

**THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL AND REGULATORY PANEL
HELD ON TUESDAY, 21ST FEBRUARY, 2006**

Present: Councillor M. Routledge (Chair)
Councillors Mrs. G. Bleasdale, B. Burn,
P.J. Campbell, Mrs. E.M. Connor, R. Davison,
R. Liddle, M. Nicholls, Mrs. A. Naylor, B. Quinn
and R. Taylor

Agent/
Applicants: Mr. Mador, Mr. Young and Mr. Weightman

Supporter: Mr. Cummings

Objectors: Mr. Mortimer, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Mitcheson

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors P. Ward and D.J. Taylor-Gooby.

2. THE MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING held on 31st January, 2006, a copy of which had been circulated to each Member, were confirmed.

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

05/254 SEAHAM NORTH (SEATON WITH SLINGLEY) - Proposed Development of Golf Course including Club House, Driving Range, Hotel and Car Parking (Reserved Matters) at Sharpley Springs Golf Course, Sharpley Hall Farm, Seaton for Mr. S. Weightman

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control Services which recommended conditional approval, (conditions relating to landscaping, materials, surface and foul sewage disposal and revised plans). The development accorded with current Structure and Local Planning Policy Guidance including Local Plan Policies 1, 2, 6, 15, 35, 36 and 86 and did not harm the character of the green belt.

05/255 SEAHAM NORTH (SEATON WITH SLINGLEY) - Proposed Access to Proposed Clubhouse at Sharpley Hall Farm, Seaton for Mr. S. Weightman

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control Services which recommended conditional approval, (conditions relating to landscaping and highway details.) The development accorded with current planning policy guidance including

Development Control and Regulatory Panel - 21st February, 2006

Local Plan Policies 1, 35 and 36 and did not give rise to an unacceptable impact on road safety.

The Senior Planning Services Officer explained that the application had been deferred at the last meeting to enable further comments to be received from the Highway Authority and to allow the objector to prepare his presentation. A letter had been received from Mr. Seymour, an objector, granting authority to Mr. Mortimer to speak on his behalf. He went on to present a summary of the main points from the report.

Mr. Mortimer explained that he did not object to the principle of the golf course, it was the position of the clubhouse, driving range and the water tank. The water tank had been installed before planning permission was granted and was located behind his home.

Mr. Mortimer explained that Mr. Seymour had sold the land to Mr. Weightman a number of years ago. The golf course had been commenced in 1991 and he had been under the illusion that the Clubhouse would be located in the first field directly next to Seaton. He explained that in the current proposals, the Clubhouse was on one side of the development and the hotel on the other. He explained that the walkway round from the hotel to the clubhouse would be a considerable walk especially on an evening and felt that it would be more appropriate for the Clubhouse to be positioned next to the hotel.

Mr. Mortimer explained that he had never been informed of the plans submitted in 2003 for the golf course and had only been contacted one year ago. He had spoken to the Highway Engineer who had advised that he had not visited the site since 2003. Since the last meeting, the Highway Engineer had visited the site with his solicitor and advised that the road needed widening and resurfacing.

Mr. Mortimer queried why the Clubhouse could not be located on Sunderland City Council's side of the golf course and explained that he did not see the logic in separating the Clubhouse from the hotel. When he purchased the house from Mr. Weightman seven years ago he felt it would have been common courtesy for Mr. Weightman to inform him of his intentions for the field. He asked Members to request a relocation of the Clubhouse. He added that if Mr. Weightman had contacted him, he would have informed him of his concerns at the outset.

The Senior Planning Services Officer explained that the application needed to be approved or refused and the applicant could not be asked to redesign the golf course. The application had been considered by the Highway Authority who were satisfied with the traffic generation.

The Principal Planning Services Officer explained that this was a major development in the countryside and numerous planning considerations had been taken into account. He referred to the original outline planning permission and the applicants had always intended to have the Clubhouse and hotel in Easington District Council's area. The applicant had his own reasons for the location of the hotel and Clubhouse. The impact on adjacent properties had been considered in

Development Control and Regulatory Panel - 21st February, 2006

full consultation with the Highway Authority and Environmental Health. It was felt that the development would have limited adverse impact on neighbouring properties.

Mr. Cummings, a supporter, explained that he had read about the proposed development in the local newspaper. He lived in Hawthorn Village and had done for the past ten years. He felt that this development would be an asset to the District as there was a lack of facilities for training and teaching golf. The only way to learn to play golf was to become a member of a golf club and there were no pay as you play facilities in the area. The applicant would be forming links with local schools to encourage young people to take up the game.

Mr. Cummings explained that he played golf approximately four times per year and having a facility close to his home was a good idea. He felt that the whole district had been upgraded and numerous projects had been carried out along the coast at Seaham and a new hotel facility at Seaham Hall. He felt this development would attract more people into the area.

Mr. Simpson referred to the road at the side of Mr. Mortimer's property and queried if the District Council would be entering into a legal agreement to ensure the improvements were to be carried out.

The Principal Planning Services Officer explained that the Highway Authority were responsible for the road and the District Council would not be entering into a legal agreement but a planning condition could be placed on the application regarding the works to the road.

Mr. I. Weightman explained that he operated the paintball site and the Highway Authority had explained that this would not be a conflict. The flow of vehicles coming into the paintballing were within a 45 minute period and there was no constant flow of traffic.

Mr. Mador explained that he was the architect for the applicant and ran a small business that specialised in golf and resort development and had been involved in 20 projects across the UK. It was explained that there had been an extensive period of consultation over the past ten months and agreement had been reached on all issues. The objections raised related to the access road, junction and noise nuisance.

With regard to the access, he explained that the Highway Engineer had visited the site and the applicant had employed a highway consultant to assess where the junctions were required. The Highway Engineer had confirmed that there was no problem with the road and was suitable for use as access. With regard to the widening of the road, he explained that the vegetation had crept onto the road over a number of years and this needed to be cut back. This was due to a lack of maintenance and by simply removing the vegetation would widen the road. This road had been a B road until 1968 and had been sufficient for two lanes of traffic.

Mr. Mador explained that the proposed Clubhouse would be 150 metres away from Mr. Mortimer's house and felt that the noise from the B road would be far in excess of any noise that would be heard

Development Control and Regulatory Panel - 21st February, 2006

from the Clubhouse. There was also a landscaping scheme between the house and the car park 25 metres wide and it was proposed that two hundred trees would be planted. Due to the existing land levels and the rise of the land, the Clubhouse would be invisible from Mr. Mortimer's house. Mr. Mador explained that the clubhouse would have no function rooms and would have a combined bar/lounge area, reception area and changing rooms and there were no facilities for large scale functions or club type facilities.

Mr. S. Weightman explained that he had had no previous objections for the golf course and had support from local schools, English Nature and local people who wanted to pay and play. There was only one course in the area to 43,000 population and the standard was 1 - 25,000. The course would not be a private members course.

It was explained that he had employed a specialist architect to design the golf course and had been encouraged by the English Golf Union to locate the clubhouse, driving range and hotel in the location it was at present. The original plans had to be changed because of safety reasons.

Mr. Weightman explained that when he had sold the property to Mr. Mortimer, the family had informed him that there would be a Clubhouse at the rear of his property and was disappointed that Mr. Mortimer had said otherwise as this was made clear from the outset.

Discussion ensued regarding the works that were to be done to the widening of the road and the Senior Planning Services Officer confirmed that the Highway Engineer had explained that there was progressive verge creeping on the road and would be edged back to achieve a 5 metre road.

A Member queried why the Clubhouse and hotel were on opposite sides of the golf course. Mr. Weightman explained that the main reason was because of the driving range. The English Golf Union had advised that the original plans were unsafe and had identified the locations where the Clubhouse, hotel and driving range should be.

Members raised concerns regarding the time the clubhouse was open to. Mr. Mador explained that the golf course would only be open until 10.00 p.m. when the clubhouse would close.

A Member queried if Mr. Mortimer had been informed of the proposals when he purchased the house. Mr. Mortimer explained that he had not been informed of the proposals for the field when he purchased his house seven years ago.

Members explained that conditions should be imposed on the application that the access road needed upgrading as per the report prior to the clubhouse opening, the 200 trees for screening be planted and the clubhouse should close at 10.00 p.m.

RESOLVED that application No. 05/254 and 05/255 be conditionally approved.

05/889 MURTON WEST - Proposed Erection of Dwellinghouse (Outline) (Resubmission) on Land East of Postgate Chase, Church Lane, Murton for Mr. A. Jones

The Principal Planning Services Officer explained that the District Council had been advised that English Heritage had made a decision to list the war memorial adjacent to the site. The Council had to go through a consultation process and advertise that the application potentially affected a listed building. A report would be submitted to a future meeting.

RESOLVED that application number 05/889 be deferred.

05/915 EASINGTON VILLAGE AND SOUTH HETTON (SOUTH HETTON) - Proposed Extension at Rear to Provide a Bedroom and Shower Room at 19 Keswick Terrace, South Hetton for Mr. J. College

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control Services which recommended unconditional approval. The development accorded with current planning policy guidance including Local Plan Policies 1, 35 and 73.

The Principal Planning Services Officer explained that Members had visited the site that day and were familiar with the location and setting.

The Principal Planning Services Officer explained that a letter had been received from the neighbouring property explaining that he had no objection to the proposal in principle however there were a number of issues which caused concern -

- the proposal to erect the construction on the boundary between the two premises was creating minimum access to the existing conservatory
- the solid brick wall on the boundary would be an eyesore and may possibly affect the value and resale of the property
- the design of the lean-to type roof

The Principal Planning Services Officer explained that access would be a legal matter between the two parties and valuation of the property was not a valid planning consideration. It was explained that in normal circumstances the application would have been recommended for refusal but there had been a detailed explanation submitted of why the extension was required and it was felt that this would not set a precedent.

Mr. Mitcheson explained that he lived in number 20 Keswick Terrace and did not object to the proposal in principal as he was on very good terms with his neighbour.

Mr. Mitcheson explained that when he submitted plans for his conservatory, he had made sure that there was a reasonable distance maintained from the boundary, however, the application was not approved because the conservatory was 400mm, approximately 16 inches longer than the regulations permitted. Therefore, in order to

Development Control and Regulatory Panel - 21st February, 2006

receive approval, the design had to be modified adding a further £1000 to the cost. He was now led to believe that the proposal to build a solid brick wall of 4.1 metres directly on the boundary would be approved regardless of any concern that he had. He explained that he had been neighbours with Mr. College for 26 years and had a good relationship with him. He fully appreciated his needs to have proper facilities regarding his invalidity and did not want to prolong his situation.

Mr. Mitcheson explained that considering the area of land available at No. 19 he felt that the architect and the health authority had opted for the simplest and most basic of designs for the proposal and had not given any consideration to the effect it would have on his property.

The Principal Planning Services Officer explained that planning officers had tried unsuccessfully to negotiate several times to change the design but it was felt on balance that the application was acceptable.

A Member asked if the extension had not been considered on the other side of the property. Mr. Young explained that the gable end had been looked at but a garage was situated there at present and it was not suitable to have it resited. The position of the extension was the most cost effective.

Discussion ensued regarding the height of the extension and it was asked if this could not be reduced. Mr. Young explained that this possibly could be reduced to a lower pitch. At present, there was a 13 degree pitch on the roof but he could request that it be reduced further. The Principal Planning Services Officer explained that there would need to be a flat roof used to overcome the objector's concerns but the Council did not usually advise that flat roofs be used.

Following discussion, it was suggested that the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Panel, along with the Head of Planning and Building Control Services, be given delegated authority to investigate alternative roofing arrangements in consultation with Mr. Mitcheson.

RESOLVED that delegated authority be granted to the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Development Control and Regulatory Panel together with the Head of Planning and Building Control Services to approve the application following investigations into alternative roofing arrangements in consultation with Mr. Mitcheson.

PRIOR TO CONSIDERATION OF THE FOLLOWING ITEM OF BUSINESS COUNCILLOR MRS. E.M. CONNOR DECLARED A PERSONAL AND PREJUDICIAL INTEREST AND LEFT THE MEETING.

05/944 PETERLEE (PASSFIELD) - Proposed Residential Development and Ancillary Retail and Leisure at East Durham and Houghall Community College, Burnhope Way, Peterlee for East Durham and Houghall Community College

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control Services which recommended conditional approval (conditions relating to full detail to be submitted, on site tree protection, Environmental Agency requirements, bat protection). The

Development Control and Regulatory Panel - 21st February, 2006

development accorded with current planning policy guidance including Local Plan Policies 67, 101 and 104 and did not give rise to an unacceptable impact on the character or future development of Peterlee.

RESOLVED that the application be conditionally approved.

JC/PH com/dev/060203
27th February, 2006