

**THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING**  
**OF THE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL AND REGULATORY PANEL**  
**HELD ON TUESDAY 6 FEBRUARY, 2007**

Present: Councillor M Routledge (Chair)

Councillors Mrs G Bleasdale, B Burn,  
Mrs E M Connor, R Davison, J Haggan,  
R Liddle, Mrs J Maitland, M Nicholls,  
R Taylor and D J Taylor-Gooby

Objectors: Jim Barnes, Eddie Jones, Jamie Weatherston,  
Adam Pencharz, Nick Brown, Stuart Ferguson,  
John Hillam, Paul Bloomfield, Bill Beavis,  
Mike Sands, Eric Hall, Ian Rosenvinge,  
Mr Wise, Mr Etherington, Councillor Maddison,  
Mrs Armstrong, Mr. Hitchin

Agents/Applicants: Mr J Handy, Mr Swanick, Mr Swinburne,  
Mr Watson, Mr Thirlaway, Mr Holden

Supporter: Mr Dring

1. **THE MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING** held on 16 January, 2007, 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**

**2006/0474 EASINGTON VILLAGE (EASINGTON VILLAGE AND SOUTH HETTON) - PROPOSED WIND TURBINE AT AKS PRECISION BALL EUROPE LIMITED, DAVY DRIVE, PETERLEE FOR AKS PRECISION BALL EUROPE**

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control Services which recommended approval subject to conditions relating to a time limit of three years, finish/colour of wind turbine, life of turbine 25 years, operations noise limited and tv receptors. The proposal was considered to accord with national planning guidance contained within PPS22 Renewable Energy. The proposal was in keeping with the relevant Durham County Structure Plan Policies and Easington District Local Plan Policies. In particular, Policies 1, 2, 35 and 53. There were no material considerations sufficient to outweigh the support for the proposal.

The Senior 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 which were outlined in the report.

## **Development Control and Regulatory Panel – 6 February 2007**

Mr Barnes, an objector, explained that in 1984, Sunderland Air Field had closed and the District Council had been approached for the Shotton Colliery site. At that time, an Officer of the Council, Ken Greenfield, together with the help of local Councillors and Officers helped to overcome any problems associated with using the land for an airfield. On 1 April 1987 a Lease was signed. AKS came later into the District and they must have been aware that they were building a factory next to an established airfield.

Mr Hitchin explained that he was the National Safety and Training Officer and had conducted a risk assessment of installing a turbine within the drop zone. If the turbine was erected then he would recommend that student parachuting would cease when the wind was south westerly and north westerly.

Mr Jones explained that he was Chairman of the British Parachute Association (BPA) and referred to page 8 of the Officer's report. Sport England had commented that Peterlee Parachute Centre was a significant site for sport in the north east. He then referred to page 10 and 11 of the Officer's report. The Airfield Operator had stated that he felt there was some scope to move the wind turbine further away and out of the drop zone.

The British Parachute Association was the National governing body for parachuting. If the application was approved, it would be a death warrant for Peterlee Parachute Centre. Peterlee Town Council and Easington Village Parish Council was concerned on the impact the application would have on the parachute centre.

Mr Jones referred to a recent decision by the Planning Inspector at Edder Acres Farm. The Inspector had recognised that if the application had been approved, it would impact upon Shotton Airfield and its operations.

Mr Jones explained that the Officer's report referred to the practicalities of relocating the turbine and he queried how hard AKS had tried to accommodate Shotton Airfield and what quality of evidence could be given. He queried how thoroughly the District Council had questioned the Applicant about the financial viability of their company.

Objections had also been raised by the Parachute Centre relating to the possibility of the wind turbine being an obstacle to planes and parachutists as well as causing turbulence, a glare hazard and ice throw. It was also a hazard when obscured by sea fret.

Mr Jones queried what knowledge the Applicants and the District Council had on the hazards that could be experienced by the development of the turbine.

## Development Control and Regulatory Panel – 6 February 2007

Mr Weatherston explained that he was a Senior Lecturer at Newcastle Business School. He had experience of working and living in Japan and was the author of three text books on business strategy and the environment. He had assessed the figures for the application and although AKS had a turnover of £7m, the company was making a loss. NSK had placed requirements on the company of an operational income target of £476,000 which would be 6.8% of turnover. This would rise to 10% in 2008 which would mean that they would have to have an operational income of £700,000. The savings in the report showed that £68,000 would be saved per annum. The figure from the Renewable Energy Foundation suggested that only a saving of £29,000 per annum would be made. This was less than ½% of the turnover which would have a company payback period of 7½ years. This would make no economic impact of sustainability of the company and therefore no fundamental economic argument.

Mr Weatherston explained that NSK planned to expand in Poland, Japan and Thailand and the capital expenditure in Europe was only 9% of their global spending. He felt that Poland would sweep up most of the capital investment in the company. NSK were building a plant in Tokyo and in 2007 the plant in Thailand would come on stream. The economic perspective of the company was moving into the Far East.

With regard to employment, employment in Europe had dropped by 34% and the NSK website suggested that this would fall even further. NSK's environmental report pointed out that the key investment was to be made elsewhere rather than the plant in England. He referred to planning Policy 22 and explained that the economic impact had to be taken into consideration. The economic impact would have no effect on the companies in Peterlee and would only affect Peterlee Parachute Centre.

Adam Pencharz, President of Newcastle University Parachute Society, explained that he had completed a total of 155 jumps of which 130 had been at Peterlee. The Society had 66 members of which the vast majority were student parachutists. If the turbine was built then the club would not exist in five years' time. The nearest drop zone was at Bridlington and students could not afford to travel.

Nick Brown from Durham University explained that Peterlee Parachute Centre trained over 70 students per years. A woman World Champion Skydiver, the Formation Team and a sector of Army parachutists had been trained at Peterlee Parachute Centre. In the past five years, four Durham University Students had become skydiving members.

Stuart Ferguson explained that UK Skydiver was a national website for skydivers. The site supported 5,000 users and had 500 members. Many of the members were very upset that Peterlee was the next drop zone under attack. He referred to Policy 90 which was the protection and provision of outdoor sports facilities.

## **Development Control and Regulatory Panel – 6 February 2007**

John Hillam explained that up until three years ago he was an instructor at Border Parachute Centre. This centre had now closed and he had tried to find an alternative site in Northumberland. He had looked for two years for land and it had been extremely difficult to find a suitable site. He eventually found land in Acklington and spent thousands of pounds only to be refused planning permission. He had found one other site north of Berwick but that was not suitable for students and without students a Parachute Centre would not be viable. Should planning permission be granted, he feared that Peterlee Parachute Centre would not survive. They would not be able to find anywhere else to parachute and parachuting would be finished in the north east. There would also be no outlet for charity jumps.

Paul Bloomfield explained that he was a local resident and parachuter. He had lived in the District for over 33 years and although he had carried out 35 jumps he was still classed as a student jumper. If the turbine was built he would be faced with up to five hours travelling time to the nearest parachute centre and depending on the weather conditions may not be able to jump. Easington District had found itself on the map recently for several negative reasons and he was hoping that the Parachute Centre would not be forced to close.

Bill Beavis explained that he had 36 years flying experience. Sunderland Airport had closed and they had been priced out of Newcastle. Being in a syndicate, he spent less money on flying than people did on smoking. Turbines operated in wind and when a lot of people turned on their heating there was no wind. When the factory was not operating, the electricity provided by the turbine would go to waste.

There were a number of air safety aspects to take into consideration. The white blades of a turbine on a misty day would not be visible until it was too late. The turbines rotating blades may serve to put off pilots and the rotation of the blades may cause turbulence well above the effective height and present a hazard to aircraft. The rotating motion of the blades may cause a varying glare hazard making it hard for pilots to focus on their flight path. Ice throw from the blades may cause hazards for people using the industrial estates, pilots and parachutists. In very humid conditions, when taking off and landing, if an aircraft crossed vortex, then the pilot might not have enough control and he queried if the Council would be liable for an unwanted accident. The diameter of the turbine was 14 metres on each blade which would be 20 metres long. During the 1970's there was a fatal accident involving the Chief Instructor at Carlisle Airport. He could not overcome the forces produced by Vortex.

Mike Sands explained that he owned Durham Microlites and had been based at Peterlee for the past ten years. People who used Microlites were ordinary members and not experienced sportsmen. Microlites had allowed hundreds of people to

## Development Control and Regulatory Panel – 6 February 2007

experience aviation and Durham Microlites spread the word to other people in other countries. Peterlee was the only place between North Morpeth and York with Microlite activity and had a mailing list of 5,000 people. If the parachuting facility was not viable then there would not be a base for Microliting. Mr Rosenvinge had put a lot of investment into the airfield.

Eric Hall explained that he was an Aero Sports Club Operator and worked full time at the airfield with his wife. He had left his previous job to develop the licensed premises at the airfield. Mr Rosenvinge had long term plans to invest in the airfield. The turnover of his business was £30,000 per annum. With regard to the jobs issues, four weeks ago NSK had announced a cut of 109 jobs from their north east factory. NSK had denied that any cuts would be made on operations on the south west industrial estate. NSK need to make £2.8m of savings and the income from the turbine paled into insignificance. Peterlee Parachute Centre was unique and irreplaceable and it was an asset to Peterlee and the north east as a whole.

Ian Rosenvinge explained that he was not against the turbine, just its location. If the application was to go ahead it would without doubt have a fatal effect on Shotton Airfield. TNEI had never visited the airfield or had any detailed discussions prior to the report. TNEI had focused on the economic arguments of the case and he felt that no adequate evidence for an alternative site had been considered.

Mr Rosenvinge circulated a plan of the area which gave consideration to three separate areas where he felt the wind turbine could be located. He believed that Shotton Airfield and a wind turbine for AKS could co-exist but a separation would be required of 1,200 metres between the centre of the parachute landing area and the turbine.

Mr Rosenvinge explained that he was disappointed with East Durham Business Service who had been an asset to his organisation in the past. Mr Weatherstone had explained that the savings represented 1/2% which was hardly likely to convince NSK not to move its operations to Poland. He had the Council's consent to fly and parachute at Shotton airfield and felt it was not morally or legally right to take away the precedent that had been set. The previous applications for masts at Edder Acres had been resisted.

Mr Rosenvinge explained that when he purchased the land from the District Council, covenants were put in place restricting activities to airport and parachute only and he could not even graze the land. Solicitors had advised that the Council would not be able to restrict use of the site. AKS had been fully aware of the airfield before they had established and they knew the requirements to fly aircraft over the factory. He referred to the title documents of AKS which stated that "the registered proprietor should not be or become entitled to any right of access of light or air or other easement or right which would

## Development Control and Regulatory Panel – 6 February 2007

restrict or interfere with the full and free use and enjoyment of the adjoining or neighbouring property" and actively sought enforcement of the covenant.

Mr Rosenvinge felt that poor research had been done by TNEI and they had selected an inappropriate site. He also questioned the economic benefit of AKS to the region and was very saddened that East Durham Business Service and the District Council's planning department had not seen through it. Mr Rosenvinge explained that he had committed his pension to the airfield and invested £750,000. £509,000 was outstanding in loans and business mortgages and he would face financial ruin and the possibility of losing his home if the application was approved.

The Principal Planning Services Officer explained that the alternative locations had not been fully assessed by Planning Officers although AKS had been requested to look at alternative sites. AKS had stated that no alternative sites were feasible.

The determination of the Edder Acres site was significantly different as no other company had been involved. With regard to the presentation by Mr Weatherston of Newcastle Business School, he explained that he was not in a position to question his statements as he did not have the relevant expertise. AKS had a representative at the meeting that evening and they could perhaps answer this further.

With regard to Policy 90, this had not been ignored but had been assessed against other Local Plan Policies. With regard to technical issues and sea fret, Officers had based their response on information received from the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA). The CAA commented that "whilst some of the arguments concerning the potential glare hazard, icing and sea fret were not particularly strong, the issue of the proximity of the turbine to the drop zone was fundamental to the debate".

D. Taylor, the District Council's Monitoring Officer, explained that the issues regarding covenants did not relate to the consideration of the planning application and Mr Rosenvinge may wish to raise these issues separately with the Council.

Mr Dring, Engineering Manager at TRW explained that they were experiencing a similar effect globally as AKS, although they had increased from 300 employees in 2003 to 820. They had increased their capital investment from £500,000 per annum to £10m per annum and turnover from £40m to £300m. TRW were looking to build their business and investigating different alternatives to make savings from electricity, water and gas. Last year the electricity account amounted to £1.6m. TRW were looking at different types of ways to reduce costs including wind turbines. They understood the feeling of the people from Peterlee Parachute Centre but 820 people with mortgages could be affected. TRW were currently quoting for work in 2011 and 2012 and they must reduce their costs to remain competitive.

## Development Control and Regulatory Panel – 6 February 2007

Mr Handy explained that he worked for TNEI which was a Renewable Energy Consultant based in Newcastle. The Planning Officer's report was clear and concise of its interpretation of what the wind turbine meant to AKS and its business. The wind turbine would be a single small turbine that would be half the height of the one located at Harehill Farm and would be within the industrial estate. The issues had been comprehensively addressed and he felt that the scheme should be approved.

A Member queried if the 75 jobs at AKS were linked with NSK and if the turbine would save the company £68,000. Bill Swanick explained that he was the Plant Director of AKS and the turbine would pay back in 3.2 years. The speakers had spoken with passion but it was all based on the assumption that the airfield would close and he had seen no risk assessment or heard any analysis of the business at the airfield.

Mr Rosenvinge explained that the risk was to novice parachutists. 20 knots was the air speed canopy and parachutists could not jump in a wind higher than 15 knots. If the parachutist was not experienced enough to take control of the canopy it would run downwind and would go at approximately 45 miles per hour and would cover  $\frac{3}{4}$  mile per minute. There were roughly 1,600 metres in a mile and the maximum distance it could go downwind was 1,200 metres. If the turbine was built 625 metres away then the novice could hit it.

A Member queried if any one from TNEI had been to the airfield to talk to them. Mr Handy explained that discussions to date had been very amicable. He had visited the aerodrome and had been shown around by Mr Rosenvinge. The location of the turbine on the site had been looked at but beyond the site, land would have to be purchased/leased and cabling would have to be ran back to AKS. Extra consultancy costs would add to the cost of the project making the scheme unfeasible.

A Member commented that if it was crucial to save on electric had the company explored any other ways of cutting costs. Mr Handy explained that experts in energy efficiency had been employed and they had implemented a number of measures to save money.

Mr Swinburne explained that over previous years, the plant had been modernised and insulated and capital investments had been made but enough savings had not been met.

A Member queried if there had been any accidents from parachute drops. Mr Rosenvinge explained that there would be expected to be 6 people per year landing out of the landing area. In 1997, someone landed on the roof of the factory and Mr Jones the Chairman of the BPA did land inside AKS when he first started parachuting.

## **Development Control and Regulatory Panel – 6 February 2007**

A Member queried how many of the novices attended the airfield. Mr Rosenvinge explained that out of 5,000 jumps, 1,000 would be novice jumpers. Between Easter and September there were lots of the general public coming to the airfield. Between October and March there were a lot of university students using the airfield. The outgoings of the airfield were between £9-11,000 per month and if the novice jumpers could not jump then Shotton Airfield would be finished.

A Member queried how many visitors came into the area. Mr Rosenvinge explained that last year approximately 1,000 people had been to the airfield and they nearly always brought somebody with them. Over the last five years there had been approximately 30,000 – 40,000 people brought into the region who did contribute to the local economy by using shops and filling stations. Although they were not as big as AKS they felt they were not insignificant in the District.

A Member queried if there were any guarantees that AKS would be still in the District in seven years time. Mr Swinburne explained that the wind turbine would help to secure the future of the 75 people who worked there. He was on the Board of Directors and there was no scheduled closure planned.

The Head of Planning and Building Control Services explained that Members needed to take account of material planning considerations. Peterlee Industrial Estate was the economic heart of Peterlee and to a large degree Easington, and a key component of economy of the region. Peterlee Industrial Estate was one of the top twenty employment zones in the region. The Structure Plan and the Local Plan supported that approach.

With regard to the air and nautical impact, Planning Officers were not experts and had taken advice from other bodies. The alternative sites had not been assessed and residential areas also needed to be protected. The economic impact on AKS and the impact on the airfield activities made the application difficult to determine. The application related to a well established company in the district and the conclusions of Officers were based on the importance of the industrial estate to the economy of Easington.

A Member commented that a number of wind turbines often became obsolete and if the application was approved he felt a condition should be added that if “the turbine was not working for six months the turbine should be dismantled”.

A Member commented that Peterlee Parachute Centre was the only facility between the Firth of Forth and Flamborough Head and felt that Policy 90 should come into consideration as this would be a facility lost to the District. It was a difficult decision to make but consideration must be given to the loss of the sports facility as well as the number of jobs that could possibly be lost if the airfield closed.



## Development Control and Regulatory Panel – 6 February 2007

Members commented that they thought the Airfield and Parachute Centre would be there for many years and Shotton airfield was valued too much to be lost. They were also concerned about the possibility of the loss of a regional sports facility.

**RESOLVED** that the application be refused.

**2005/0763 PETERLEE (HOWLETS) – RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT COMPRISING 18 No. HOUSES, NURSERY AND RELOCATION OF PLAYING FIELD AT FORMER ITEC CENTRE, BURNHOPE WAY, PETERLEE FOR THE NORTH BLUNTS PARTNERSHIP – DISCHARGE OF PLANNING CONDITIONS**

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control Services which recommended that discharge of conditions numbered 13 and 14 of Decision Notice 05/763.

**RESOLVED** that discharge of conditions numbered 13 and 14 of Decision Notice 05/763 be agreed.

**2006/0722 PETERLEE (PASSFIELD) – PROPOSED FRONT PORCH AND REAR TWO STOREY EXTENSION AT 11 BARNARD WYND, PETERLEE FOR MR F WATSON**

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control Services which recommended approval subject to conditions relating to materials, no windows to east facing elevation, positioning of the southern limit of the upper lounge shown on the submitted drawing 2027/05/06 not to be any closer to the glazing in the south facing wall of the extension and thereafter no alterations. The proposal was considered to be in accordance with the Statutory Development Plan and Policies 1, 35 and 73 of the District of Easington Local Plan.

Mr Wise, an objector, explained that he was the owner of 10 Barnard Wynd and also spokesman for Mr Lown of 6 Barnard Wynd. He felt that the extension was too large and overpowering and was not in keeping with the rest of the properties in the surrounding area. The two storey gable end of number 11 would effectively double in size and would stand out in stark contrast to the adjacent single storey of number 10.

The existing property was poorly maintained and a larger area at the side of the house would extend the existing dumping ground. As a result, the development would detract from the character and amenity of the area and have a detrimental impact upon the surrounding properties. In the South East corner of the rear garden to number 10 was a patio and barbecue area. The area was used in the summer as a relaxing area where the occupants often sat and enjoyed their meals and took a glass of wine in private. The proposed development at number 11 totally overlooked the garden area and would be an intrusion into his privacy.

## Development Control and Regulatory Panel – 6 February 2007

He referred to the Planning Officer's report which commented that "the extension would be visible from the main frontage of Barnard Wynd but only when viewed through the approximately 4 metre wide gap between these properties" and he felt this was not strictly accurate. The whole gable end of the extension would be seen from the lounge, study and front garden of number 6. A large part would be seen from number 7 and the cul-de-sac head. In addition, the massive gable end would be seen in part from the front and back gardens of numbers 8, 9 and 10 and as such it would be grossly overpowering.

A further comment stated that "it was considered that the massing of the extension was not out of keeping either with the scale of the existing house or the character of the area generally". Doubling the size of the gable end and the fact that there was no other house in Barnard Wynd of such proportions rendered this comment inaccurate. This would be another house attached at 90° to the existing property.

The Planning Officer stated "it was considered that the size and design of an existing garden room extension in the same position relative to the plot boundary as proposed works at number 11 would prevent the proposed extension being prominent from much of the rear garden of number 10". This statement was not correct and was contradicted further in the report where it stated that the main elevation of the proposed extension would be visible from the most of the rear garden of number 10. Sight lines drawn on the location plan showed that the patio area and 60% of the rear garden of number 10 would be visible from number 11's first floor. Conversely, an even greater percentage of the extension would be seen from the garden of number 10 and consequently it would be very prominent.

Mr Wise disagreed with the statement that "it was considered that the extension would not be apparent as an excessively large structure in relation to the height of number 10." To consider that a 2.25 metre difference in height was somehow acceptable did not detract from the fact that the proposal was two storey compared to the single storey of number 10. Furthermore, the sloping gardens would in fact emphasise the differing heights between the properties.

It was not agreed that "outward views from the upper floor to the sides and over the neighbouring garden would be severely limited." As previously stated the sight lines showed the extent of the views from within the new development.

Mr Wise explained that with a large window to the south face and a glass block window to the east he expressed concern regarding the structural integrity of the development. Would a large south facing window withstand all design criteria for wind loading. Would the large east facing glass block window withstand all design criteria for window/dead loading. The brick pillar to the south east corner seemed too slender to take the

## Development Control and Regulatory Panel – 6 February 2007

dead loading from the roof together with wind loads transmitted from the south and east windows.

He was concerned that the increase in the area between the extension and the existing fence between numbers 10 and 11 would make an even larger dumping ground. This had been an area used to deposit old fridges, washing machines, crates, old flooring materials and the like and had been a continuous source of contention. This was of particular interest to the owners of number 6 whose lounge window directly overlooked this area and who had in the past had to contact the Council on behalf of Mr Watson to arrange removal. Barnard Wynd was a very narrow road and construction traffic was bound to cause problems to the residents in general.

Referring to the construction of a greenhouse at number 11, Mr Wise explained he would not wish to see a repeat of the length of time of construction lasting almost four years and of the construction methods used which was wall plates spanning window openings without the use of lintels.

In conclusion, Mr Wise felt that the planning application should be refused. In the event that the development could not be reasonably refused, the size of the extension should be limited to single storey. This would preserve some privacy for number 10 whilst at the same time reducing the visual impact. It was also significant that the development as submitted would effectively provide for five lounges. That would seem to be excessive by anybody's standards and not sustainable when considered in conjunction with the detrimental impact that the proposed development would have. The plans would seem to indicate that the proposed development would extend approximately 0.5 metres beyond the rear building line of number 10. The proposed building line at the rear of the property should not extend beyond that of number 10.

Mr Watson, the Applicant, circulated photographs of the view from his house and the proposed plans which showed sight lines of the proposed extension. The porch was now in agreement with the Planning Officer's requirements and was in keeping with the street plan. With regard to the extension to the rear, he felt that the Objector's fears could not be maintained. At present, the views from the upper floor could see virtually every part of the garden of the Objector's dwelling. If the extension was built this would not change. He added that the Objector had commented that the extension was beyond his building line and he was quite happy for a condition to be attached for the extension not to exceed the building line of number 10.

The extension was not out of proportion of the building and Planning Officer's thought it would be appropriate and fit in with the building. The gable end would have no detriment and the Planning Officer thought this had no significant effect. With regard to loading requirements and pillar strengths, he felt that this was not a matter for planning but for building regulations

## **Development Control and Regulatory Panel – 6 February 2007**

and his Architect was confident that the construction could be achieved.

The extension did comply with Policy 73 and was in keeping with the buildings in the area. The size was comparable with numbers 9, 10, 12 and 13.

Mr Watson referred to the extension on number 10 which was a single storey on one side and double storey on the opposite side of the building and felt that a precedent had been established and it was incorrect for double standards.

There would be solar panels on the roof which would supply heating for most of the extension and the glazing was constructed to have maximum solar gain. The front of the extension was almost entirely glass.

The Principal Planning Services Officer explained that Members had visited the site and could assess the potential impact. The Applicant had offered to reduce the extension to bring it in line with number 10.

Members explained that a condition was to be attached to reduce the extension so that it did not protrude beyond the rear building line of number 10.

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

### **2006/0866 WHEATLEY HILL (THORNLEY AND WHEATLEY HILL) – PROPOSED STABLES (RESUBMISSION) AT LAND WEST OF LYNN TERRACE, WHEATLEY HILL FOR MR A HARVEY**

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control Services which recommended approval subject to conditions relating to building and external materials. The proposed development complied with planning policies referred to in the report.

The Senior 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 of the issues in the report.

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

### **2006/0874 SEAHAM (SEAHAM NORTH) – PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF PLOT 4, EAST SHORE VILLAGE, SELF BUILD AREA, SEAHAM FOR MR D THOMAS**

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control Services which recommended refusal as the proposed development by virtue of its scale, design and close proximity to existing adjacent residential properties on Dene Way was considered to form a visually dominating feature, which if built would result in unacceptable loss of light and outlook to those residents' properties. In particular, the

## Development Control and Regulatory Panel – 6 February 2007

impact on the gardens to the adjacent properties would be considerable in view of the height of the proposed dwelling and its close proximity to the boundary. Accordingly the proposal was considered to be contrary to Policies 1 and 35 of the District of Easington Local Plan.

**RESOLVED** that the application be refused.

**2006/0875 PETERLEE (DENEHOUSE) – PROPOSED REAR CONSERVATORY AT 91 O'NEILL DRIVE, PETERLEE FOR MR SMITH**

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control Services which recommended approval as the proposal was considered to be in accordance with the Statutory Development Plan and District of Easington Local Plan Policies 1, 35 and 73.

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

**2006/0883 MURTON (MURTON WEST) – PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT COMPRISING 20 No. DWELLINGS AT WELLFIELD HOUSE, WELLFIELD ROAD, MURTON FOR MR E D ALDER, BROSELEY HOMES LIMITED**

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control Services which recommended that Members be minded to approve the application subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement relating to offsite open space provision and subject to conditions relating to landscaping, highway details, materials. Delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning and Building Control Services to issue the decision upon satisfactory completion of the Section 106 Agreement. The proposed development was in accordance with the relevant planning policies referred to in the report.

The Senior 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 of the main issues outlined in the report. The Applicant had offered £400 per dwelling in relation to the off site open space provision. The Council would normally require £500 per dwelling.

Mr Etherington, an objector, explained that he lived in the bungalow adjacent to the access road. Working on an average of 2 cars per house that would be an extra 40 cars accessing the site. Wellfield Road had a very tight bend and was a bus route. When Wellfield House was in use, parking was not adequate and people parked in the back lanes of Wellfield Road. Staff and Council vehicles also parked off site. He added that he wanted development in the area but felt that 20 houses was a cause for concern.

Mr Alder explained that he was the Land Director of Broseley Homes and the Highway Authority had felt that the proposal met their standards. The previous Nursing Home had a lot of

## **Development Control and Regulatory Panel – 6 February 2007**

deliveries and there was a lot of cars coming in and out of the site as well as a lot of visitors for elderly residents. He felt that the traffic impact would be less and there would be a reduction in the flow of traffic. The proposal was for two storey 2 and 3 bedroomed traditional starter homes. Research had been carried out in the past and the majority of these types of properties were owned by single occupiers which would only have one car per dwelling. Designated parking bays were also included within the site. He added that he was prepared to enter into a Section 106 Agreement of £500 per dwelling.

A Member suggested that the construction traffic be restricted from 8.00 a.m. to 5.00 p.m.

**RESOLVED** that:-

- (i) the application be approved subject to completion of a Section 106 Agreement and condition relating to working hours
- (ii) the Head of Planning and Building Control Services be authorised to issue the decision on satisfactory completion of the Section 106 Agreement.

**PRIOR TO CONSIDERATION OF THE FOLLOWING APPLICATION, COUNCILLOR MRS E CONNOR DECLARED A PERSONAL AND PREJUDICIAL INTEREST AND LEFT THE MEETING.**

### **2006/0899 WINGATE (WINGATE) – PROPOSED HOUSE AT FORMER WELLFIELD HOUSE, MOOR LANE, WINGATE FOR MR D GRAHAM**

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control Services which recommended approval subject to a satisfactory response from the Environment Agency relating to the means of foul drainage. Conditions relating to materials, means of enclosure, landscaping scheme, landscaping timing, revised site plan arrangements. If a satisfactory response had not been received from the Environment Agency prior to the panel meeting, the panel be requested to grant delegated authority to the Head of Planning and Building Control Services to approve the application once agreement had been reached with the Environment Agency. The site was considered to be previously developed land suitable for the erection of one dwelling. The application site was relatively close to the settlement of Wingate and was not considered to be isolated in the open countryside.

The Senior Planning Services Officer explained that the Environment Agency had not yet responded therefore delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning and Building Control Services.

**RESOLVED** that:-

## **Development Control and Regulatory Panel – 6 February 2007**

- (i) the application be conditionally approved subject to a satisfactory response from the Environment Agency;
- (ii) the Head of Planning and Building Control Services be authorised to approve the application on receipt of a satisfactory response from the Environment Agency.

### **COUNCILLOR MRS E CONNOR REJOINED THE MEETING**

#### **2006/0903 SHERATON WITH HULAM (HUTTON HENRY) – AGRICULTURAL BUILDING AT SHERATON HALL FARM, HURWORTH BURN ROAD, SHERATON FOR MR D TODD**

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control Services which recommended approval subject to conditions relating to materials, means of enclosure, landscaping, landscaping timing, visibility splays at entrance to site from C24 Hurworth Burn Road. The proposal was considered to accord with the relevant Development Plan Policies in particular Policies 1, 3, 35 and 56 of the District of Easington Local Plan.

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

#### **2006/0908 MURTON (MURTON WEST) – PROPOSED 6 No. HOUSES AND 4 No. APARTMENTS AT MURTON HOUSE FARM, THE VILLAGE, MURTON FOR MIRRORED LEISURE LIMITED**

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control Services which recommended approval subject to conditions relating to materials, boundary enclosures, landscaping, contaminated land and amended design. The proposals were considered to represent an acceptable form of development which would improve the character and appearance of the site in accordance with relevant Development Plan Policies particularly Policies 1, 35 and 67 of the District of Easington Local Plan.

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 of the main issues outlined in the report.

An amended plan had been received regarding the front elevation and negotiations were taking place regarding the building at the rear that would impact on the adjacent property.

The Principal Planning Services Officer referred to the comments from the Highways Authority received in respect of the previous planning application.

"the 10 proposed dwellings plus possibly 2 or 3 existing dwellings would need to be served by a road and footway layout to adoption standard to access out onto the B1285.

## Development Control and Regulatory Panel – 6 February 2007

The site visibility splay to the west of the proposed access 2.4 x 79m was acceptable. The sight visibility to the east was deemed adequate as indicated.

A 1.8m wide footway would be required on the eastern side of the proposed access road.

The 3.5m wide private access was narrow and should be increased to at least 4.5m

The proposed access road to adoption standard is on the line of a public right of way footpath ref 13 which may require diverting."

The Principal Planning Services Officer explained that a plan incorporating the required amendments had been submitted and was confirmed as acceptable by the Highway Authority. The current proposal was based on the same layout.

The Principal Planning Services Officer referred to the bungalow and explained that the rear buildings were unsightly and the proposal would improve the situation. The Applicants intended to reduce the impact by installing a hipped roof on the building. It was not felt that the two buildings would overlook the adjacent bungalow.

A Member commented that the lady who lived in the bungalow was ill and could not attend the meeting that evening.

Councillor Maddison explained that he was speaking on behalf of Murton Parish Council. He was very concerned that the Highways Authority had indicated that there was no effect on the roads coming through the village. He had a report that was to be considered by the Highways Committee the following week and was very concerned about the Highway Officer's comments.

The development was opposite the village green and the Parish Council had secured funding through Durham County Council and Groundwork East Durham to regenerate the village green. If the development was approved, parking could overflow onto the village green and the people from the pub would also use the village green as parking.

His main issue was of safety and for two years he had been campaigning for traffic calming through the village. This had finally been accepted and was to be considered at the Highways Committee the following week. He felt that this was a dangerous place to put a housing estate.

L Armstrong, Clerk to Murton Parish Council, explained that the Parish Council wanted to bring back the historic value of the green to Murton. Funding for Phase 1 and 2 had been secured but the application could jeopardise Phase 3.



## **Development Control and Regulatory Panel – 6 February 2007**

The Principal Planning Services Officer explained that he had spoken to a Highways Officer that day who had advised him that he had made an assessment on a site visit the previous year. There was a parking area for residents and he could not comment on the impact it would have on funding regimes.

Mr Thirlaway, the Applicant, explained that the scheme to the village green would improve the area and the Officer had covered the majority of points he wanted to say.

Members explained that they were concerned that the Highway Committee at Durham County Council were considering a report that could impact upon this development.

A Member explained that she felt the impact on the village green if the development was approved, would be horrendous. Houses were to be built on the footpath and she felt that the bungalow would be overpowered by the development.

Mr Thirlaway explained that the properties would be stepped back from the footpath and a wall would be built at the front.

The Head of Planning and Building Control Services explained that if the application was deferred it would give Officers the opportunity to peruse the report to be considered by the Highways Committee and speak to Officers at Durham County Council.

**RESOLVED** that application number 2006/0908 be deferred.