

DARLINGTON BOROUGH COUNCIL

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

COMMITTEE DATE: 22 October 2008

Page

APPLICATION REF. NO:	08/00615/FUL
STATUTORY DECISION DATE:	20/10/08
WARD/PARISH:	MIDDLETON ST GEORGE
LOCATION:	Lancaster House, Durham Tees Valley Airport, Middleton St George
DESCRIPTION:	Erection of 130 bedroom hotel with associated access and car parking
APPLICANT:	C G Robinson Limited

APPLICATION AND SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site, which measures some 1.0 hectare in area, is situated on the north western edge of the Durham Tees Valley Airport complex.

It is of an irregular shape, bounded to the northwest by a redundant section of the C 52, to the east by a nursing home and fire training centre and to the south by an area of grassland the development of which was recently granted outline planning permission for a hotel scheme (Ref:06/01008/OUT).

The site is currently occupied by a range of buildings the main one of which is two storey in height and of flat roof construction. The remainder are single storey. Most of the buildings are in poor condition. A proportion of the site is hard surfaced. The rest of the surface area is comprised of overgrown grassed areas and extensive areas of bramble. The site is screened on all sides by young, semi-mature and mature trees of various species. Not all of these trees lie within the site itself. There are also a number of trees across the main area of the site, and several within a small island in front of the main building which are protected by a tree preservation order.

There are currently two vehicular access points into the site from the adjoining road network. One is situated near the north western corner of the site, directly off the redundant section of the C52, and other on the southern side of the site, which is linked to the former main spine road to the airport terminal via a private road. This road is lined either side by trees which are the subject of tree preservation orders.

This is a full application involving the redevelopment of the site for a 130-bedroom hotel, which would also accommodate conference facilities, dining area and a gymnasium. It would be a four storey L shaped building with a maximum height of 15.8m.

134 car parking spaces are provided. Access to the site would be via the existing link road onto the airport access road.

The application is accompanied by the following documents: -

- Planning, Design and Access Statement
- Transport Assessment
- Arboricultural Surveys; and
- An Ecological Report

The development is one that falls within the thresholds set out in Schedule II of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999 (SI/1999/293) (the “1999 Regulations”). As required by the 1999 Regulations, the Local Planning Authority must adopt a formal opinion as to whether an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is required for the development. This process has been undertaken and, having taken into account the criteria set out in Schedule 3 to the 1999 Regulations, the LPA has determined that the proposal does not constitute EIA development.

PLANNING HISTORY

06/01166/OUT – Outline planning permission was granted in October 2007 for a 74 bedroom hotel.

PLANNING POLICY BACKGROUND

Relevant Planning Policy

The starting point for considering the proposal is the statutory development plan. The relevant parts in respect of the proposed hotel use is as follows:

The North East of England Plan Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021

- 2 – Sustainable Development
- 4 – The Sequential Approach to Development
- 12 - Sustainable Economic Development
- 21 -Airports
- 33 – Biodiversity & Geodiversity
- 35 - Flood Risk
- 38 – Sustainable Construction
- 39 – Renewable Energy Generation
- 54- Parking and Travel Plans

Borough of Darlington Local Plan (1997, with alterations 2001)

- E11 - Conservation of Trees Woodlands and Hedgerows
- E12 - Trees and Development
- E13 - Tree Preservation Orders
- E14 - Landscaping of Development

E16 - Appearance From Main Travel Routes
E23 - Nature and Development
E25 – Energy Conservation
E29 - The Setting of New Development
E46 - Safety and Security
EP9 - Teesside Airport Employment Land – North
R1 - Designing for All
R2 - Access for People with Disabilities
TO4 - Hotels and Guest Houses
T12 - New Development-Road Capacity
T13 - New Development-Standards
T24 - Parking and Servicing Requirements for New Development
T31 - New Development and Public Transport
T39 – Conditions for Pedestrians
T52 - Drainage Infrastructure

Government Planning Policy

PPS1 – Delivering Sustainable Development
PPS6 - Planning for Town Centres
PPS23- Planning and Pollution Control
PPS25- Development and Flood Risk
PPG13- Transport

RESULTS OF CONSULTATION AND PUBLICITY

Two letters of objection have been received to the proposed development. One from local residents and the other from Peel Airports Group, the owners and operators of Durham Tees Valley Airport.

The following issues have been raised: -

- *The airport is acknowledged as a key economic driver of regional significance. Both Darlington and Stockton Borough Councils have granted planning permissions for the expansion of the airport including an airport related business park and hotel. Durham Tees Valley Airport Limited (DTVAL) is currently preparing a master plan to set out expected growth to 2030, the preparation of which is being overseen by steering group comprising representatives of Darlington and Stockton Borough Council's, Government Office, Regional Assembly and Tees Valley Regeneration. Sustainable growth of the airport is a key part of national policy on air transport, and of the development plan and economic strategy for the Tees Valley. The approved north side business park and its hotel is deemed appropriate and essential in the context of the airport expansion proposals. By contrast the Lancaster House scheme has not been considered as part of the wider context of the development at the airport. An oversupply of competing bed spaces in the initial stages of airport growth would undermine the investment made in infrastructure and services to serve both the airport and related developments. These points might appear to seek to preserve a commercial interest but are also material in a planning sense. Without the significant investment proposed and the income generated by both the airport expansion and the north side business park developments,*

there is a serious concern that the growth of the airport and its potential to become an economic driver for the region will be undermined.

- *The tests set out in PPS6 (Town Centres) apply but have not been addressed by the application.*
- *The proposal fails to address the issue of need and does not consider the cumulative impact of a larger hotel or existing hotel commitments at the airport.*
- *Even if evidence of need can be established it is clear that a sequential assessment of potential sites should be undertaken. Such an assessment should consider approved developments and other potential sites that come forward in the future.*
- *The applicants have not attempted a sequential test nor does it perform well against the test set out in PPS6 or the RSS.*
- *The accompanying Transport Assessment is based on out of date traffic data. Until this is updated no credible consideration of the capacities of local junctions can take place. During discussions with the Highways Agency on other projects at the airport it is clear that they are concerned about any increase in traffic at these junctions and have in the past insisted on improvements. A similar approach must be taken with this application.*
- *The proposal states that drainage will be fed into the existing system, which is being upgraded by DTVL. These improvements will provide sufficient capacity for DTVL's own development in the form of a private system and will not release any spare capacity for other projects in the vicinity. Furthermore, these improvements will not release capacity at Goosepool Beck as the new system is for the new developments only. Details of how the drainage will be managed should form part of the application. In the absence of such details it would be inappropriate to make this conditional to any approval and the application should be refused.*
- *There is an existing flooding problem on Goosepool Beck that the existing drainage from the site runs to. Any increase in flows to that stream will only increase the problem. Whilst a full Flood Risk Assessment may not be justified, the potential increase in flooding in the wider catchment area is a determinative issue and therefore some consideration should be given to this.*
- *The tree report does not address the potential impact that the proposed footway may have on the trees lining the western side of the access road. Planning permission should not be granted until a detailed design of the footpath and road widening has been provided.*
- *An accompanying supporting statement with the application recommends that it should not be determined until a Great Crested Newt survey has been undertaken. A full ecological survey is also recommended.*
- *The site access road is unsuitable for use by vehicles or pedestrians. The access road is shown on the submitted drawings to have a width of 4.6m whereas measured on site this is 4.6m, which fails to comply with the advice set out in the Department for Transport document Manual for Streets. Or the outline approval previously approved for this site.*
- *Detailed plans should be provided showing the width of the footway along the access road and also detailed design of the access road and its junction with the adopted highway.*
- *The applicant does not own all of the land adjacent to the access road and therefore agreement would need to be reached with at least two other landowners*
- *for the development to commence. One of the landowners is DTVL who own the access road and are not prepared to allow the work to take place on their land.*
- *The Borough of Darlington Local Plan suggests that "upgrading and or renewal of the existing road and drainage infrastructure is also desirable and should accompany any*

development or redevelopment proposals". Clearly this has not been addressed. This would therefore be contrary to policy T13 of the Local Plan, which requires all roads of this type to be built to adoptable standards.

- *The applicant is not believed to be the registered owner of the site.*
- *Certificate B has been incorrectly completed. Durham Tees Valley Airport (DVTVA) owns the access road to the site, which is included in the application boundary*

North East Assembly has made a number of detailed comments on the application, which are summarised below: -

"The proposed development conforms with RSS policy 21 regarding airport related development. Although a hotel is normally classed as a city centre use under guidelines set out in PPS6, it will aid the implementation of RSS policy 21 and therefore the NEA deems that it is in conformity with regional planning policy.

The potential disturbance of great crested newt breeding grounds needs to be assessed through further surveys. If this species is found to be present within the boundaries of the development site, the applicant would be required to gain a license from Natural England before any works could proceed. The NEA supports this approach as it is consistent with RSS policy 23.

The proposal does not incorporate SUDS. Support for the use of SUDS is outlined in PPS25 and RSS policy 34, therefore the NEA supports the local planning authority in requiring the adoption of SUDS.

The proposal does not incorporate any embedded renewable energy, which is contrary to RSS objectives on energy use and climate change. The proposal would be in general conformity with the RSS, provided it incorporates 10% renewable energy, or where the local authority is satisfied that this is not viable."

Tees Valley Regeneration has commented as follows: -

"The recently issued Regional Spatial Strategy for the North East (RSS July 2008) seeks to maximise the potential of both airports in the Region to support economic growth and regeneration. Policies 10 and 21 in the RSS both support the sustainable expansion of facilities at Durham Tees Valley Airport, and provides for land at the Airport to be safeguarded for airport related uses. The definitions of airport related uses includes hotels. Paragraph 3.48 of the RSS states "for development including hotels.....the relationship to the airport related business should be explicitly justified, be of an appropriate scale relative to core airport related business and be assessed against relevant policy elsewhere in planning policy guidance."

The strategically important role of Durham Tees Valley Airport to the economy of the sub region is also recognised in the Tees Valley City Region Business Case (2008), which seeks government support for airport growth and the potential of development adjacent to airports. Durham Tees Valley Airport's role as a key economic driver is clearly recognised at regional and sub-regional/city level, and the Airport will play a major role in the future development of the Tees Valley. A range of facilities are necessary to support airport growth and hotels are an integral part of that growth.

This application therefore broadly accords with the strategic policy set out in the Regional Spatial Strategy. However Darlington Borough Council should be satisfied that:

- *The applicant has sufficiently justified the need for the development, particularly in relation to demand for additional hotel accommodation at the Airport, and*
- *The proposal supports and complements future development and growth at the Airport.”*

One North East make the following comments:

“The regional Economic Strategy promotes the need for quality of place within existing and proposed development. With this in mind, should the application be view favourably, the Agency would request the Local Planning Authority to encourage the developer to pursue the highest standards of quality in the development of this site, e.g. BREEAM, Building for Life and Secured by Design. In line with Government objectives to generate 10% of electricity from renewable energy sources by 2010 the application should also provide details regarding the provision of renewable energy measures within the scheme.”

PLANNING ISSUES

In acknowledging the important work Tees Valley Regeneration, One North East and Peel Holdings have, and continue to do, in promoting and facilitating the ongoing development of DTVA, this Council has constantly supported the airport’s role as a key economic driver for the Tees Valley sub-region. That role, explained in the comments of the Tees Valley Joint Strategy Unit’s response above, is confirmed and supported by the adopted and emerging economic and planning policy. In principle therefore, subject to the usual planning considerations, the strategy for regenerating the airport is supported.

The main issues to be considered in the determination of this application are: -

- Planning Policy
- Visual Amenity
- Residential Amenity
- Ecology
- Foul and Surface Water Drainage
- Flooding
- Trees
- Highway Implications

Planning Policy

The principle of hotel development on this site has already been established with the grant of the outline planning permission in October 2007.

The new Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) was published in July 2008. Policy 21 of the RSS supports the development of the two north east airports and cites an anticipated 3 million growth in passengers per annum to Durham Tees Valley Airport (DTVA) by 2016 as well as possible expansion of the airport through 80ha of land which is currently safeguarded for development. Taking into account the needs and preferences of tourists to the airport is also cited within Policy 21.

The detailed comments in relation to PPS6 and the previous scheme continue to be relevant for this case, including comments previously made on the Council's position in relation to the needs test.

PPS6 sets out the Government's planning policies for main town centres uses, including hotels. Applicants putting forward proposals for main town centre uses outside a town centre are as a general rule required to demonstrate the need for the development, that it is of an appropriate scale, that there are no more central sites for it (ie. that the applicants have adopted a sequential approach to site selection), that there would be no unacceptable impacts on existing centres and that the location is accessible.

However, PPS6 adds that: a demonstration of need is not required where an application is in accordance with an up-to-date development plan document strategy, a sequential approach need not be applied to a proposal for a site which is "allocated in an up-to-date development plan document"; and an impact assessment need not be undertaken for an application which is in accordance with an up-to-date development plan strategy. The wording for each of these is slightly different but officers consider that the present proposal qualifies for exemption under all of them given that Policy 21 of the adopted RSS brings up to date and confirms the policies of the adopted development plan in respect of hotel development at or adjacent to Durham Tees Valley Airport.

Regarding scale (usually defined in terms of gross floorspace), the hotel would be of unexceptional scale, and would appear to be appropriate to the location. (It is not within the scope of this test to consider the appropriateness of having a number of hotels in close proximity serving the airport; given the lack of requirement for a needs test that will be for the market to determine.)

In respect of the final PPS6 test, local planning authorities are required to consider whether the development would be accessible by a choice of means of transport, taking full account of customers' likely travel needs. Given that the proposed hotels would principally serve passengers and flight staff using the airport, the proximity of the sites to the terminal, its car parks, public transport facilities and taxi ranks (and to lesser extent walking and cycling routes) would seem to meet any reasonable requirements for genuine accessibility to them. Local planning authorities must also consider the impact of the development on car use, traffic and congestion. As most trips by the hotel's customers would be made to the airport in any event any additional impact on overall distance travelled by car and on local traffic levels and congestion in the area could be expected to be minimal.

In conclusion, the proposals accord with the relevant policies of PPS6 as well as with those of the development plan. Officers consider that, notwithstanding the range of planning issues raised by objectors, an underlying factor is the commercial competition with the Airport's own proposal for a hotel, north of the Business Park. For the reasons set out above, competition is not considered a material planning issue.

Visual Amenity

The proposed building is considered acceptable in terms of its design, form and siting. The building would be situated some 110m from the airport spine road and screened to a large degree by existing tree coverage around the perimeter of the site. Consequently its visual impact on the visual amenities of the area would be fairly minimal.

Residential Amenity

Functions held at the hotel may have the potential to give rise to problems of noise and disturbance for residents in the adjoining nursing home to the east. It would be prudent therefore to make any grant of planning permission conditional to the submission of a sound insulation scheme to address this issue.

The nearest dwellings to the site (Goosepool Cottages) are situated some 90m to the northeast, beyond the Darlington/Saltburn Railway line. A residential care home lies to the east approximately 25m from the site boundary and 46m to the nearest part of the proposed hotel building. Given these separation distances between the neighbouring buildings and the site there is unlikely to be any adverse effects on the amenities of the occupiers of those properties.

Ecology

A report has been submitted with the application, which assesses the existing ecological interest of the site. The report identified the presence of great crested newt breeding ponds within 500m however no sightings or evidence of breeding were found to indicate that great crested newts are present within the site.

The ecology report was undertaken in 2007 for the previous outline application. Natural England have advised that based on this report the proposed redevelopment of the site is unlikely to have an adverse impact on this protected species. However they also comment that the Council should consider whether the current proposals might alter the level of impact on protected species and therefore negate their previous advice.

The Council's Countryside Section are satisfied that the scheme would not impact on protected species however they recommend the inclusion of wildlife friendly habitat areas to compliment a landscaping scheme for the site, which can be made conditional to any approval.

Foul and Surface Water Drainage

Northumbrian Water has raised no objection to the development subject to conditions requiring schemes for the treatment of foul and surface water drainage being approved and implemented. In requiring these conditions the statutory undertaker has made the following comments: -

“ The Goosebeck Sewage Treatment Works (STW) is at full capacity, its effluent discharges to a very small watercourse and any expansion of the STW would be difficult to achieve with the consent of the Environment Agency (EA).

Discussions have been held in the past with the developer of the airport to reorganise the airport's drainage system that would release some capacity at Goosebeck STW. The reorganised drainage system would drain to another STW at Middleton One Row which itself would be replaced with a transfer pumping station to pump the foul flows to the STW at Stressholme in Darlington. To date there have been no firm proposals by the airport developer to carry out the reorganisation of the airport drainage system. NWL is proceeding with the project to transfer the Middleton One Row STW flows for its own requirements but the earliest start date for construction would not be until the end of 2009 and may be later. On completion of this scheme, and in the absence of a reorganisation of the airport drainage system by the airport developer, there will still not be any capacity at the Goosebeck STW. A feasibility study is required to review the drainage options in and around the airport.”

Flooding

The site is not within a floodplain and the application is not of a type on which the Council is required to consult the Environment Agency. Nevertheless the Agency has been consulted on the proposed development and has raised no objections. However, they have suggested the imposition of conditions to any approval to prevent polluted waters from the car park being discharged into any watercourse or soakaway system.

Trees

The development would necessitate the removal of a number of trees in the central area of the site located around the existing buildings. However these are not considered to be of any significant value. The arboriculture reports accompanying the application indicate the retention of the perimeter tree coverage, which could form the basis of a landscaping scheme for the development should permission, be granted. The Protected trees at the southeastern corner are also to be retained.

The Council's arboricultural officer is satisfied that the proposed works to the access road and the incorporation of a footway on the western side will not cause any detriment to the lives of the protected trees provided that measures are in place to protect them prior to road works taking place. Such safeguarding measures would also need to extend to the other trees to be retained, which can be made conditional to any approval.

Highway Implications

The Highways Agency has advised that they do not consider that the development would have any significant impact on the wider road network.

The Council's Highway's Engineer has raised no objections to the scheme on parking or other highway grounds but has made some specific comments regarding pedestrian access to the wider footpath network and access to public transport which are as follows:-

“Though the proposed footpath on the western side of the access road will provide a direct pedestrian link to the main road the pedestrian routes to the existing bus stops are poor. However the land where the footways would be required is outside the control of the applicant and it would not be reasonable to include a condition requiring improvements of these routes. The bus stops are approximately 250m from the hotel entrance and is well within guidance values for preferred minimum walking distances”

He has also made a number of detailed comments regarding requirements for: the width of the access road; provision of dropped crossings and tactile paving within the site; amendments to disabled parking provision; and provision of lighting to the proposed pedestrian footpath on the western side of the access road. Such requirements can be made conditional to any approval.

SECTION 17 OF THE CRIME AND DISORDER ACT 1998

The contents of this report have 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. It is not considered that the contents of this report have any such effect.

CONCLUSION

It is acknowledged that the Airport plays a key transport and economic role for the Tees Valley sub region and that the general principle of regeneration and expansion should be supported where appropriate. The application site lies within an area allocated for airport employment land as identified in the development plan. As with other recent hotel application approvals at the airport, including the previous outline approval on this site, the principle of development in this location is acceptable. It is expected that the market will decide which, if any, of the hotels get built, in response to demand.

The layout and scale of the proposed development are considered acceptable. The development would not adversely affect the amenities of neighbouring occupiers or the amenity value of nearby protected trees. The application is not considered to raise any issues in relation to foul or surface water drainage, car parking provision, highway safety or crime prevention. Consequently it is considered that there are no material reasons to withhold a grant of planning permission.

RECOMMENDATION

THAT PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS

1. A3 Implementation Limit (Five Years)
2. B4 Details of Materials (Samples)
3. B5 Detailed Drawings (Accordance with Plan)
4. Notwithstanding anything indicated on the submitted drawings the following details shall be submitted to, and approved by, the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development: -
 - a) Access Road detail to incorporate a minimum width of 4.8m and associated lighting.
 - b) Dropped crossings and tactile paving at all crossing points within the site.
 - c) Provision of a rear access zone of 1.2m on disabled car parking spaces (not to encroach onto the vehicle circulation area between the parking spaces).
 - d) Provision of a cycle link from the northwestern corner of the site to the wider cycle route network around the roundabout at the main entrance to the airport.

The development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the approved details and the works shall be implemented prior to the hotel being brought into use.

REASON – In the interests of highway safety.

5. Notwithstanding condition 4a (above) the footpath link shall be of a no dig construction, details of which shall be submitted to, and approved by, the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development.

REASON – In order to safeguard the root zones of the adjacent protected trees.

6. No development shall commence until precise details of crown lifting of trees along the western side of the access road have been submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the approved details.

REASON – To safeguard the life of the preserved trees in the interests of visual amenity.

7. E11 Tree Protection Measures
8. F7 Maintain Vehicular Sightlines
9. D18 Control of Fumes
10. D19 Ventilation Equipment (Details Required)
11. J2 Contamination
12. Prior to the commencement of development precise details of secure covered cycle parking for staff and visitors shall be submitted, and approved by, the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the approved details and the cycle parking provision shall be made available prior to the occupation of the buildings.

REASON – To ensure that adequate parking provision is provided in accordance with the adopted and emerging planning and transport policies which promote access by alternative transport modes.

13. Notwithstanding any information that has been provided with the application, details of a full travel plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development. This scheme shall not be implemented otherwise than in accordance with the approved details.

REASON - To encourage the reduction of journeys made to and from the site by private motor vehicles by the promotion of more sustainable forms of transport.

14. Development shall not be commenced until a detailed scheme for the treatment of the foul flows from the development hereby approved has been submitted to, and approved by, the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be occupied until the scheme for the treatment of the foul flows has been completed and commissioned in accordance with the approved details.

REASON - The sewage treatment works to which the development will discharge is at full capacity and cannot accept the foul flows.

15. Development shall not commence until a detailed scheme for the disposal of surface water from the development hereby approved has been submitted to, and approved by, the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the approved details.

REASON – To ensure the discharge of surface water from the development does not increase the risk of flooding from sewers in accordance with the requirements of PPS 25 “Development and Flood Risk” and complies with the Hierarchy of Preference contained within Revised Part H of the Building Regulations 2000, and for environmental reasons to avoid the unnecessary pumping and treatment of surface water.

16. Prior to being discharged into any watercourse, surface water sewer or soakaway system, all surface water drainage from the parking areas and hardstandings shall be passed through an oil interceptor installed in accordance with a scheme previously submitted to, and approved by, the Local Planning Authority. Roof water shall not pass through the interceptor.

REASON- To prevent pollution of the water environment.

17. Any facilities for the storage of oils, fuels or chemicals shall be sited on impervious bases and surrounded by impervious bund walls. The volume of the bunded compound should be at least equivalent to the capacity of the tank plus 10%. If there is multiple tankage, the compound should be at least equivalent to the capacity of the largest tank, or the combined capacity of interconnected tanks, plus 10%. All filling points, vents, gauges and site glasses must be located within the bund. The drainage system of the bund shall be sealed with no discharge to any water course, land or underground strata. Associated pipework should be located above ground and protected from accidental damage. All filling points and tank overflow outlets should be detailed to discharge downwards into the bund.

REASON – to prevent pollution of the water environment.

18. Details of landscaping, to include wildlife friendly habitat areas, shall be submitted to, and approved by, the Local Planning Authority prior to site clearance/demolition work commencing on site. Such landscaping shall be provided either within the first planting season after the completion of the development or prior to the building being occupied and thereafter permanently maintained. Any trees or shrubs removed, dying, severely damaged or becoming seriously diseased within five years of planting shall be replaced by trees or shrubs of similar size and species to those originally approved.

REASON –To create biodiversity and ensure a satisfactory appearance of the site and to improve the visual amenities of the locality.

19. No development shall take place until the Local Planning Authority has approved in writing a report provided by the applicant identifying how the predicted CO₂ emissions of the development will be reduced by at least 10% through the use of on-site renewable energy equipment. The carbon savings, which result from this, will be above and beyond what is required to comply with Part L of the Building Regulations. Before the development is occupied the renewable energy equipment shall have been installed and the Local Planning Authority shall be satisfied that their day-to-day operation will provide energy for the development for so long as the development remains in existence.

REASON - In order to comply with the objectives set out in the Regional Spatial Strategy for on site renewable energy sources.

20. No development shall be commenced until a design statement, to BREEAM Standards, for the development has been submitted to, and approved by, the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be carried out otherwise in accordance with the approved details.

REASON – In order that the Local Authority are satisfied as to the details of the development and to ensure that the development is carried out in a sustainable manner.

21. No development shall commence until a scheme to achieve at least 10% on site energy from renewable sources, has been submitted to, and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the approved details.

REASON – in order to comply with the objectives set out in the Regional Spatial Strategy for on site renewable energy sources.

22. Notwithstanding anything shown in application the car park shall be designed with the intention of achieving the ‘Park Mark’ Safer Parking Award.

REASON – In the interests of crime prevention.

SUGGESTED SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANTING PLANNING PERMISSION

The application site lies within an area allocated for airport employment land as identified in the development plan. The layout and scale of the proposed development are considered acceptable. The development would not adversely affect the amenities of neighbouring occupiers or the amenity value of nearby protected trees. The application is not considered to raise any issues in relation to foul or surface water drainage, car parking provision, highway safety or crime prevention. Therefore the proposed development is considered to comply with the policies in the development plan and Government planning policy set out below: -

The North East of England Plan Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021

- 2 – Sustainable Development
- 4 – The Sequential Approach to Development
- 12 - Sustainable Economic Development
- 21 - Airports
- 33 – Biodiversity & Geodiversity
- 35 - Flood Risk
- 38 – Sustainable Construction
- 39 – Renewable Energy Generation
- 54 - Parking and Travel Plans

Borough of Darlington Local Plan (1997, with alterations 2001)

- E11 - Conservation of Trees Woodlands and Hedgerows
- E12 - Trees and Development
- E13 - Tree Preservation Orders
- E14 - Landscaping of Development
- E16 - Appearance From Main Travel Routes
- E23 - Nature and Development
- E25 – Energy Conservation
- E29 - The Setting of New Development

E46 - Safety and Security
EP9 - Teesside Airport Employment Land – North
R1 - Designing for All
R2 - Access for People with Disabilities
TO4 - Hotels and Guest Houses
T12 - New Development-Road Capacity
T13 - New Development-Standards
T24 - Parking and Servicing Requirements for New Development
T31 - New Development and Public Transport
T39 – Conditions for Pedestrians
T52 - Drainage Infrastructure

Government Planning Policy

PPS1 – Delivering Sustainable Development
PPS6 - Planning for Town Centres
PPS23- Planning and Pollution Control
PPS25- Development and Flood Risk
PPG13- Transport

INFORMATIVE TO BE INCLUDED SHOULD PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED

The applicant is advised that works are required in the public highway and contact must be made with the Highways Manager (contact Mr A. Ward 01325 388743) to arrange for the works to be carried out or to obtain authority under Section 184 of the Highways Act 1980 to execute the works.