

DURHAM COUNTY COUNCIL

AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE (CENTRAL & EAST DURHAM)

AT A MEETING of the **AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE (CENTRAL & EAST DURHAM)**
held at County Hall, Durham on **Tuesday 11 January 2011**

PRESENT

COUNCILLOR C WALKER in the Chair

Members

Councillors B Arthur (Substitute for R Liddle), J Bailey, A Bell, J Blakey, G Bleasdale, P Charlton, D Freeman, S Iveson, A Laing (Substitute for M Plews), J Moran and K Thompson.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors R Liddle and M Plews.

A1 Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 14 December 2010 were confirmed as a correct record by the committee and signed by the Chair.

A2 Declarations of Interest

There were no declaration of interest submitted.

A3 Applications to be determined by the Area Planning Committee (Central & East Durham)

- (a) **4/10/00705/FPA – Durham Villages Regeneration, Land at Colliery Road, Bearpark, Durham
Erection of 12 no. Residential Dwellings (Phase 2) with Associated Access, Parking and Landscaping**

Consideration was given to the report of the Principal Planning Officer (Durham City Area Office) which recommended the application for approval. The Principal Planning Officer gave a detailed presentation on the main issues outlined in the report.

Resolved: That the application be **APPROVED** subject to the conditions contained in the report.

- (b) **PL/5/2010/0419 – Mr C Burnip, Former Scrap Yard, Black Lane, Wheatley Hill
Extension of Time Limit for Implementation of Planning Permission Ref No. PLAN/2007/0508 for 26 No. Houses and Associated Works**

Consideration was given to the report of the Principal Planning Officer (Easington Area Office) which recommended the application for approval. The Principal Planning Officer gave a detailed presentation on the main issues outlined in the report.

Resolved: That the application be **APPROVED** subject to the conditions contained in the report.

- (c) **PL/5/2010/0471 – Mr G Angus, The Cottage, Rear of Crimdon Terrace, Blackhall
Conversion and Extension of Existing Building**

The Principal Planning Officer advised the Committee that this application had been withdrawn from the agenda for the meeting.

- (d) **PL/5/2010/0491 – Miller Homes Ltd North East Region, Former Vane Tempest Club, New Drive, Seaham, SR7 7BX
Residential Development Comprising 52 No. Dwellings**

Consideration was given to the report of the Principal Planning Officer (Easington Area Office) which recommended the application for approval. The Principal Planning Officer explained that Members had visited the site that day, and gave a detailed presentation on the main issues outlined in the report.

Mr Armbrister an objector speaking on behalf of Seaham Harbour Cricket Club, Anglo Saxon Church and the Community of New Drive, Seaham indicated that the Cricket Club were concerned that cricket balls from the club could damage property and injure people within the new development resulting in a claim. This concern had been raised with the planning department and they had recently met with Miller Homes to obtain information on liability. They asked if the builder would erect some netting to prevent any damage and if an undertaking could be provided so that the Cricket Club were not held liable in the event of any damage caused by cricket balls. If these issues could be resolved then Seaham Cricket Club would have no objections to the application.

Mr Armbrister also indicated that they would like to see all the dirt track road made up to an acceptable level with lighting and a pathway as at present it was not safe and the road was very busy which lead to various places.

The Solicitor advised the Committee that liability with regard to the cricket balls was not a matter for planning but was between the Developer and Seaham Harbour Cricket Club.

The Principal Planning Officer also advised the Committee that the Developer was not responsible for the road beyond the development site but discussions had taken place with the Developer and it was believed that they were prepared to tarmac the road to the Cricket Club but this could not be included as a planning condition.

Members indicated that they would have liked a condition imposed to erect some netting but understood that this could not be achieved as it was a matter between the Developer and the Cricket Club but asked that the Planning Officer take this up with the Developer and ask if netting could be provided.

Councillor Bleasdale raised concerns as to where the play equipment would be located. The Principal Planning Officer indicated that neither of the play equipment would be on site but he believed that new procedures were in place where bids would have to be placed which would involve community consultation to take place.

Resolved: That the application be **APPROVED** subject to the conditions contained in the report.

- (e) **PL/5/2010/0503 – Mr J Wallace, 1 Cook Way, Peterlee, County Durham, SR8 1HY**
Rear Extension to Create Cold Store

Consideration was given to the report of the Principal Planning Officer (Easington Area Office) which recommended the application for approval. The Principal Planning Officer explained that Members had visited the site that day, and gave a detailed presentation on the main issues outlined in the report.

Resolved: That the application be **APPROVED** subject to the conditions contained in the report.

A4 Appeal Update

Appeal Decisions

The Principal Planning Officer (Durham City Area Office) and the Principal Planning Officer (Easington Area Office) gave details in relation to the following appeals, which had been considered by the Planning Inspectorate:

- (i) **Site at Queens Head Public House, 3 North View, Ludworth, Durham, DH6 1NF**

An appeal had been lodged against the Council's refusal to grant planning permission for subdivision of vacant public house to form 1 no. A1 retail unit and 1 no. A5 hot-food takeaway, with elevational changes to front of building, and erection of extraction flue to rear at Queens Head Public House, 3 North View, Ludworth, Durham, DH6 1NF.

The appeal was to be dealt with by way of written representations and the Committee would be advised of the outcome in due course.

- (ii) **Site at 15 Brockwell Court, Brandon, Durham, DH7 8QX**

An appeal had been lodged against the Council's refusal to grant planning permission for the retention of decking to rear of existing dwelling at 15 Brockwell Court, Brandon, Durham, DH7 8QX.

The appeal was to be dealt with by way of written representations and the Committee would be advised of the outcome in due course.

- (iii) **Site at Land to the rear of Waycot, Wingate Road, Trimdon Station, TS29 6AR**
Planning Reference- PL/5/2010/0311

Appeals had been lodged against the Council's refusal of planning permission and an Enforcement notice for the part retrospective change of use to caravan site for occupation by gypsy-traveller family with associated

development including hard standing, access road, septic tank, small utility building and landscaping.

The development was refused as it was considered that the junction of the access road leading to the application site with the C22, Wingate Road, was sub-standard in terms of its alignment and the available sight lines, and that coupled with the increase in traffic movements at this junction would be detrimental to highway safety.

The appeals were to be dealt with by means of a hearing, and members would be informed of the outcome in due course.

**(iv) Site at Weems Farm, Mickle Hill Road, Hesleden, TS27 4PY
Planning Reference PL/5/2010/0359**

An appeal had been lodged against the Council's refusal of planning permission for the retrospective increase in height of an extension at the site.

The proposal was refused as the development by virtue of its excessive size, scale, height and massing constituted an incongruous and prominent feature that was not in keeping with the scale and character of the existing dwelling. It was also considered that the development adversely impacted upon the character and appearance of the surroundings and the countryside.

The appeal was to be dealt with by means of written representations, and members would be informed of the outcome in due course.