

COMMITTEE REPORT

APPLICATION DETAILS

APPLICATION No:	DM/16/02056/FPA
FULL APPLICATION DESCRIPTION:	Conversion of existing garages into residential Bungalows
NAME OF APPLICANT:	Derwentside Homes
ADDRESS:	Garage Blocks Arnold Close East Stanley
ELECTORAL DIVISION:	Stanley Steve France
CASE OFFICER:	Senior Planning Officer Telephone: 03000 264871 steve.france@durham.gov.uk

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND PROPOSALS

The Site

1. This is one of the two separate garage site proposals for new residential development by Derwentside Homes presented to Members on this agenda. The larger of the two applications, 602m² in area this proposal involves the conversion of three garage courts, containing six garage blocks or 30 individual garages to form six new residential properties for rent to older residents. The garages were designed to serve the 32 dwellings in Arnold Close, a twin cul-de-sac development of two-storey, local authority built mid-linked family dwellings, with open parking courts also available in some areas. These houses have private, fenced rear gardens, and a mix of fenced and open-plan front gardens, presumably dependent on their tenure. The built residential environment is high-density, but separated by large areas of close mown open space with occasional trees. The surrounding estate includes cul-de-sacs of bungalows for older residents, with Arnold Close leading to Stanley Court, a block of 30 Care Connect monitored flats for older residents.
2. Each of the garage blocks is bounded by adopted footpaths and/or open space. One of the sites' garages back onto existing rear gardens, two of the sites are arranged so that the gable ends of the garages and the existing vehicle manoeuvring areas share a boundary with a footpath also serving rear gardens – one of these sites backs onto a two storey blank gable and open space, with small trees, the other backing onto an open parking court and open space with trees.

The Proposal

3. The application proposes conversion of the existing pairs of garage blocks into paired facing dwellings proposed for older residents. The conversion involves a mono-pitch roof, raised at one end, running the length of the building, with

fenestration serving living accommodation facing across a shared garden area with bin store, and a car parking space for each unit. A high level window gives additional internal light at the higher end of the remodelled roof. Modern materials will give the proposed units a highly contemporary appearance, with a colour palette intended to integrate into the existing surrounding residential environment.

4. The scheme is presented as an innovative re-use of brownfield sites that have the potential to attract anti-social behaviour, and that may have limited redevelopment potential, providing contemporary and cutting edge cost effective affordable housing provision. The application is supported by a number of documents setting out the above, and contending that the applicant has currently 21 alternative individual garages available within 2 minutes walk of the current sites in surrounding streets that, they state, would be offered to displaced garage occupants.
5. The application is reported to Committee at the request of one of the local Ward Members.

PLANNING HISTORY

6. The application is a resubmission following withdrawal of the same scheme earlier in the year to allow the applicants the potential to address concerns raised.

PLANNING POLICY

NATIONAL POLICY

7. 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.
8. 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’.
9. In accordance with paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework, the weight to be attached to relevant saved local plan policy will depend upon the degree of consistency with the NPPF. The greater the consistency, the greater the weight. The relevance of this issue is discussed, where appropriate, in the assessment section of the report below.
10. The following elements of the NPPF are considered relevant to this proposal;
11. *NPPF Part 4 – Promoting Sustainable Transport.* Notes the importance of transport policies in facilitating sustainable development and contributing to wider sustainability and health issues. Local parking standards should take account of the accessibility of the development, its type, mix and use, the availability of public transport, levels of local car ownership and the need to reduce the use of high-emission vehicles.

12. *NPPF Part 6 – Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes.* Housing applications should be considered in the context of a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Local Planning Authorities should seek to deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create inclusive and mixed communities. Policies should be put in place to resist the inappropriate development of residential gardens where development would cause harm to the local area.
13. *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.
14. *NPPF Part 8 – Promoting Healthy Communities* – the planning system is considered to have an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities, delivering social recreational and cultural facilities and services to meet community needs.

NATIONAL PLANNING PRACTICE GUIDANCE:

15. The newly introduced National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) both supports the core government guidance set out in the NPPF, and represents detailed advice, both technical and procedural, having material weight in its own right. The advice is set out in a number of topic headings and is subject to change to reflect the up to date advice of Ministers and Government.
16. *Design - The importance of good design.* Good quality design is an integral part of sustainable development. The National Planning Policy Framework recognises that design quality matters and that planning should drive up standards across all forms of development. As a core planning principle, plan-makers and decision takers should always seek to secure high quality design, enhancing the quality of buildings and spaces, by considering amongst other things form and function; efficiency and effectiveness and their impact on wellbeing.

LOCAL PLAN POLICY:

17. The following are those saved policies in the Derwentside District Local Plan relevant to the consideration of this application:
18. *Policy GDP1 – General Development Principles* – outlines the requirements that new development proposals should meet, requiring high standards of design, protection of landscape and historic features, protection of open land with amenity value, respecting residential privacy and amenity, taking into account ‘designing out crime’ and consideration of drainage.
19. *Policy HO5 – Housing Development on Small Sites* – Stanley is one of the listed settlements where housing development will be permitted on small sites. Development must be appropriate to the existing pattern and form of development; must not extend beyond the existing built up area; represents acceptable backland or tandem development; and should not exceed 0.4 hectares when taken together with an adjoining site.
20. *Policy TR2 – Development and Highway Safety* – relates to the provision of safe vehicular access, adequate provision for service vehicle manoeuvring, etc.

RELEVANT EMERGING POLICY:

21. Paragraph 216 of the NPPF says that decision-takers should give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to: the stage of the emerging plan; the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies; and, the degree of consistency of the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the NPPF. The County Durham Plan was submitted for Examination in Public and a stage 1 Examination concluded. An Interim Report was issued by an Inspector dated 15 February 2015, however that report was quashed by the High Court following a successful Judicial Review challenge by the Council. As part of the High Court Order, the Council has withdrawn the CDP from examination. In the light of this, policies of the withdrawn CDP can no longer carry any weight. As a new plan progresses through the stages of preparation it will begin to accrue weight in due course.

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:

22. *Highways* – County Engineers write, potential ‘alternative car parking measures (for the occupants of the existing garages) have been identified as part of these proposals, the land in question is not highway land and therefore could be fenced off so taking this into consideration in principal I have no objections to this proposal...’. Whether the offer of alternative garages is taken up or not, Engineers consider there is sufficient spare capacity in the highways network to accommodate the on-street parking of vehicles that would be displaced by the proposals. Subject to a number of detailed requirements relating to the modification, reconstruction and reconfiguration of the existing site access and footways and stopping-up procedures.

23. *Northumbrian Water* - have written to say they have no comments on the proposals.

PUBLIC RESPONSES:

24. Sixty four letters of consultation were sent out, reflecting the representations received in relation to the previous (withdrawn) application, and site notices were posted adjacent the three sites. Eleven objections have been received in response to the current application. Strong representation has also been received from one of the local Ward Members. All responses are summarised below:
25. The Councillor is concerned at the lack of regard shown for the views and opinions of local people in the process of how this and the parallel application were submitted. Both applications are contended to result in a loss of amenity for local residents and change the entire principle and way of life for residents in the areas. The applications will impact on the local highways, causing more congestion in an already busy area and will result in issues with turning, parking and the general manoeuvrability of vehicles. Most houses in this area are privately owned and the proposed schemes will not fit in the area. The garages are well used and well maintained and the alternative parking arrangements suggested by Derwentside Homes are unrealistic and simply not practical.

26. The Councillor has tried unsuccessfully to work with Derwentside Homes to speak with local people and to take on board their concerns but has concluded the applicant's aims are driven by financial incentive at the expense of local people.
27. Local residents strongly echo the above sentiments, with it clear that their main concerns relate to the loss of parking into an already congested area, and the direct implications to highway safety both for their own vehicles and for delivery, service and emergency vehicle access. The relationship and access to garages is presented as an integral part of the design of the estate, more relevant today, with higher rates of car ownership. The garages are presented as valued community assets that are well-used. The alternative garage provision proposed is considered unacceptable, too far from Arnold Close, this issue being of particular concern for older and ill residents. Problems will be exacerbated in winter. The state of repair of the alternative garages offered is of concern to one resident. Raised insurance premiums and damage to vehicles parked on-street are also raised.
28. For other issues, some correspondents consider that the scale and character of the buildings are inappropriate in the estate, with the raised roof of particular concern, both in obtrusively affecting views, overshadowing and necessitating tree removals. Proposed materials will not fit in and are questioned in regards to potential longevity. Existing pedestrian access to properties will be obstructed if the scheme is approved.
29. Further concerns are raised in relation to the impact of the construction period, potential devaluation of house prices, the potential for antagonism directed at new residents in relation to the loss of the garages, and a contention that designated car parking for the proposed properties is 'disrespectful'. One resident asks that all those objections sent in respect of the last application be taken into consideration on the current one.

APPLICANT'S STATEMENT:

30. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) explains the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of 'sustainable development', setting out the three dimensions of such as; an economic role, a social role and an environmental role. These three aspects are mutually dependent, and lead to a presumption in favour of 'sustainable development' schemes unless other material considerations indicate otherwise, and the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the NPPF as a whole. The NPPF identifies a requirement for requiring good design (at Part 7), particularly in delivering a wide choice of high quality homes (at Part 6), contributing positively to making places better for people. With the HUSK concept designed around conversion of existing garage structures in direct conformity with the NPPF's definition of 'previously developed land', and the social inclusion that the usual arrangement of the garage structures within existing local-authority built estates will bring, ensuring the intended older demographic clientele will remain sited within and interacting with their local community, thereby 'promoting healthy communities' (at Part 8).
31. The conversions will at the same time address the appearance of existing garage blocks which are often a blight to housing estates whilst introducing contemporary materials and finishes that will introduce modern contemporary buildings as a design feature and new design standard in existing, established estates. That the dwellings proposed are to be restricted to older residents and make a virtue of what may otherwise be seen as substandard residential relationships where garage blocks are facing, through the benefits of passive security and the principles of 'designing out crime', both for the dwellings themselves and their parking provision. Sited

sporadically across estates, rather than in an enclave of their own, older residents will remain integral to and interacting with the comings and goings of the wider community. The layout of the estates usually allows for a pragmatic approach to visitor car parking provision, whilst not compromising pedestrian safety or existing residential amenity. The provision of bungalows, especially for older residents is often a shortfall of housing demand the HUSK product can help address.

32. The three identified elements of 'sustainable development' identified in the NPPF are interwoven into the HUSK model for the conversion of existing garage block buildings within Local authority built estates in a way that should comply with up-to-date planning policies or direct comparison with the NPPF and the government's aspirations for significant housing provision.

The above is not intended to list every point made and 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://publicaccess.durham.gov.uk/online-applications/search.do?action=simple&searchType=Application>

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS AND ASSESSMENT

33. 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 residential development, and the potential impact on highway safety.

The Principle of Development

34. The proposals have been discussed in principle between the Architect and Officers over a number of months before submission of the applications. Notwithstanding the issue of displaced parking – i.e. if the garages were redundant, the proposals were concluded to potentially represent a highly sustainable re-use of existing structures.
35. As conversion of existing buildings, the amount of construction and ground disturbance involved is significantly reduced. The garage blocks by definition are sited within established communities in a large settlement, with good access to the facilities, services, commercial opportunities and sustainable transport links that define locational sustainability – especially important where dwellings for older residents are proposed. In providing new housing with access to the requirements of modern living, in close proximity to sustainable transport links, and in continuing the existing mixed community of family and older people's accommodation that is a feature of the estate, the proposals are considered in line with the advice given in Parts 4, 6 and 8 of the NPPF (as above).
36. The planning policies set out in the current Development Plan, the Derwentside District Local Plan 1997 (saved policies 2009) are out-of-date and of reducing weight. In terms of the principle of development (rather than considering the detail of the proposals where Policy GDP1 is relevant), Policy HO5 for Housing Development on Small Sites has four criteria, as set out above. Tested against the individual requirements; the proposals are considered appropriate to the existing pattern and form of the settlement, they do not extend beyond the existing built up area of the settlement, they are not backland development and the size of the site is under 0.4ha (this last element not NPPF compliant. This policy is 'partially' NPPF compliant as it is considered inflexible in terms of the definition of a small site. The weight this policy lends to the debate is positive in the planning assessment balance.

37. The provision of new housing is the imperative of the Government's requirements for the planning system. Paragraph 14 of the NPPF sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when considered against the Framework as a whole.
38. The proposals are concluded in principle sustainable – the NPPF advising that 'development which is sustainable can be approved without delay'.

Housing Land Supply

39. The Council is currently unable to demonstrate the housing land supply required of it. Whilst the lack of a 5 year supply, and the guidance at paragraph 49 of NPPF make it clear that it is not the case that every housing site should therefore be approved, there is a strong "presumption in favour of sustainable development". This site and the development proposed are considered sustainable. The scheme will make a positive contribution to the supply of housing in County Durham. This issue is material in considering the current proposals.

Scale and Character

40. The conversion of the garages involves an alteration to the roof to result in a long mono-pitch that runs the length of the structure, which also allows for a high-level gable window to light the lounge area. One of the potential advantages of the conversions proposed is that the footprint and basic massing of the building, and therefore its relationship to surrounding buildings, curtilages and highways remains as already established. Demolition and rebuild on the proposed sites would be viewed as new development and therefore likely unacceptable. The proposals seek to integrate into the area through the use modern materials in traditional colours.
41. Both the NPPF (at part 7) and NPPG bring quality of design to the fore as a material planning consideration – 'good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, (and) is indivisible from good planning'. The NPPF lists potential benefits from the achievement of high quality and inclusive design including; establishing a strong sense of place, creating attractive and comfortable places to live, optimising the potential of sites to accommodate development, creating an appropriate mix of uses, responding to local character whilst not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation, creating safe places that do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion, and being visually attractive as a result of good architecture. The NPPF makes it clear that 'planning.... decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. The requirements of Development Plan Policy GDP1, for proposals to be in 'keeping with the character and appearance of the area', should be read and proportionately weighted in the context of this advice.
42. Officers consider the proposals represent a highly innovative alternate use for the garage structures on brownfield sites which, if redundant, would be difficult to redevelop for other uses. The conversion is undoubtedly innovative and achieves an interesting balance between modern appearances in a traditional colour palette. Read in the context of the advice in the NPPF, and the proportionate weight given to Policy GDP1 the proposals are considered acceptable in terms of their scale and character.

Residential Privacy and Amenity

43. This topic has two dimensions – those relating to existing residents and those relating to proposed residents – Policy GDP1(h) requiring, ‘protection of the amenities of neighbouring occupiers and land users’.
44. The proposals are a conversion of the existing garage blocks - one resident’s concern that the proposals will obstruct an existing access to a rear garden is therefore unfounded. The proposals involve, as described above, the creation of a mono-pitch roof – raising one end of the structure around 1.5m in height. In terms of the proposed massing – and therefore any effect of the height of the structure in relation to existing houses and their rear gardens is a matter of degree rather than a new feature, as the basic relationship is already established. The effect on the privacy and amenity of existing residents is therefore considered acceptable.
45. One resident complains at the negative effect on an existing view. This is not a material planning consideration.
46. In terms of the new residents, the two proposed dwellings will face each other closely, although they are handed rather than mirrored so the living rooms do not face each other. The facing distance is 7m, and residents would have to decide whether the benefits of a close neighbour, mutual support and good passive security outweigh the closeness of a separate dwelling and a shared curtilage. Officers consider that the proposal represents another alternative for personal preference, there being traditional semi-detached bungalows and an apartment block for older residents both close at hand on the estate, the proposals adding to variety and choice.

Highway Safety

47. When the proposals were discussed presubmission and in principle it was on the basis that the structures that would be proposed converted were redundant, and the issue of parking displacement was not discussed. The strong response to the first planning application, subsequently withdrawn indicated, at best, that there was significant disagreement between the applicant and local residents on the extent of the garages’ use and their value to the community. A Statement of Community Involvement detailing the results of a postal consultation on the proposals undertaken by Derwentside Homes is submitted with the current application, however the nature and timing of this and the applicants apparent unwillingness to meet has inflamed some residents and led to significant criticism from a local Ward Member.
48. The estate is by no means wholly dependent on the garage block for parking - Arnold Close and surrounding streets use the communal garage blocks and also open parking courts, along with roadside parking often remote from dwellings. Not all garages are used for parking, and the tenants of the garages do not necessarily reside in the adjacent dwellings, or even the same street. Car ownership has increased since the estates were built, bringing additional demand. There is no doubt that the proposals will displace some parking onto surrounding streets, and that there will be an impact. However, Highways Engineers response highlights a critical material consideration and conclusion. Owned by Derwentside Homes, the garage structures are private, and with proper notice to tenants could be removed from use at any time, whether development was proposed or not. Highways Engineers analysis of the proposals takes into account both the safety implications of the detailed specification proposed and the more general effects on highway’s safety and capacity. A recommendation for refusal on highway safety grounds contrary to

the formal advice of the County Council Highways Engineers is considered untenable by Planning Officers.

49. There is contention as to the effectiveness and convenience of the developer's offer of alternative garage parking, and whilst there is sympathy for residents whose health makes this an apparently unviable alternative, there is no requirement on the developer to provide space for existing residents, even when some of those residents may be the developer's tenants. Whilst Highways Engineers have acknowledged the offer of alternative provision, this is not critical to their conclusions.
50. The reduced weight of the Policies in the development plan relating to highway safety is set by the NPPF, which advises planning authorities to 'actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable..... only preventing development on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impact is severe'. Furthermore, to use the language of Paragraph 14 of the Framework, the adverse impacts of a refusal (on highways grounds) would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, those benefits being the supply of new dwellings in a sustainable location. The development provides on-site parking for new residents, and with the various criteria of Policy TR2 considered by Highways Engineers in framing their response, the conclusion must be that in strict highways terms, the proposals are acceptable.
51. To address the other highway concern raised by local residents, the realities of car ownership in winter in North Durham in residential estates that are not gritted are a fact of life rather than an argument against the development as contended by one resident.

Other Issues

52. Members will note that the proposed dwellings are proposed intended for, and indeed are specifically designed for, older residents. This area of provision is an integral part of the applicant's business. There is no policy justification to formally ensure this through condition.
53. Northumbrian Water has raised no objection to the development in relation to drainage issues. Whilst some existing residents complain of existing foul drainage problems, it is not for the proposed development to address these problems.
54. The siting of the bin stores causes concern to some correspondents. The defined, enclosed areas are a standard feature of housing development. They are sited within the sites adjacent footpaths and have no safety or amenity implications.
55. That the proposals represent conversion of existing structures ensures there is no immediate pressure for removal of adjacent trees. Submitted photographs show that some of these trees overhang the garage blocks as existing and would therefore require pruning works for clearance. A condition is proposed attached to give detailed control over the extent of these works. The trees are on Council land giving control over any suggestion of their removal.
54. One resident questions the potential longevity of the materials proposed. The use of modern, efficient building systems is not to be discouraged and is often more sustainable in nature than traditional materials and methods. The Building Regulation process will ensure that the materials will meet required standards. Whilst as a conversion, the implications of the construction period should be reduced, however, in a restricted cul-de-sac with known parking and access issues, a standard

construction timing condition is proposed to attempt to mitigate to some degree the effects of the construction works.

56. Members will be aware that any potential devaluation of property is not a material consideration in the determination of the planning balance.

CONCLUSION

57. The application proposes an innovative scheme of conversion of existing buildings that will provide new, sustainable residential dwellings, with the NPPF is clear in its presumption in favour of such. That the Council is in lieu of its requirements for identifying residential development land adds further to the presumption in favour of development. A refusal could therefore only be countenanced where there are 'adverse impacts' that would 'significantly and demonstrably' outweigh the benefits. These adverse impacts must be able to be demonstrated in terms of planning policy to be defensible as a refusal reason.
58. Whilst there is significant concern at the loss of the garages, in the absence of an objection on any level from Highways, the weight these objections bring is not considered such that it would 'significantly and demonstrably' outweigh the benefits. Officers are disappointed that what appears to have potential as an innovative and sustainable method of reusing buildings and providing sustainable homes has been distracted by a lack of understanding of the importance of including existing residents and communities in the development process by the applicants. The applicant's offer of some mitigation through provision of alternate garaging, albeit this is likely to be more remote from people's homes, has been noted however it is also noted that this could not be enforced.
59. Nonetheless, with the highways issues considered and found acceptable, and all other issues raised either addressed or considered capable of resolution by condition, the proposals are recommended positively.

RECOMMENDATION

60. That the application be **APPROVED**, subject to the following conditions:
1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
Reason: Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
 2. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in strict accordance with the following approved plans: H-15002-husk-pl-0010 Proposed site plan, H-15002-HUSK-PL-125 Floorplans and Elevations as Proposed, H-15002/husk/PL/0011A Plots 1&2 Site plans, H-15002/husk/PL/0012 Plots 3&4 Site plans, H-15002/husk/PL/0013 Plots 5&6 Site plans.
Reason: To define the consent and ensure that a satisfactory form of development is obtained in accordance with Policies GDP1, HO5 and TR2 of the Derwentside District Local Plan (saved policies 2009).
 3. Notwithstanding any details of materials submitted with the application details of the finish and materials of all proposed hardstanding areas and boundary markers /

binstores must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local planning authority before their use on-site. The development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To achieve an acceptable form of development in accordance with Policies GDP1, HO5 and TR2 of the Derwentside District Local Plan (saved policies 2009).

4. The applicant must submit to, and have approval in writing by the Local planning authority, a detailed scheme to show the proposed modification, reconstruction and reconfiguration of the existing site access and footways, to include, but not restricted to, detail the continuation of the 1.8m wide footway at the vehicular access with a lowered vehicular crossing point. Said scheme, and any required stopping-up of the highway must be completed in full before the beneficial occupation of the residential units hereby approved.

Reason - In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy TR2 of the Derwentside District Local Plan (saved policies 2009).

5. No construction works may commence until the applicant has submitted a detailed scheme of tree works and tree protection that ensures the retention of the adjacent trees during the construction period and mitigates the relationship of the trees and the structure. Said tree protection works must be in compliance with British Standard BS 5837:2012 and remain in place for the full period of external development works. Authority for the works must be sought from the land-owner.

Reason: To protect trees on and adjacent the site during the construction period in line with Policy EN11 of the Derwentside District Local Plan, 1997 (saved Policies 2009), this information required pre-commencement as affecting all physical development works on-site.

6. No construction operations, including the use of plant, equipment and deliveries, which are likely to give disturbance to local residents should take place before 0800hrs and continue after 1800hrs Monday to Friday, or commence before 0800hrs and continue after 1300hrs on Saturday. No works should be carried out on a Sunday or a Bank Holiday.

Reason: In order to protect the amenities of residents in and adjacent the development site as a requirement of Policy GDP1 of the Derwentside District Local Plan, 1997 (saved Policies 2009).

STATEMENT OF PROACTIVE ENGAGEMENT

61. The Local Planning Authority in arriving at the decision to approve the application has actively engaged with the applicant to secure a positive outcome in accordance with the Local Plan and the NPPF. (Statement in accordance with Article 35(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015)

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Submitted application form, plans supporting documents and subsequent information provided by the applicant.

The National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

National Planning Practice Guidance Notes

Derwentside District Local Plan (saved policies 2009)

Statutory, internal and public consultation responses



Planning Services

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

Conversion of existing garages into residential Bungalows

Application Number : DM/16/02056/FPA

Comments

Date – 29.09.16

Scale 1:1250