

**THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING**  
**OF THE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL AND REGULATORY PANEL**  
**HELD ON TUESDAY 14 MARCH 2006**

Present: Councillor M Routledge (Chair)  
Councillors R Davison, M Nicholls,  
Mrs A Naylor, R Taylor, D J Taylor-Gooby  
and P G Ward

Also Present: Councillor B Joyce

Objectors – Mr and Mrs Burnett and  
Mrs Sergeant

Agent – Mr I Thorpe

1 **THE MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING** held on 21 February 2006, a copy of which had been circulated to each Member, were confirmed.

2 **APPLICATIONS UNDER THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACTS  
TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990  
PLANNING (LISTED BUILDINGS AND CONSERVATION AREAS) ACT 1990**

**05/763 PETERLEE PASSFIELD – Proposed Residential Development  
Comprising 18 No. Houses, Nursery and Relocation of Playing Field  
at Former ITEC Centre, Burnhope Way, Peterlee for the North  
Blunts Partnership**

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control Services which recommended conditional approval (conditions to include materials to be agreed, means of enclosure to be agreed, landscaping scheme to be submitted and agreed by the Local Planning Authority, protection of trees during construction, parking schemes serving the nursery to be implemented prior to occupation, street lighting, an amended plan to be submitted showing the required visibility splay at the junction between the access road and Neville Road, an amended plan to be submitted showing the proposed hoggin footpath at the north of the application site removed, sports pitch to be constructed to Sport England's specification). The application was considered to accord with Structure Plan Policies 1, 3 and 9. It was also considered to accord with District of Easington Local Plan Policies 1, 35, 36, 37, 38 and P8. No other material considerations outweighed the support for the proposals.

The Principal Planning Services Officer explained that Members had visited the site that day and were familiar with the location and setting and gave a detailed presentation on the main issues that were outlined in the report.

The Principal Planning Services Officer explained that Mr Wolfe, a registered objector had contacted him to explain that he was unable to attend as he had been called away on business and would like his concerns outlined. His concerns related to drainage problems on the

## Development Control and Regulatory Panel – 14 March 2006

eastern boundary near to his property in Burnside Close, youths causing anti-social behaviour and drug abuse in the dene.

It was explained that Sport England had withdrawn their objection. They had been under the impression that the school had been built and had verbally commented that they now had no objections to the scheme.

The developers had indicated that once the nursery building was built it would transfer to Durham County Council on completion. The nursery was to replace East Durham and Houghall Community College nursery on the opposite side of the road at North Blunts School. The football pitch would also be transferred to Durham County Council.

Discussions would take place with Durham County Council, District of Easington Council and Peterlee Town Council to determine who would take over the day to day management of the football pitch. The footpath was not essential to the scheme and could be omitted. In the previous application, some of the Woodfield residents were concerned regarding access to their properties. It was explained that the application would need to be linked to the previous Section 106 legal agreement which related to the retail park.

Mrs Burnett, an objector explained that the proposal was much better than the previous application, especially the 10 metres between her property and the development. The only objection she had was to the type of housing on the northern boundary as it was out of keeping with houses in the area. She felt that eventually the people who bought the houses would block off the car ports and replace them with garages. She explained that the houses in Woodfield had their living rooms looking over the development and car lights would shine directly into the living rooms when parking their cars. She felt that the housing should be detached or semi-detached and a garage would be preferable.

Mrs Burnett explained that she was also concerned regarding the removal of the trees. They had been there for a long time and some of residents had requested that the trees be taken down some years ago but had been refused by the Council. She added that a number of years ago the residents had approval to buy the land to enclose it for gardens and this had been refused.

Mrs Burnett explained that she had been concerned that the football pitch would be used by East Durham and Houghall Community College. She also raised concerns regarding the construction materials that were to be used for the nursery. Modus Properties had built the ASDA Superstore and everyone agreed that this was an eyesore and didn't want this to happen on the site. She would like to make sure that additional planting would be carried out. This was now the time to rectify the problem with the link houses and make them into detached or semi-detached.

Mr Burnett explained that he had lived there for thirty years and knew the area very well. He added that he was happy that there was a 10 metre barrier between his home and the proposed site. All residents

## Development Control and Regulatory Panel – 14 March 2006

concerns had been taken on board and he appreciated this although he was still concerned regarding the link houses in front of his property.

Mr Thorpe, the agent explained that it was not intended to mislead Planning Officers when the report had detailed that forty four trees would be removed. The forty four trees related to the northern boundary of the site that was referred to in the local plan. The other trees related to the football pitch on the eastern side of the site. There were a number of trees that needed maintenance in the area and would benefit from selective removal.

The footpath was not essential to the scheme and it was included to keep trees in the public realm and create a barrier between the new site and the properties in Woodfield. Over 50% of the site would be public open space. One area that had not been mentioned was the north east corner of the site which had been designed to be left untouched. If planning conditions were to be considered then this could be a potential area that should be included. The area was untouched meadow and did include wild flowers that ought to be protected.

The Principal Planning Services Officer explained that he was pleased that the residents were generally happy overall. He referred to the concern regarding the design of the houses on the northern boundary and explained that central government advice was that developers were required to get the most out of the land and had increased the density figures. There were a number of housing sites throughout the district which had a mix of housing types. Although the views of Woodfield would be significantly changed, this area had been identified as a development site in the District Local Plan.

With regard to the protection of trees, he would recommend that a planning condition be attached to protect all of the trees and shrubs although it was down to the developer to provide a suitable landscaping scheme.

Members raised concern regarding the car lights shining into the front rooms of residents and asked if this problem could be rectified. Mr Thorpe explained that the footpath would be removed from the plans and planting would be increased in density and would be designed in such a way to be a planted barrier. The boundary of the proposed site would also be fenced.

The Principal Planning Services Officer explained that one option could be to attach a planning condition for the block of housing on the northern boundary and the Council would require further details.

Concern was raised regarding the number of car parking spaces for the nursery and felt that cars would overspill onto the road. The Principal Planning Services Officer explained that the highway authority had parking standards and had assessed the scheme and they had advised that parking was adequate.

Concern was expressed that the sports field was directly next to the main trunk road and felt that it could pose a risk for children chasing

## **Development Control and Regulatory Panel – 14 March 2006**

a ball and felt there should be some type of fencing. Mr Thorpe explained that the previous scheme had a two metre fence around the entire site and it was hoped that dense planting would provide a suitable screen but didn't think there would be any objection to provision of fence.

Members explained that conditions should be attached regarding the block of housing to the northern side of the boundary, protection of trees and shrubs and fencing around the sports pitch.

**RESOLVED** that the application be conditionally approved.

### **3 EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

**RESOLVED** that in accordance with Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act, 1972 as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) Act, 1985 the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involved the disclosure of exempt information, as defined in Paragraphs 1, 2 and 6a, Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

### **4 PLANNING INVESTIGATION REPORT**

#### **Land at Rear of 1-5 Fillpoke Lane, Crimdon, Blackhall**

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control Services in relation to the above planning investigation report, a copy of which had been circulated to each Member.

**RESOLVED** that:-

- (i) enforcement notices be issued to the owners of the property situated at 1-5 Fillpoke Lane, Crimdon. The individual notices would specify that the use of the land as residential gardens should cease and that the land should be reinstated to use as agricultural land;
- (ii) the notices would specify a four week compliance period;
- (iii) the Head of Planning and Building Control be authorised to take any other action deemed appropriate.