have expressed a desire to use the airport if flights to popular holiday destinations were made available;*
- *As an unelected organisation, Tees Valley unlimited has no mandate from Tees Valley residents to provide funding for the new link road;*
- *Do not support many of the Master Plan proposals, including decision to concentrate on two existing business routes to Amsterdam and Aberdeen and 'general aviation' rather than providing frequent, affordable flights to popular destinations; the proposal to build 400 houses on airport land which is likely to constrain future aviation development at the airport and the continued reliance on public funding. Peel seem reluctant to make significant capital investments itself;*

- *Relying on two scheduled routes is a huge business risk. If KLM calls it a day it would probably be the end of the airport;*
- *No test has been applied to demonstrate the need or demand for housing on the airport site;*
- *Do not agreed with the use of a particularly low passenger forecast to shape the Master Plan, especially as the UK economy is now recovering and UK passenger numbers are on the increase;*
- *The same low forecast also appears to have been used for road traffic and noise assessments which not right as DTVA is capable of handling at least 900,000+ passengers per annum;*
- *Development of the airport is generally welcomed, but only support development which is aviation related, demonstrably sustainable and does not restrict future expansion of aviation activities, especially the expansion of passenger services;*

A further 11 objectors have submitted a different standard objection letter which raises the following issues:

- *Object to the application on the basis that this is the first of a number of applications that will see the implementation of the Airport Master Plan which envisages selling land, a valuable airport asset, for the development of up to 400 houses;*
- *The Plan says this is necessary to maintain the existing level of services to Aberdeen and Amsterdam. The airport will then concentrate on General Aviation rather than scheduled holiday and flights;*
- *This is contrary to what Robert Hough, then Chairman of DTVA thought 18 months earlier when he was quoted as saying that one million passengers was within the airport's potential;*
- *Peel Holdings and DTVA claim widespread support for the Master Plan proposals, which is not true. In spite of public meetings, presentations and publicity less than 100 people supported the Master Plans visions and objectives;*
- *A Facebook page called 'SAVE Teesside Airport' was started in February 2014 opposing the Masterplan and within 3 months had 3,000 supporters. It now has over 5,500 supporters and numbers are still climbing;*
- *Councillor Chris Hobson of Middlesbrough Borough Council started a petition calling on the government to intervene to save the airport which drew over 3000 signatures;*
- *Residents of Middleton St George voted overwhelmingly against more housing in the area, especially on airport land;*
- *The Now and Then local magazine ran a poll of readers and more than 3000 respondents voted against housing development at the airport;*
- *The traffic impact assessment does not reflect the current planning position but presupposes that other parts of the current Masterplan are implemented;*
- *It gives no good reasons why the existing planning consent, which includes a proposal for a new link road off the A67 to the south of the development site, has been abandoned;*
- *Instead a watered down solution is offered without any real justification for dropping the original proposal and without proper traffic impact assessment;*
- *The proposal includes the provision of traffic lights to prevent vehicular movements across the end of the runway when planes are landing. If the Masterplan is carried out there will not be many planes landing;*
- *The implementation of the new road depends entirely upon DTVA being given £5 million grant of public money;*

- *The planning application is the start of the implementation of the Masterplan and as such should be rejected unless and until a new Masterplan can be produced which more closely reflects what the people of the region would like to see for their local airport;*
- *The airport is an asset to the North East and we are sick of spending money on taxis, fuel, hotels in other towns and flights when we have a very good airport on our doorstep.*

A total of 12 individual objections have been submitted which raise the following issues:

- *Object to the building of a housing estate because we need an airport more;*
- *Object to £5 million of taxpayers money being given to a multi-million pound company to help them install a road that will only benefit the said housing estate and not the airport itself*
- *Believe local residents would welcome an increase in flight operators from the airport. Why were full flights to and from the airport stopped?*
- *Friends and neighbours would prefer a local airport for their holiday transport and not have to travel miles to other regional airports;*
- *Peel are deliberately misleading the Council and has not consulted the public with regard to a Masterplan. I have had no notification and would have voted against it. Local people want the airport fully operational;*
- *There are plenty of other places to build houses and object to any development on this vital transport link to the rest of the UK and overseas;*
- *Welcome development of services at the airport;*
- *Peel consider that as the Masterplan has been subject to considerable public consultation with local community and key stakeholders, it should have weight as a material consideration. Peel choose to ignore two major petitions against the proposal;*
- *Do not agree with the premise of the passenger forecast used to shape the Master Plan. Suggest these figures are based on the fact that flight services which the Teesside population wants and needs are not being catered for at present;*
- *At the moment only the flights on offer are essentially business flights hence the figures provided in the Master Plan;*
- *The situation is a travesty especially when you consider what a boon to the economy a well run charter holiday providing airport would be;*
- *How can an airport with such good transport links and infrastructure not be succeeding?*
- *Any housing development on the site can only have a detrimental effect on the airport now and in the future;*
- *The existing planning consent for Southside also includes proposals for a separate access from off the A67. The Design and Access Statement (DAS) dismisses this link road as 'not deliverable' and claims that as a result development of Southside has 'not progressed'. The Planning Statement also refers to the Southside development as having stalled due to 'prevailing economic conditions' and says that 'it is recognised that Southside, as originally conceived, is not commercially viable'. There is no discussion or nor justification for this summary dismissal of the earlier proposal. Nor is there any comment on the economic circumstances that lead to the land not being developed in the past but which make it developable now. The application is defective without this information;*
- *The airport is struggling to meet the target set out in the Masterplan of 200,000 passengers per annum (142,000 passengers in 2014) and practically no freight traffic. If the 50ha of airport related land could not be developed when the airport was thriving it*

is difficult to see where the demand will come from now it is operating in reduced circumstances;

- *There is obvious suspicion that once the £5million grant for the road is given and the road built, it will be followed by planning applications seeking to change the status of this land;*
- *The Design and Access Statement says that the new link road will need to be designed to serve phase I and II of the Southside Business Park and it is felt to be sufficient. No mention is made of the capacity of the existing road from the A67. The original scheme envisaged the Southside being accessed with its own dedicated road. The existing access road and A67 roundabouts will now have to cater for all this traffic plus traffic generated by the north side potential developments and the residential development of up to 400 houses. If the airports fortunes were to survive this one single access road would be catering for domestic, industrial, business and airport traffic as well as emergency vehicles. It is unlikely to be anywhere near sufficient if earlier forecasts of passenger and freight traffic were to be met;*
- *The DAS mentions that 'suitable traffic control measures to prevent vehicle movements during take-off and landings' should be put in place. No indication is given to how disruptive this would be to traffic to and from the 1.9m sq ft of development nor to the risk assessment to aircraft of those traffic control measures being ignored;*
- *The DAS also claims that the potential for railway sidings has been protected whereas the plan shown on p25 shows the area hemmed in between the railway line and the new access road and does not show any opportunity to extend a siding into Southside;*
- *No details of the funding from the Local Growth Funding has been given. There is no explanation of the business case given by the airport leading to a grant being given and whether this will be a grant or a loan. The road is opening up 1.9m sq ft. of development which should be able to support the road cost. As a minimum the money should be borrowed not given;*
- *Less likely to attract new businesses to the area without a fully functioning airport;*
- *Object to the application on the basis that the passenger numbers, aircraft movements and cargo tonnage used to assess future road traffic movements, noise and other issues at the airport are far too low. Moreover they do not take account of the extant planning permission which the airport has for 3 million passengers per annum (ppa) and other activities;*
- *The 3 million ppa scenario should be examined to determine any incremental planning conditions which should apply i.e. now that a single access road on to the A67 is proposed for all airport travel, otherwise the extant permission for 3 million ppa will remain in place on the wrong premise;*
- *Disagree with the applicant's assertion that there is no requirement for an Environmental Impact Assessment. Given the contention over future levels of aviation activity a detailed study is necessary to explore all scenarios. Piecemeal planning applications and a single scenario approach to consideration of all the issues could lead to omissions, errors and inappropriate decisions;*
- *The TA acknowledges that DTVA has approved development for 3million ppa, however uses the DfT forecast of 200,000 ppa in 2020 as its base scenario. The rationale for specifically using 2020 figures when the development will be in place for many decades beyond that date is illogical. These figures are far too low a basis upon which to assess future traffic movements at the airport in any case;*
- *The Planning Statement already acknowledges that forecast road traffic from Southside will be significant when fully built out. Do not know whether the single carriageway*

access road and two roundabouts can cope with traffic movements arising from 3 million ppa on top of that;

- The Noise Assessment also acknowledges the extant permission for 3 million ppa, over 25,000 tonnes of cargo and 89,558 aircraft movement per annum, however it uses the DfT forecast of 200,000 ppa in 2020 coupled with the forecast of 28,017 air traffic movements for 2020 set out in the Masterplan to assess future noise conditions;*
- Even using those very low figures the report concludes there will be issues and that mitigation measures would be required to protect the proposed future housing from noise;*
- The Masterplan has no legal basis and DTVA is not bound by it. The Government recommends that airports review their masterplans on a regular basis to its contents and strategy could easily change;*
- Road traffic and noise will be among the key issues which will determine the suitability and sustainability of the airport land for housing. If the Councils accept that the 200,00 ppa figures etc. represents the upper envelope for future conditions it is likely that Darlington Borough Council would be able to back track on that when it comes to assessing the application for housing;*
- The Traffic Assessment and Airport Safeguarding Reports appear to have been prepared separately with no consideration of issues that fall across both, including an analysis of how long and how often traffic on the proposed new link road will be stopped by the traffic lights on red under various scenarios. Using the figures of 3million ppa the traffic lights would almost certainly be on red for around 30 minutes every hour;*
- No risk assessment has been provided associated with the use of traffic lights on the proposed new link road and the measures put in place to mitigate the risks i.e. traffic lights breaking down, an HGC breaking down between the traffic lights, vehicles ignoring red stop lights;*
- Concerned that the regulatory offset on northside between the proposed link road and the adjacent Taxiway B (21 metre air taxi buffer zone) may be insufficient to allow very large aircraft such as the Boeing 747 which has landed at DTVA in the past to continue to use this taxiway with adequate safety margin. If certain aircraft would no longer be able to safely use the taxiway the offset should be increased so as not to constrain future aviation opportunities at the airport;*
- It appears from the Council's Highway Engineer's comments that the applicant's traffic assessment has been taken at face value without further consideration (or perhaps only considered traffic which will be generated by the consented Southside development). Neither way would be right in my view;*
- Believe the correct approach to analysing the traffic issues arising from this proposal is as detailed in my objection;*
- The traffic assessment should take account of all consent developments (including for 3 million ppa); all proposed developments in the Masterplan; the fact that a single access road onto the A67 is now proposed for all future airport site traffic;*
- The applicant cannot rely on previous analysis showing that the adopted highway network could accommodate all airport traffic as the scheme is now different.*

PLANNING ISSUES

Background to Application

The Southside Business Park has been a longstanding employment allocation within the adopted (and emerging) Development Plans for both Darlington and Stockton Borough Councils. There

is an extant permission for 176,900 sq. m of warehousing and distribution floorspace on Southside, which includes a new link road to Southside from the A67. The current planning application relates only to the new link road and a B2/B8 unit to unlock the delivery of the Southside development, the latter being within the administrative boundary of Stockton Borough Council. The planning application does not seek consent for any of the wider development proposals within the Master Plan which in due course will be subject to separate planning applications. The main issues for consideration are whether the proposed link road is acceptable in principle and having consideration for other matters of development management.

Planning Policy

Saved Local Plan Policy EP10 (Teesside Airport Employment Plan – South) of the Borough of Darlington Local Plan 1997 states that land to the south of the main runway will be safeguarded for development which requires a location at or adjacent to an airport and which cannot be located to the north of the main runway within the vicinity of the airport terminal; and which forms part of a comprehensive scheme providing for access to, and the orderly development of, the whole of the area to the south of the main runway, together with land in the adjoining Local Authority area; and incorporates access arrangements which do not interfere with the operation of the airport; and provides for the character and appearance of the area of high landscape value to the south of the airport.

Core Strategy Policy CS1 (Darlington's Sub-Regional Role and Locational Strategy) identifies Durham Tees Valley Airport as a strategic location for airport related employment uses throughout the plan period. Given the above policy position it is considered that the principle of providing an alternative link road to serve an extant planning permission for employment development on the Southside site is acceptable.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out significant policy context requiring the economic, environmental and social aspects of 'sustainable development' to be balanced against each other. Therefore the NPPF requires all planning decisions to be made in accordance with the 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. The presumption requires proposals to be approved if they comply with the development plan or any adverse impacts of approving the application would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the NPPF. In relation to airport growth, the NPPF promotes a collaborative approach to secure sustainable development: *'Local authorities should work with neighbouring authorities and transport providers to develop strategies for the provision of viable infrastructure to support sustainable development, including... transport investment necessary to support strategies for the growth of... airports.'* *'When planning for... airports... plans should take account of their growth and role in serving business, leisure, training and emergency service needs. Plans should take account of this Framework as well as the principles set out in the relevant national policy frameworks and the Government Framework for UK Aviation'*.

Visual Impact

Policy CS2 (Achieving High Quality, Sustainable Design) states that high quality, safe, sustainable design will be promoted in all new development, specifically reflecting or enhancing Darlington's distinctive, natural, built and historic characteristics that positively contribute to the character of the local area and its sense of place. Policy CS14 (Promoting Local Character and Distinctiveness) requires that the distinctive character of the Borough's built, historic, natural and environmental townscapes, landscapes and strong sense of place will be protected and, where appropriate, enhanced.

The proposed link road, security fencing and alterations to the existing highway have been designed, taking into account the constraints of the site and the surroundings. The alterations to the existing highway and proposed link road will take place within the existing visual envelope of the Airport and will respect the developed nature of the airport site, such that these elements of the proposal falling within the administrative boundary of Darlington Borough Council are not considered to have any unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The impact of the proposed employment unit and change of use of agricultural land falling outside of the Borough will be assessed by Stockton.

Aviation Safety

There is a regulatory framework within which all international airports must operate. The primary regulator is the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) which is responsible for all aspects of safety in relation to airport operations. The proposed link road and employment unit have been designed with regard to this regulatory framework. In particular, the siting of the road has been designed to maintain all necessary offset to maintain the operation of the airport and its safety. The CAA has been consulted on the application and has raised no comments.

Highway Matters

A Transport Assessment (TA) has been submitted with the application, which demonstrates that the changes to the access arrangements would not have an adverse effect on the highway network when compared to the previously consented approvals. The TA also considers the traffic generation associated with the proposed new commercial premises for B2/B8 use to be developed on Southside. The impact of the proposed changes demonstrates a substantial reduction on the surrounding road network (approximately 65%) which has been assessed at two locations; the estate road roundabout and the A67 roundabout.

The results provided within the TA show that the impact of the proposed changes are acceptable as they can be accommodated at the junctions identified above and that both junctions continue to operate within capacity. Details of the proposed capacity of the internal link road have also been provided within the TA and this is considered acceptable.

The traffic analyses provided and comparisons made with extant consents have demonstrated that the proposed internal link road can accommodate the Southside consent and can therefore become the access route, replacing the new junction on the A67. It also demonstrates that the existing local highway network can accommodate the combined application and Northside considerations.

The proposed site sites within the wider DTVA Master Plan Area (AMPA) and as such will benefit from good facilities for walk and cycle trips. The AMPA is connected to National Cycle route 14 via Yarm Road and advisory routes also connect the AMPA with Middleton St George and Dinsdale Railway Station. The AMPA is currently served by the number 12 bus service which provides access to Darlington Railway Station and the wider bus network.

The Council's Highway Engineer accepts the findings of the TA and on this basis raises no highway objection to the proposal. Highways England has also been consulted and similarly has no objection to the application. While the Council's Transport Policy Officer has requested a number of sustainable transport improvements and contributions, these issues were addressed as part of the extant consent for the Southside development and it is not considered necessary to revisit these issues as part of the current proposals.

Ecology

An Ecological Appraisal of the land which is to form the route of the new link road has been undertaken and submitted with the application. Core Strategy Policy CS15 (Protecting and Enhancing Biodiversity and Geodiversity) seeks to ensure that new development would not result in any net loss of existing biodiversity value by protecting and enhancing the priority habitats, biodiversity features and the geological network through the design of new development.

The assessment has identified that the current proposal will result in the development of 2.03 ha of unimproved grassland which is of county ecology and nature conservation value. It is recognised that this impact is unavoidable in achieving an access which links Northside and Southside. As such, consideration has been given to a scheme to mitigate this loss. It is proposed to set aside land within the application site on which compensatory grassland habitats could be created. This would provide mitigation and as the land would be incorporated within the Airport boundary (within the Stockton Borough Council area) it could be managed as part of the wider areas of Airport grassland which already exist alongside the runway and taxiways.

Accordingly, this application includes an area of compensatory habitat on adjacent arable farmland. This land allows not only for like-for-like replacement of the impacted grassland but for an overall net increase in the grassland habitat, ensuring a gain in biodiversity. The detailed specification of the habitat mitigation is subject to a condition. The Ecology Officer has raised no objection subject to the proposed mitigation and controlling condition. Tees Valley Wildlife Trust initially objected to the application (as a result of a consultation by Stockton Borough Council) but it is understood that this has now been withdrawn subject to the habitat mitigation condition.

The assessment has also confirmed that there are no protected species on the site, in particular it has been established that there are no water bodies on or adjacent to the site which could be suitable for Great Crested Newts. On this basis and subject to the habitat mitigation condition, the proposal is considered to comply with the requirements of Policy CS15.

Flooding

As the site is located in Flood Zone 1 and is greater than 1 hectare the Environment Agency's Standing Advice requires that a Flood Risk Assessment be submitted with the application. A Flood Risk Assessment has been submitted with the application which explains that surface water runoff from the northern extent of the link road will drain to a new pumping station and will then be pumped to an existing outfall. Neither Northumbrian Water, the Environment Agency nor the Lead Local Flood Authority has raised an objection to the proposal, subject to appropriate planning conditions requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the Flood Risk Assessment and requiring final details of an appropriate surface water drainage solution to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval prior to the commencement of development.

Archaeology

Core Strategy Policy CS14 seeks to protect, enhance and promote the quality and integrity of Darlington's distinctive national or nationally significant built heritage and archaeology. Paragraph 139 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest that are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments should be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets.

A Cultural Heritage Technical Note has been submitted with the applicant which identifies that the site includes the levelled remains of former medieval ridge and furrow. The assessment however has explained that this feature is of low significance given that the remains are denuded and are set in the context of a modern airfield. Furthermore, wider geophysical surveys have not revealed any geophysical anomalies that could be archaeological in origin. The note also highlights that there are some surviving WWII remains within the application site and concludes that the development will protect the significance, setting and legibility of the surviving elements of the non-designated WWII remains.

Durham Archaeology has no comments to make on the application but support the recommendations of Tees Archaeology who are leading on the application and who recommend a condition to secure the submission of a programme of archaeological work. On this basis the proposal is considered to comply with Policy CS14 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Noise and Air Quality

A Noise Assessment of the proposed development has been undertaken and has considered how noise from the proposed development will affect the existing environment, and how future noise from the Airport (including its Master Plan proposals) and local road traffic affects sensitive receptors within the proposed development. In particular, regard has been given to the implications of the link road and employment unit on the proposed residential uses on Northside which are set out in the Master Plan. It must be noted however that the future proposals set out in the Master Plan are not subject of this application.

The noise assessment has acknowledged that the forecast road traffic from Southside will be significant. However, these flows will not occur initially and will relate to delivery of the entire development in the Master Plan (which are not subject of this application) and the proposed development only includes the first phase of the wider Southside development. In any case, it is clear that the new link road, which will divert traffic past the proposed residential development (as set out in the Master Plan) on Northside, will not prejudice the achievement of all necessary internal and outdoor noise standards to ensure the amenity of future occupiers.

An Air Quality Assessment of the proposed development has been undertaken and assesses the effects of increased traffic on the local roads resulting from the proposed development and the proposed mixed use development on Northside (as set out in the Master Plan). The assessment has also considered the impacts to new residential properties arising from emissions from the Airport.

The operational impacts of increased traffic emissions arising from the additional traffic on local roads due to the proposed developments have been assessed. The impacts of local traffic and airport sources on the air quality for future occupiers of the proposed development have been shown to be acceptable at the worst-case locations assessed, with concentrations being well below the air quality objectives.

The Environmental Health Officer has considered the submitted information and raises no objection to the submitted information.

Land Contamination

The Council's Environmental Health Officer has advised that as the majority of the proposed link road appears to reuse existing hardstanding/paved roadways the likelihood of construction

workers or future users coming into contact with underlying soils is low and as such there are no particular contamination concerns regarding the proposed link road development. A contingency condition is however attached in the event that the proposed development disturbs any contaminated and/or hazardous underlying soils.

Other Matters

A significant number of the objectors to the application have made comments in respect of the wider development proposals set out in the Master Plan. These proposals do not form part of this current application and will be the subject of separate planning applications in due course. As such these comments are not considered to be material to consideration of this planning application.

SECTION 17 OF THE CRIME AND DISORDER ACT 1998

The proposed development has been considered in the context of the requirements placed on the Council by Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, namely, the duty on the Council to exercise its functions with due regard to the likely effect of the exercise of those functions on, and the need to do all that it reasonably can to prevent, crime and disorder in its area. The proposed development does not give rise to crime and disorder issues.

CONCLUSION

The proposed link road and alterations to the existing highway are considered to be acceptable in principle in terms of serving an extant planning permission for the Southside employment site. Furthermore the proposals are considered to be acceptable in terms of visual impact and highway safety and subject to appropriate conditions do not give rise to any unacceptable issues in terms of other matters of development management. The proposal is therefore considered to comply with development plan policies and the National Planning Policy Framework.

RECOMMENDATION

THAT PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. A3 (Standard 3 year time limit)
2. (A) No demolition/development shall take place/commence until a programme of archaeological work including a Written Scheme of Investigation has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. The scheme shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and:
 - (i) The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording;
 - (ii) The programme for post investigation assessment;
 - (iii) Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording;
 - (iv) Provision to be made for the publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation;
 - (v) Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation;
- (B) No demolition/development shall take place other than in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under part (A) of this condition;

(C) The development shall not be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under part (A) of this condition and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured.

REASON – In the interests of the preservation of any archaeological remains.

3. No construction/building works or deliveries shall be carried out except between the hours of 0800 and 1800 hours on Mondays to Fridays and between 0900 and 1300 hours on Saturdays. There shall be no construction activity including demolition on Sundays or on Bank Holidays.

REASON – To ensure that the development does not prejudice the enjoyment of neighbouring occupiers or their properties.

4. Surface water discharges from this site shall be flow regulated to ensure that flooding problems elsewhere in the catchment are not exacerbated. Final details of an appropriate surface water drainage solution shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before development commences and the development shall be completed in accordance with the approved scheme. The discharge rates from the site will be restricted to the existing greenfield runoff rates (QBAR value) with sufficient storage within the system to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design shall also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event surcharging the drainage can be stored on site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into drains or watercourse. Micro Drainage design files (mdx files) are required to be submitted for approval. The flow path of flood waters exiting the site as a result of a rainfall event exceeding the 1 in 100 year event should also be provided.

REASON – To ensure the site is developed in a manner that will not increase the risk of surface water flooding to site or surrounding area.

5. A Construction Management Plan shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development to agree the routing of all HGV movements associated with the construction phases and to effectively control dust emissions from the site works, this shall address earth moving activities, control and treatment of stock piles, parking for use during construction and measures to protect any existing footpaths and verges, vehicle movements, wheel cleansing, sheeting of vehicles, offside dust/odour monitoring and communication with local residents.

REASON – In the interests of the occupiers of adjacent and nearby premises and highway safety.

6. Prior to the commencement of development a scheme for the ground preparation works consisting of soil stripping of arable topsoil to reduce nutrient levels, drainage works to ensure a free draining soil (except in agreed areas which may provide wetland habitat in the non-turf trans located areas) for the receptor site to ensure the success of grassland habitat creation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such a scheme shall include:

- (i) The precise delineation and location of the area to be a minimum of 3.67ha which shall include turf translocation of the 2.03 ha to be lost from situ and additional creation of 1.64ha through green hay and seed planting;
- (ii) Details of the timing for the delivery and works (to ensure breeding birds are not affected) of the long-term maintenance and management of the site which shall include for the duration of the establishment of the receptor site and the subsequent remediation/maintenance, management and monitoring of the receptor site for the lifetime of the development.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details to the reasonable satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

REASON – To ensure the identified ecological impact of the proposed development is appropriately mitigated.

7. In the event that suspected contamination material is found at any time when carrying out the approved development, it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken, in accordance with best practice guidance, the details of which are to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority in advance. Where remediation is shown to be necessary a remediation scheme must be prepared and submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing in advance. Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme, a verification report must be prepared to show that the remediation has been undertaken to a satisfactory standard, which is subject to the approval in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON – To ensure the proper restoration of the site.

8. B5 (Development in accordance with approved plans)

INFORMATIVES

NETWORK RAIL MATTERS

Drainage

All surface and foul water arising from the proposed works must be collected and diverted away from Network Rail property. In the absence of detailed plans all soakaways must be located so as to discharge away from the railway infrastructure. The following points need to be addressed:

1. There should be no increase to average or peak flows of surface water run off leading towards Network Rail assets, including earthworks, bridges and culverts.
2. All surface water run-off and sewage effluent should be handled in accordance with Local Council and Water Company regulations.
3. Attenuation should be included as necessary to protect the existing surface water drainage systems from any increase in average or peak loadings due to normal and extreme rainfall events.
4. Attenuation ponds, next to the railway, should be designed by a competent specialist engineer and should include adequate storm capacity and overflow arrangements such that there is no risk of flooding of the adjacent railway line during either normal or exceptional rainfall events. It is expected that the preparation and implementation of a surface water drainage strategy addressing the above points will be conditioned as part of any approval.

Services

We would expect services to be routed away from the railway and not to cross it.

Fail Safe Use of Crane and Plant

All operations, including the use of cranes or other mechanical plant working adjacent to Network Rail's property, must at all times be carried out in a "fail safe" manner such that in the event of mishandling, collapse or failure, no materials or plant are capable of falling within 3.0m of the nearest rail of the adjacent railway line, or where the railway is electrified, within 3.0m of overhead electrical equipment or supports.

Excavations/Earthworks

All excavations/ earthworks carried out in the vicinity of Network Rail property/ structures must be designed and executed such that no interference with the integrity of that property/ structure can occur. If temporary works compounds are to be located adjacent to the operational railway, these should be included in a method statement for approval by Network Rail. Prior to commencement of works, full details of excavations and earthworks to be carried out near the railway undertaker's boundary fence should be submitted for the approval of the Local Planning Authority acting in consultation with the railway undertaker and the works shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Where development may affect the railway, consultation with the Asset Protection Project Manager should be undertaken. Network Rail will not accept any liability for any settlement, disturbance or damage caused to any development by failure of the railway infrastructure nor for any noise or vibration arising from the normal use and/or maintenance of the operational railway. No right of support is given or can be claimed from Network Rail's infrastructure or railway land.

Security of Mutual Boundary

Security of the railway boundary will need to be maintained at all times. If the works require temporary or permanent alterations to the mutual boundary the applicant must contact Network Rail's Asset Protection Project Manager.

Armco Safety Barriers

An Armco or similar barrier should be located in positions where vehicles may be in a position to drive into or roll onto the railway or damage the lineside fencing. Network Rail's existing fencing / wall must not be removed or damaged. Given the considerable number of vehicle movements likely provision should be made at each turning area/roadway/car parking area adjacent to the railway.

Method Statements/Fail Safe/Possessions

Method statements may require to be submitted to Network Rail's Asset Protection Project Manager at the below address for approval prior to works commencing on site. This should include an outline of the proposed method of construction, risk assessment in relation to the railway and construction traffic management plan. Where appropriate an asset protection agreement will have to be entered into. Where any works cannot be carried out in a "fail-safe" manner, it will be necessary to restrict those works to periods when the railway is closed to rail traffic i.e. "possession" which must be booked via Network Rail's Asset Protection Project Manager and are subject to a minimum prior notice period for booking of 20 weeks. Generally if excavations/piling/buildings are to be located within 10m of the railway boundary a method statement should be submitted for NR approval.

OPE

Once planning permission has been granted and at least six weeks prior to works commencing on site the Asset Protection Project Manager (OPE) MUST be contacted, contact details as below. The OPE will require to see any method statements/drawings relating to any excavation, drainage, demolition, lighting and building work or any works to be carried out on site that may affect the safety, operation, integrity and access to the railway.

Vibro-impact Machinery

Where vibro-compaction machinery is to be used in development, details of the use of such machinery and a method statement should be submitted for the approval of the Local Planning Authority acting in consultation with the railway undertaker prior to the commencement of works and the works shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved method statement

Encroachment

The developer/applicant must ensure that their proposal, both during construction, and after completion of works on site, does not affect the safety, operation or integrity of the operational railway, Network Rail and its infrastructure or undermine or damage or adversely affect any railway land and structures. There must be no physical encroachment of the proposal onto Network Rail land, no over-sailing into Network Rail air-space and no encroachment of foundations onto Network Rail land and soil. There must be no physical encroachment of any foundations onto Network Rail land. Any future maintenance must be conducted solely within the applicant's land ownership. Should the applicant require access to Network Rail land then must seek approval from the Network Rail Asset Protection Team. Any unauthorised access to Network Rail land or air-space is an act of trespass and we would remind the council that this is a criminal offence (s55 British Transport Commission Act 1949). Should the applicant be granted access to Network Rail land then they will be liable for all costs incurred in facilitating the proposal.

Trees/Shrubs/Landscaping

Where trees/shrubs are to be planted adjacent to the railway boundary these shrubs should be positioned at a minimum distance greater than their predicted mature height from the boundary. Certain broad leaf deciduous species should not be planted adjacent to the railway boundary. We would wish to be involved in the approval of any landscaping scheme adjacent to the railway. Where landscaping is proposed as part of an application adjacent to the railway it will be necessary for details of the landscaping to be known and approved to ensure it does not impact upon the railway infrastructure. Any hedge planted adjacent to Network Rail's boundary fencing for screening purposes should be so placed that when fully grown it does not damage the fencing or provide a means of scaling it. No hedge should prevent Network Rail from maintaining its boundary fencing. Lists of trees that are permitted and those that are not permitted are provided below and these should be added to any tree planting conditions:

Acceptable:

Birch (*Betula*), Crab Apple (*Malus Sylvestris*), Field Maple (*Acer Campestre*), Bird Cherry (*Prunus Padus*), Wild Pear (*Pyrus Communis*), Fir Trees – Pines (*Pinus*), Hawthorne (*Cretaeagus*), Mountain Ash –Whitebeams (*Sorbus*), False Acacia (*Robinia*), Willow Shrubs (*Shrubby Salix*), Thuja Plicatata "Zebrina"

Not Acceptable:

Acer (*Acer pseudoplatanus*), Aspen – Poplar (*Populus*), Small-leaved Lime (*Tilia Cordata*), Sycamore – Norway Maple (*Acer*), Horse Chestnut (*Aesculus Hippocastanum*), Sweet Chestnut (*Castanea Sativa*), Ash (*Fraxinus excelsior*), Black poplar (*Populus nigra var, betulifolia*), Lombardy Poplar (*Populus nigra var, italica*), Large-leaved lime (*Tilia platyphyllos*), Common lime (*Tilia x europea*)

A comprehensive list of permitted tree species is available upon request.

Lighting

Where new lighting is to be erected adjacent to the operational railway the potential for train drivers to be dazzled must be eliminated. In addition the location and colour of lights must not give rise to the potential for confusion with the signalling arrangements on the railway. Detail of any external lighting should be provided as a condition if not already indicated on the application.

Access to Railway

All roads, paths or ways providing access to any part of the railway undertaker's land shall be kept open at all times during and after the development.

Network Rail is required to recover all reasonable costs associated with facilitating these works.

The method statement will need to be agreed with:

Asset Protection Project Manager
Network Rail (London North Eastern)
Floor 2A
George Stephenson House
Toft Green
York
Y01 6JT

Email: assetprotectionneem@networkrail.co.uk

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY MATTERS

Environmental Permitting Regulations (non-mains drainage).

Advice to Applicant It should be noted that the use of non-mains drainage may require an Environmental Permit from the Environment Agency. Under the terms of the Environmental Permitting Regulations (England and Wales) 2010, anyone intending to discharge volumes of sewage effluent of 5 cubic metres per day or less to surface waters or 2 cubic metres per day or less to ground may be eligible for an exemption. We are currently working with Defra to review our approach to regulating these small sewage discharges. Whilst this review is underway we will not require registration of small sewage discharges in England under an exemption as previously required, as long as you comply with the conditions set out in our Regulatory Position Statement. This is available on our website at:<http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/homeandleisure/118753.aspx>.

Please note that we will retain the existing system so that anyone can still register if they wish to. This might be, for example, as part of a house sale. An Environmental Permit from the Agency is normally required for discharges above this volume or to sensitive locations. It is illegal to discharge sewage effluent in sensitive locations, or discharge over 5 cubic metres per day to surface waters or 2 cubic metres per day to ground, without an Environmental Permit. Further guidance on Environmental Permitting requirements is available on our website at:<http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/business/topics/water/32038.aspx> With regards to design, the site must be drained by a separate system of foul and surface water drainage, with all clean roof and surface water being kept separate from foul water. Useful websites for applicants:

EA website - Do I need to apply for a permit or register an exemption?<http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/business/topics/water/110593.aspx>EA website - Apply for a new Bespoke permit: <http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/business/topics/permitting/117626.aspx>

Land Contamination - Advice to LPA/Applicant

We are unable to provide detailed site-specific advice or guidance with regards to land contamination issues for this site. However, the developer should be aware that the site is located on a Principal Aquifer which is a sensitive controlled waters receptor which could be impacted by any contamination at the site. The developer should address risks to controlled waters from contamination at the site, following the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and the Environment Agency Guiding Principles for Land Contamination.

CONTAMINATION MATTERS

In the event that any suspected munitions or other suspected hazardous substances are encountered, it must be reported immediately to MoD, HSE and the emergency services.

THE FOLLOWING POLICIES AND DOCUMENTS WERE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT IN CONSIDERATION OF THE APPLICATION:

Borough of Darlington Local Plan 1997

Saved Policy EP9 (Teesside Airport Employment Land – North)
Saved Policy EP10 (Teesside Airport Employment Land – South)
Saved Policy T49 (Teesside Airport)

Darlington Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2011

Policy CS1 (Darlington's Sub-Regional Role and Locational Strategy)
Policy CS2 (Achieving High Quality, Sustainable Design)
Policy CS5 (The Provision of Land for Employment Purposes)
Policy CS15 (Protecting and Enhancing Biodiversity and Geodiversity)
Policy CS16 (Protecting Environmental Resources, Human Health and Safety)
Policy CS17 (Delivering a Multifunctional Green Infrastructure Network)

National Planning Policy Framework