



**Area Planning Committee (Central and East Durham)**

**Date** Tuesday 12 June 2012  
**Time** 1.00 pm  
**Venue** Council Chamber, County Hall, Durham

---

**Business**

**Part A**

1. Minutes of the Meeting held on 8 May 2012 (Pages 1 - 6)
2. Declarations of Interest, if any
3. Applications to be determined by the Area Planning Committee (Central & East Durham)
  - a) 4/12/00324/VOC & 4/12/00325/VOC - Ramside Hall Hotel, Carville, Durham, DH1 1TD (Pages 7 - 18)  
Variation of condition no. 2 of listed building consent ref: 08/00197/LB and condition no. 7 of reserved matters approval ref 08/00196/RM, in order to amend the design, scale and layout of the approved bedroom and leisure extension.
4. Such other business as, in the opinion of the Chairman of the meeting, is of sufficient urgency to warrant consideration

**Colette Longbottom**  
Head of Legal and Democratic Services

County Hall  
Durham  
31 May 2012

To: **The Members of the Area Planning Committee (Central and East Durham)**

Councillor C Walker (Chair)  
Councillor P Taylor (Vice-Chair)

Councillors J Bailey, A Bell, J Blakey, G Bleasdale, J Brown,  
P Charlton, D Freeman, S Iveson, A Laing, R Liddle, J Moran,  
J Robinson, K Thompson and B Wilson

---

**Contact: Ian Croft**

**Tel: 0191 383 3489**

---

This page is intentionally left blank

**DURHAM COUNTY COUNCIL**

**AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE (CENTRAL AND EAST DURHAM)**

At a Meeting of **Area Planning Committee (Central and East Durham)** held in Council Chamber, County Hall, Durham on **Tuesday 8 May 2012 at 1.00 pm**

**Present:**

**Councillor C Walker (Chair)**

**Members of the Committee:**

Councillors P Taylor (Vice-Chair), J Bailey, A Bell, J Blakey, G Bleasdale, J Brown, P Charlton, D Freeman, S Iveson, R Liddle, J Moran, K Thompson and A Naylor

**Apologies:**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors A Laing, J Robinson and B Wilson

**Also Present:**

Councillor Robin Todd

**1 Minutes**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 10 April 2012 were confirmed by the Committee as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**2 Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

**3 Applications to be determined by the Area Planning Committee (Central & East Durham)**

**3a 4/12/00154/VOC - Plots 5N and Plot 5S Bishopsgate, 48 North End, Durham, DH1 4LW**

The Committee considered a report of the Principal Planning Officer (Durham Area) regarding the variation of condition 2 of application 11/00748/FPA (demolition of existing bungalow and erection of 2 no. dwelling houses) revising the layout of site together with other alterations to the rear elevation of the northern plot dwelling and roof profile on the southern elevation of the southern plot dwelling (for copy see file of Minutes).

Mr James Taylor, Principal Planning Officer, provided the Committee with a detailed presentation, which included photographs of the site. Members of the Committee had visited the site earlier in the day and were familiar with the location and setting.

Councillor G Holland, local Member, spoke against the application and informed the Committee that his views were supported by Councillor Martin, local Member. He outlined to the Committee the planning history involved with this site, which had been over a period of two years. The current application still did not accord with Policies H7, H10, H13, Q8 and Q9 and it was his opinion that due procedure had not been followed in this application. The proposed development failed and the application should be refused because it represented overdevelopment and would result in an adverse impact on the character and appearance of a residential area.

Mr Anderson, local resident, spoke against the application, and informed the Committee he had similar issues as those considered earlier relating to Plot 4. He challenged the legality of the original planning permission granted for the site because local objections would have been stronger if correct drawings had been submitted. The gardens to the rear of Plots 5N and 5S were very narrow and there was no screening between these houses, which were 3 storeys high, and the properties they backed on to.

The Principal Planning Officer responded to the points made. The sizes of the buildings on the site were slightly smaller than approved, although their position on site was slightly different. Careful consideration had been given to issuing stop action, but the application was not considered to be contrary to the Local Plan. Although the garden areas of Plots 5N and 5S had reduced, the available garden of the two dwellings was still acceptable. A considerable amount of work had been carried out to ensure the plans reflected what had been surveyed on site.

Councillor K Thompson informed the Committee that he believed the application represented overdevelopment and recommended refusal. Councillor J Bailey seconded this recommendation.

Councillor P Taylor informed the Committee that, although problems had been experienced with this development, the application must be judged on planning policies. As it stood, the application accorded with planning policies and he asked upon what grounds it could be refused.

Councillor Freeman referred to the objection of Design and Conservation which was outlined in paragraph 66 to the report and added that this, together with the application failing to meet Policy Q8 could be reasons for refusal.

The Principal Planning Officer informed the Committee that while it was regretful how this application had progressed, the application had previously been found to be acceptable in terms of the design of the buildings. The developer had discharged all key conditions and the applicant was commencing the development lawfully. The concerns expressed by Design and Conservation were around the design and impact of the properties, but the design was consistent with others in the area. The distances outlined in Policy Q8 had been met.

In reply to a question from Councillor Bleasdale regarding refusing the application, Mr Neil Carter, Planning and Development Solicitor informed the Committee that the planning permission granted for the development could not be fully implemented on site because of discrepancies on the plans submitted. This was a section 73 application to vary condition 2 of the planning permission to remedy this defect.

**Resolved:**

That the application be approved, subject to the conditions detailed in the recommendations in the report.

**3b PL/5/2011/0060 - Melrose Arms, Office Row, Front Street, Shotton Colliery DH6 2NA**

The Committee considered a report of the Principal Planning Officer (Easington Area) regarding the change of use from public house to educational centre (Class D1:Non-Residential Use) at the Melrose Arms, Office Row, Front Street, Shotton Colliery (for copy see file of Minutes).

The Principal Planning Officer gave a detailed presentation on the application which included photographs of the site. Members had visited the site that day and were familiar with the location and setting.

Councillor Robin Todd, local Member, addressed the Committee. He expressed concern at the application around highways issues and associated parking. The application site, which had no off-street parking, was on the main road into Shotton from the A19 which was particularly busy during shift changes at nearby factories. The application was for the building to be used as an educational centre, with a recommended restriction that it be used solely for this purpose, which would require monitoring by the Council. Shotton Partnership already provided a learning centre in Shotton and Councillor Todd expressed concern that the proposed facility may lead to community segregation. He suggested that a better use for the site would be for demolition of the building to be followed by residential development with off-street parking.

Mr Blakey, local resident, spoke against the application. He informed the Committee that the applicant had damaged the fixtures and fittings on the interior of the former public house. He did not see the application as being a viable proposition for a businessman to undertake and expressed concern that the education centre would become a prayer facility which would result in increasing numbers using the facility. He expressed similar concerns as Councillor Todd regarding highways and parking issues.

Mr Neki, agent for the applicant, addressed the Committee. The proposed education centre would serve a small local community of approximately 10 to 12 families and would be a local centre for them to congregate in on an evening and at weekends. It was not anticipated that people from outside of the Shotton area would use such a small centre, and it was intended that 6 to 12 people would use it as and when needed, which would not generate a lot of traffic. The pub had been

derelict and available on the open market for a number of years but had attracted no interest. When the building was previously operating as a pub many people would have visited which would have generated a lot more traffic than the current application. Given the investment that his client would be putting into the building to refurbish it, Mr Neki requested that the application be granted without the recommended 12-month conditional approval.

The Principal Planning Officer (Easington Area) addressed the points raised. The County Council had an active enforcement team, and any reported transgressions to the planning permission would be investigated. The Committee needed to consider the application before it today which was in an existing building and would improve the range of facilities in the area.

**Resolved:**

That the application be approved, subject to the conditions outlined in the report.

**3c PL/5/2011/0082 & PL/5/2011/0083 - The Castle, The Village, Castle Eden TS27 4SL**

The Committee considered a report of the Principal Planning Officer (Easington Area) regarding the change of use from residential to hotel (C3 to C1) (resubmission including revised and additional information) and associated listed building consent at The Castle, The Village, Castle Eden (for copy see file of Minutes).

The Principal Planning Officer gave a detailed presentation on the application which included photographs of the site. Members had visited the site that day and were familiar with the location and setting.

The Principal Planning Officer informed the Committee that since the report was circulated the following updates had been received:

- Information had just been received today that the applicant had sufficient control over the land required for the necessary highways visibility splay works to be carried out. However, there had not been time to verify this, and an initial inspection of the submitted details suggested there was still uncertainty over the situation. On this basis, Paragraph 32 of the report should indicate that the applicants had failed to provide evidence that they had a reasonable prospect of carrying out these works. Similarly, in the absence of further investigation, Reason for Refusal No. 1 in the Recommendation Section of the report remained relevant in its entirety, subject to a change of wording to refer to a reasonable prospect of carrying out the works, rather than sufficient control over the land.
- The proposed lift shaft had been removed from the application and therefore there was no requirement for a bat survey to be carried out as detailed in paragraph 35.
- The Environment Agency had withdrawn its objection to the proposals because the non-mains drainage issue had been resolved. Therefore, Reason for refusal No. 3 in the Recommendation Section in the report should be deleted.

Councillor Len O'Donnell, local Member, addressed the Committee. He informed the Committee that the application was part of an ongoing application which had been taking place with amendments for the last two years. Castle Eden village was an area of outstanding beauty with very narrow streets for vehicles to access the proposed hotel. He referred the Committee to paragraph 33 of the report which stated that the highway improvement scheme would be deemed to be unacceptable in terms of its impact on the Conservation Area which was contrary to saved Local Plan Policy 22. He supported local residents in their objections to the application and the recommendations of the planning officers.

Dawn Carter, local resident, addressed the Committee. She referred to the narrowness of the road in the village and showed photographs of traffic congestion that was occasionally caused by services held at the village church, which resulted in cars parking on the B road. The village lane narrowed towards the castle gates.

Mr Davies, the applicant, addressed the Committee. The Castle had approximately 30 rooms and was a landmark of the area, but needed a larger use than at present. Plans regarding access had been changed to meet the needs of the Council and any trees removed by the visibility splay works would be mitigated by replanting. For the last 4 years the Castle had been hired for events and parties during which time no complaints had been received regarding traffic or access through the village. Change of use of the Castle to a hotel would bring with it economic benefits of local producers being used for food supplies, local contractors being employed for building works and economic benefits of tourism to the region.

The Principal Planning Officer replied that although the trees in the vicinity of the visibility splay may be of varying quality, they were in a conservation area and were a significant grouping of mature trees. Any replanting works would not be of a similar impact. The frequency of the Castle being hired for private parties and events was not known, whereas the conversion to a hotel would result in regular usage with regular activities in the proposed restaurant and bar areas.

**Resolved:**

That the recommendations in the report be approved, subject to the changes to Reason for Refusal No. 1 and the deletion of Reason No. 3 as described by the Principal Planning Officer.

**3d PL/5/2012/0039 - 51 Ocean View, Blackhall TS27 4DA**

The Committee considered a report of the Principal Planning Officer (Easington Area) regarding the erection of a front and rear two storey extension at 51 Ocean View, Blackhall (for copy see file of Minutes).

The Principal Planning Officer gave a detailed presentation on the application which included photographs of the site.

Councillor Crute, local Member, addressed the Committee. While he appreciated that planning officers were constrained by NPPF guidance, he expressed a hope

that common sense could prevail. There would be no overshadowing caused by the development because the property faced a westerly direction; there would be no adverse visual impact on the street scene because the proposed extension would be a long way from the street line; there were extensions of a similar design already in the area; there was no adverse public perception because all neighbouring properties had been consulted and no objections had been received. Indeed, at a recent residents association meeting there were no objections and some expressions of support for this type of development.

Mr G Fallow, applicant, addressed the Committee. The existing rear extension at the property extended by some 3 to 4 metres and the proposed extension would be 5.1 metres, which would be well within local guidelines. Although local guidelines stated that a front extension should only extend up to 1.5 metres, the property was well set back from the street and consideration should be given to waiving the 1.5 metre guideline on this occasion. There would be virtually no overshadowing because of the location of the property and the travel of the sun. The footprint of the proposed development would be less than 100% of the existing property, and would result in plot usage of less than 31%, due to the large size of the gardens.

The Principal Planning Officer replied to the points raised. Some degree of overshadowing would occur to the detached property to the north. While it was accepted that the extension would be set back from the edge of the street, it was too large in overall size terms. It was also accepted that there had been no objections from neighbouring properties, however, there was a need to protect the amenities of neighbours and the environment. The current rear extension was only single storey.

**Resolved:**

That the application be approved for the following reasons: the proposals were not considered to have such an adverse effect on the amenities of neighbours or the appearance of the street scene to justify refusal of planning permission

**4 Appeal Update**

**Appeal by Mr Dominic Charles Hunt - Site at 9 Hope Street, Sherburn, Durham - Planning Ref: 4/11/00704**

The Inspector had dismissed the appeal.

**Appeal by Mr Harding - Site at 13 Neville Street, Durham - Planning Ref: 4/11/00342**

The Inspector had dismissed the appeal.

**RESOLVED**

That the information be noted.

## Planning Services

# COMMITTEE REPORT

---

### APPLICATION DETAILS

---

<b>APPLICATION No:</b>	4/12/00324/VOC & 4/12/00325/VOC
<b>FULL APPLICATION DESCRIPTION:</b>	Variation of condition no. 2 of listed building consent ref: 08/00197/LB and condition no. 7 of reserved matters approval ref 08/00196/RM, in order to amend the design, scale and layout of the approved bedroom and leisure extension.
<b>NAME OF APPLICANT:</b>	Ramside Estates Ltd
<b>ADDRESS:</b>	Ramside Hall Hotel, Carville, Durham, DH1 1TD
<b>ELECTORAL DIVISION:</b>	Belmont
<b>CASE OFFICER:</b>	Barry Gavillet, Senior Planning Officer, 03000 262 515, <a href="mailto:barry.gavillet@durham.gov.uk">barry.gavillet@durham.gov.uk</a>

---

### DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND PROPOSALS

---

**Site:** The application site relates to an existing hotel situated within the Green Belt. The building itself is Grade II listed and has been extended previously on a number of occasions, the original building now forming a relatively minor part of the overall building. The building itself is occupied as a hotel performing various associated functions including a golf course with associated detached clubhouse.

**Proposal:** Outline planning permission was granted in March 2005 (04/00836/OUT) for the erection of a 56 bedroom extension, ballroom redevelopment, provision of leisure/health spa, car park extension and golf course extension. Subsequently, an application for reserved matters was approved for the erection of the leisure facility element and which comprises details in respect of layout, scale, appearance, access and landscaping. The reserved matters approval was not subject to a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with specific plans; hence any amendments to the plans would result in a new, full planning application being required. Therefore the applicant added a condition to this approval via the non-material amendment procedure which listed the previously approved plans and allowed amendments to be made via an application to vary the planning condition. This application seeks to vary condition no. 2 of listed building consent ref: 08/00197/LB and condition no. 7 of reserved matters approval ref 08/00196/RM, in order to amend the design, scale and layout of the approved bedroom and leisure extension.

The application is being reported to committee as it is a major development.

---

### PLANNING HISTORY

---

There are four strands to the relevant planning history, which relate firstly, to the land at Hill Top Farm, secondly, the site of the existing golf course and finally, Ramside Hall Hotel itself.

In terms of Hill Top Farm, planning permission (89/00997) was granted in November 1990 for the conversion of redundant farm buildings to form holiday accommodation together with a manager's house. The permission was renewed in January 1996 but has now expired.

The site of the existing golf course benefits from a planning permission (89/00517) from October 1989 which permitted the use of the site together with other land adjacent and surrounding Ramside Hall Hotel for use as a golf course.

Thirdly, as described above, outline planning permission (04/00836/OUT) for the extended golf course, ballroom redevelopment, and bedroom/leisure facility extension was granted in March 2005. A subsequent reserved matters application for the golf course (06/00494/RM) was approved in December 2008, while reserved matters and listed building consent for the leisure facility (08/00196/RM and 08/00197/LB) were approved in April 2008, reserved matters and listed building consent for the bedroom extension (06/00186/RM and 06/00375/LB) were approved in May 2006, and finally, reserved matters and listed building consent for the redevelopment of the ballroom (08/00198/RM and 08/00199/LB) were approved in June 2008. Following the agreement of all pre-commencement planning conditions pursuant to the outline planning permission, reserved matters approval and listed building consents, the applicants sought to implement and therefore keep alive the permission by constructing foundations in June 2010 relating to the bedroom extension/leisure facility and the ballroom.

Outline permission was granted in November 2011 with details of access only for the erection of 34 dwellings as enabling development to facilitate the redevelopment and expansion of Ramside Hall Hotel. Finally, the applicant added a condition to the reserved matters approval for the bedroom and leisure extension via the non-material amendment procedure which listed the previously approved plans and allowed amendments to be made via an application to vary the planning condition, hence this current application.

---

## **PLANNING POLICY**

---

### **NATIONAL POLICY**

The Government has consolidated all planning policy statements, guidance notes and many circulars into a single policy statement, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), although the majority of supporting Annexes to the planning policy statements are retained. The overriding message is that new development that is sustainable should go ahead without delay. It defines the role of planning in achieving sustainable development under three topic headings – economic, social and environmental, each mutually dependant.

The presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in the NPPF requires local planning authorities to approach development management decisions positively, utilising twelve 'core planning principles'

The following elements are considered relevant to this proposal;

NPPF Part 1 – Building a strong, competitive economy. The Government is committed to securing economic growth in order to create jobs and prosperity, building on the country's inherent strengths, and to meeting the twin challenges of global competition and of a low carbon future.

NPPF Part 4 – Promoting sustainable transport. Transport policies have an important role to play in facilitating sustainable development but also in contributing to wider sustainability and health objectives. Smarter use of technologies can reduce the need to travel. The

transport system needs to be balanced in favour of sustainable transport modes, giving people a real choice about how they travel. However, the Government recognises that different policies and measures will be required in different communities and opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary from urban to rural areas.

NPPF Part 7 – Requiring Good Design. The Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment, with good design a key aspect of sustainable development, indivisible from good planning.

NPPF Part 9 - The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.

NPPF Part 10 – Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change. Planning plays a key role in helping shape places to secure radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimising vulnerability and providing resilience to the impacts of climate change, and supporting the delivery of renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure. This is central to the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development.

NPPF Part 11 – Conserving and enhancing the natural environment. The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils; recognising the wider benefits of ecosystem services; minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible, contributing to the Government's commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures; preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability; and remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate.

NPPF Part 12 – Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment. Working from Local Plans that set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, LPA's should require applicants to describe the significance of the heritage asset affected to allow an understanding of the impact of a proposal on its significance

## **REGIONAL PLANNING POLICY**

The North East of England Plan - Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021 (RSS) July 2008, sets out the broad spatial development strategy for the North East region for the period of 2004 to 2021. The RSS sets out the region's housing provision and the priorities in economic development, retail growth, transport investment, the environment, minerals and waste treatment and disposal. Some policies have an end date of 2021 but the overall vision, strategy, and general policies will guide development over a longer timescale.

In July 2010 the Local Government Secretary signalled his intention to revoke Regional Spatial Strategies with immediate effect, and that this was to be treated as a material consideration in subsequent planning decisions. This was successfully challenged in the High Court in November 2010, thus for the moment reinstating the RSS. However, it remains the Government's intention to abolish Regional Spatial Strategies when the forthcoming Local Government Bill becomes law, and weight can now be attached to this intention.

Policy 1 (North East Renaissance) seeks to achieve and maintain a high quality of life for all, both now and in the future, requiring a major economic, social and environmental renaissance throughout the Region.

Policy 2 (Sustainable Development) states that proposals should support sustainable development and construction through the delivery of environmental, social and economic objectives.

Policy 3 (Climate Change) sets out the regional policy on contributing to the mitigation of climate change and assisting adaptation to the impacts of climate change.

Policy 4 (The Sequential Approach to Development) provides that a sequential approach to the identification of land for development should be adopted to give priority to previously developed land and buildings in the most sustainable locations.

Policy 7 (Connectivity and Accessibility) seeks to promote the need to reduce the impact of travel demand particularly by promoting public transport, travel plans, cycling and walking, as well as the need to reduce long distance travel, particularly by private car, by focusing development in urban areas with good access to public transport.

Policy 8 (Protecting and Enhancing the Environment) seeks to ensure, amongst other things, to conserve and enhance historic buildings, areas and landscapes.

Policy 9 (Tyne and Wear City-Region) amongst other things sets out that the Green Belt should prevent the merging of Durham City and Chester-Le-Street, for example, and preserve the setting and special character of Durham City.

Policy 11 (Rural Areas) sets out that planning proposals should support the development of a vibrant rural economy that makes a positive contribution to regional prosperity, whilst protecting the Region's environmental assets from inappropriate development.

Policy 16 (Culture and Tourism) seeks, amongst other things to ensure that new tourism facilities benefit the local economy, people and environment without diminishing the attractiveness of the place visited.

Policy 25 (Urban and Rural Centres) seeks to ensure amongst other things that the design of development in centres should contribute to the creation of sustainable communities and be in harmony with and enhance the built environment.

Policy 27 (Out-of-Centre Leisure Developments) sets out that regional and sub-regional scale leisure developments need to be considered and justified through the sequential approach and locational strategy.

#### **LOCAL PLAN POLICY:**

Policy E1 (Durham City Green Belt) reflects national advice in PPG2 and outlines the presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt in order to preserve its intrinsic openness.

Policy E7 (Development in the Countryside) advises that new development outside existing settlement boundaries will not normally be allowed. However, there are a number of exceptional circumstances where development outside existing settlement boundaries may be considered acceptable.

Policy E10 (Areas of Landscape Value) is aimed at protecting the landscape value of the district's designated Areas of Landscape Value.

Policy E23 (Listed Buildings) seeks to safeguard listed buildings and their settings by not permitting, development that would adversely affect the special interest of a listed building, total or substantial demolition, or development detracting from the setting of a listed building. Any alterations must be sympathetic in design, scale and materials.

Policy E26 (Historic Parks and Gardens) seeks to restrict new development at parks and gardens designated for the historic or landscape significance.

Policy EMP16 (Employment in the Countryside) sets out the circumstances in which the Council will support proposals that create employment in the countryside.

Policy H5 (New Housing the Countryside) sets out criteria outlining the limited circumstances in which new housing in the countryside will be permitted, this being where it is required for occupation by persons employed solely or mainly in agriculture or forestry.

Policy H13 (Residential Areas – Impact upon Character and Amenity) states that planning permission will not be granted for new development or changes of use which have a significant adverse effect on the character or appearance of residential areas, or the amenities of residents within them.

Policy T1 (Traffic – General) states that the Council will not grant planning permission for development that would generate traffic likely to be detrimental to highway safety and / or have a significant effect on the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring property.

Policy T10 (Parking – General Provision) states that vehicle parking should be limited in amount, so as to promote sustainable transport choices and reduce the land-take of development.

Policy R10 (Recreation and Leisure in the Countryside) is concerned with new recreation or leisure development in the countryside. Developments should not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the countryside, areas of high landscape value or the openness of the Green Belt; adversely affect the natural or historic environment; adversely affect existing public rights of way or established recreational routes; adversely affect existing flora and fauna, wildlife habitats and wildlife corridors; have a detrimental effect on the amenity of residents or people using the area for other recreational activities; result in congestion on the local road network and be inaccessible by public transport, cyclists and pedestrians.

Policy R11 (Public Rights of Way) seeks to encourage and safeguard public access to the existing network of public rights of way and other permissive paths.

Policy V3 (Tourist Attractions) seeks to ensure that new attractions or extensions to existing attractions are developed sympathetically without compromising amenity, character and accessibility for all.

Policy V4 (Tourist Facilities and Attractions Outside Settlement Boundaries) advises that such facilities should not adversely affect the Green Belt, nature conservation, is adequately served by the existing road network and is without adverse impacts upon the amenity of nearby residents.

Policies Q1 and Q2 (General Principles Designing for People and Accessibility) state that the layout and design of all new development should take into account the requirements of all users.

Policy Q5 (Landscaping – General Provision) sets out that any development which has an impact on the visual amenity of an area will be required to incorporate a high standard of landscaping.

Policy Q8 (Layout and Design – Residential Development) sets out the Council's standards for the layout of new residential development. Amongst other things, new dwellings must be appropriate in scale, form, density and materials to the character of their surroundings. The impact on the occupants of existing nearby properties should be minimised.

Policy U8a (Disposal of Foul and Surface Water) requires developments to provide satisfactory arrangements for disposing foul and surface water discharges. Where satisfactory arrangements are not available, then proposals may be approved subject to the submission of a satisfactory scheme and its implementation before the development is brought into use.

*The above represents a summary of those policies considered most relevant in the Development Plan the full text, criteria, and justifications of each may be accessed at <http://www.cartoplus.co.uk/durham/text/00cont.htm>.*

---

## **CONSULTATION AND PUBLICITY RESPONSES**

---

### **STATUTORY RESPONSES:**

Northumbrian Water – no objections

### **INTERNAL CONSULTEE RESPONSES:**

Tree Officer – no objections

Highways Officer – no objections

Landscape Officer – no objections

Environmental Health – no objections

Ecology Officer – no objections. Great Crested Newt Survey needs to be updated.

Design Officer – some concerns. However the applicant has taken on board most of the suggested amendments at the pre-application stage.

### **PUBLIC RESPONSES:**

The application has been advertised by way of a press notice, site notice and letters to individual residents. One letter has been received from a nearby resident which raises concerns about noise due to outdoor functions.

### **APPLICANTS STATEMENT:**

The proposed development is an extension of the existing building within the existing extensive grounds and will have little adverse effect upon any adjacent premises.

The development will enhance the existing facilities of the hotel and provide a greater choice of facilities for tourism and business in and around Durham City.

The development of the site would therefore have a positive effect on sustaining and developing tourism, local services and facilities.

*The above represents a summary of the comments received on this application. The full written text is available for inspection on the application file which can be viewed at <http://82.113.161.89/WAM/showCaseFile.do?action=show&appType=planning&appNumber=10/00955/FPA>*

---

## **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS AND ASSESSMENT**

---

Having regard to the requirements of Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 the relevant Development Plan policies, relevant guidance and all other material planning considerations, including representations received, it is considered that the main planning issues in this instance relate to the principle of development, the scale, layout and design of the development and its impact upon the adjacent listed building.

### **Principle of the development**

The principle of providing an extension to the hotel to accommodate new bedrooms and leisure facilities on the proposed site in terms of its impact on the openness of the Green Belt and impact on other centres has been agreed by virtue of the outline planning permission granted in 2005 and the subsequent reserved matters application which was granted in 2008. There has been a change in planning policy since these approvals with the introduction of the governments National Planning Policy Framework. However, it is considered that the proposals are in accordance with the overriding message that new development that is sustainable in terms of economic, social and environmental terms should go ahead without delay.

As this application only seeks to amend the scale, design and layout of the proposed development, these are considered to be the main issues relating to this application along with the impact on the adjacent Listed Building and Historic Park and Garden.

### **Scale, design and layout and impact on the Listed Building**

The hotel buildings are grouped together in the lower lying area of the site at the south-west side, they form a relatively compact group in a 'T' formation on plan with decorative gardens set into the larger angle of the 'T'. The building as a whole is generally two and three storeys high with the gothic tower of the original house projecting above that; the external walls of the buildings are all rendered with a grey-buff pebble dash finish, and have parapets with castellated tops, partly concealing slate roofs. The more recent additions to the building have continued this theme, as would the bedroom wing which would be added prior to the erection of the proposed leisure building.

The proposed leisure building, however, does not continue this theme and introduces a new design emphasis more themed in relation to the golf clubhouse, that being an existing leisure building on the site. The northwest elevation of the building overlooking the car park and hotel entrance is of three-storeys and would be constructed largely of a buff render with significant amounts of glazing including slit windows to the ground and first floors and with a vertical emphasis. The entrance to the leisure facility on this elevation would be completely glazed and would sit between two projecting pillars that bear the name of the hotel. The south east elevation which faces the golf course is also three-storeys in appearance and would be predominantly glazed at ground floor level with the upper levels dominated by the sloping ribbed zinc roof which would sit over the internal swimming pool. Both elevations lead to the hydrotherapy and spa pool element of the building which have a hexagonal footprint and tower like appearance respectively. The building as a whole would be covered by a large ribbed zinc roof with triangular louvre vents which help to break up the expanse of the roof.

In terms of the appearance the proposed extension, whilst not slavishly following the host Listed Building in terms of design emphasis seeks to introduce a new approach reflective of the introduction of a new facility to Ramside as a whole. Therefore, while a departure in design terms, the proposal retains some traditional detailing while offering a more modern theme and will, it is considered, safeguard the special character of the Listed Building, without causing harm to its setting, in accordance with saved City of Durham Local Plan policy E23 which seeks to safeguard listed buildings and their settings.

The existing and proposed buildings are not easily seen from outside the site with the exception of a short section at the west end of Pittington Lane which is elevated above the site and where a view can be obtained of the buildings lying below the road level with the hills beyond the City in the distance.

In terms of the recent application for 34 dwellings to occupy land to the South/South West of the clubhouse this has been assessed as if it were built in terms of visual and amenity impact. Given the arrangement of the buildings on the site and the topography of the land the new housing will rise up to the south and west behind an established mature tree belt. The leisure extension is the closest aspect but is sandwiched between the clubhouse and existing hotel so in effect contained within a tight grouping. Given the separation distances, broken views and topography it is not considered the new housing development will be adversely affected by the hotel and leisure extensions.

Clearly the proposal will lead to the loss of existing parking areas and a small group of trees in order to allow for replacement parking provision which will include large areas of landscaping. The previous condition requiring details of the landscaping has not been discharged to date and so this, along with the other conditions which were imposed on the previously approved reserved matters application should be repeated should this application be approved.

The proposals in this context will not undermine the sites allocation as a Historic Park and Garden in accordance with saved City of Durham Local Plan policy E26 which seeks to restrict new development at parks and gardens designated for the historic or landscape significance; particularly given the use of the site as a golf course and tourist facility.

In terms of the one public representation received the holding of outdoor functions occurs on site at present and indeed may into the future but given the nature of the use it is considered commensurate and the separation distances would not lead to adverse residential amenity conditions.

In light of the above it is considered that the proposals are acceptable in terms of scale, design and appearance and the impact on the adjacent Listed Building and Historic Park and Garden.

---

## **CONCLUSION**

---

As stated above, the principle of providing an extension to the hotel to accommodate new bedrooms and leisure facilities on the proposed site in terms of its impact on the openness of the Green Belt and impact on other centres has been agreed by virtue of the outline planning permission granted in 2005 and the subsequent reserved matters application which was granted in 2008. This current application simply seeks to amend the design and layout of the extensions which have previously been approved.

For the reasons set out above it is considered that the amended design and layout of the proposals are acceptable and would not have any adverse impact on the Listed Building or

the Historic Park and Garden. Therefore it is considered that the proposals are in accordance with the relevant saved Local Plan policies, Regional Spatial Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

The approval of this application would enable the redevelopment and expansion of hotel accommodation and leisure facilities at Ramside Hall Hotel and enhance its role as an important contributor to the tourism, leisure and conference offer of Durham City and indeed the County as a whole.

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

---

That the variation of condition no. 7 of the reserved matters application (ref: 08/00196/RM) be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions/reasons:

1. Notwithstanding the information shown on the submitted application details of all materials to be used externally and the standard of their finish shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing before the development is commenced, and thereafter implemented in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of the area in accordance with part 7 and 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework and saved policy Q8 of the City of Durham Local Plan.

2. That notwithstanding the information shown on the submitted plans precise details of all new fenestration, glazing and head and cill details shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority prior to development commencing and thereafter implemented in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of the area in accordance with part 7 and 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework and saved policy Q8 of the City of Durham Local Plan.

3. Notwithstanding the information shown on the submitted plans the proposed windows shall be set at least 100mm in reveal in accordance with details which shall be submitted at 1:20 scale, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the development commences, and thereafter implemented in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of the area in accordance with part 7 and 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework and saved policy Q8 of the City of Durham Local Plan.

4. Before development is commenced details of all flues, vents, and extracts shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, being thereafter implemented to the satisfaction of the said Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of the area in accordance with part 7 and 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework and saved policy Q8 of the City of Durham Local Plan.

5. Before any development is commenced the approval of the Local Planning Authority is required in writing to a scheme of landscaping and tree planting for the site indicating, inter alia, the number, species, heights on planting and positions of all the trees, together with details of post planting maintenance. Such scheme as approved by the Local Planning Authority shall be carried out in its entirety within a period of 12 months beginning with the date on which development is commenced, or within such

longer period as may be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. All trees, shrubs and bushes shall be maintained by the owner or owners of the land on which they are situated for the period of five years beginning with the date of completion of the scheme and during that period all losses shall be made good as and when necessary, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of the area in accordance with part 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework and saved policy Q5 of the City of Durham Local Plan.

6. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in strict accordance with the following approved plans. Plan References; 171A 00E, 171A 01J, 171A 02J, 171A 03J, 171A 04F.

Reason: To define the consent and ensure that a satisfactory form of development is obtained in accordance with part 7 and 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework and saved policy Q8 of the City of Durham Local Plan.

That the variation of condition no. 2 of the listed building consent (ref: 08/00197/LB) be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions/reasons:

1. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in strict accordance with the following approved plans. Plan References; 171A 00E, 171A 01J, 171A 02J, 171A 03J, 171A 04F.

Reason: To define the consent and ensure that a satisfactory form of development is obtained in accordance with part 7 and 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework and saved policy Q8 of the City of Durham Local Plan.

---

## **REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDATION**

---

The development was considered acceptable having regard to the following development plan policies:

NPPF Part 1, NPPF Part 4, NPPF Part 7, NPPF Part 9, NPPF Part 10, NPPF Part 11, NPPF Part 12

The North East of England Plan - Regional Spatial Strategy Policy 1, Policy 2, Policy 3, Policy 4, Policy 7, Policy 8, Policy 9, Policy 11, Policy 16, Policy 25, Policy 27

City of Durham Local Plan Policy E1, Policy E7, Policy E10, Policy E23, Policy E26, Policy EMP16, Policy H5, Policy H13, Policy T1, Policy T10, Policy R10, Policy R11, Policy V3, Policy V4, Policy Q1, Policy Q2, Policy Q5, Policy Q8, Policy U8a

In particular the development was considered acceptable having regard to consideration of issues of scale, design and layout, the impact on the Listed Building and Heritage Park and Garden.

The impact on the openness of the Green Belt is considered acceptable given the previous consent and relatively minor changes to the design all within the previous application's height and massing principles.

The residents objection received was not influential in leading to a refusal because the holding of outdoor events is permitted on this site and the approval of this application would not change these circumstances.

---

## **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

---

Submitted Application Forms, Plans and supporting documents

National Planning Policy Framework

North East of England Plan Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021 (RSS) July 2008

City of Durham Local Plan

Consultee Responses



**Planning Services**

**Variation of condition no. 2 of listed building consent ref: 08/00197/LB and condition no. 7 of reserved matters approval ref 08/00196/RM, in order to amend the design, scale and layout of the approved bedroom and leisure extension.**

This map is based upon Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of Her Majesty's Stationary Office © Crown copyright.  
 Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceeding.  
 Durham County Council Licence No. 100022202 2005

**Comments**

**Ramside Hall**

**Date** 12 June 2012

**Scale**