

**THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING**  
**OF THE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL AND REGULATORY PANEL**  
**HELD ON TUESDAY 20 MARCH 2007**

Present: Councillor M Routledge (Chair)  
Councillors Mrs E M Connor, R Davison,  
M Nicholls, D J Taylor-Gooby and  
R Taylor

Objectors: Mr. Salt, Mr. Howarth

Supporters: Mrs. Anderson, Mrs. Murch, Mrs. Muers,  
Mr. Humphries, Mr. Ord, Mrs. Oates

Applicant: Mr. Cudlip, Mr. Preston, Mr. Hudson,  
Mr. Weightman, Mr. Reid

**1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Mrs G Bleasdale, B Burn, J Haggan and Mrs J Maitland.

**2 THE MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING** held on 27 February 2007, 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**

**PRIOR TO CONSIDERATION OF THE FOLLOWING ITEM OF BUSINESS,  
COUNCILLOR R DAVISON DECLARED A PERSONAL AND PREJUDICIAL INTEREST  
AND LEFT THE MEETING.**

**2006/0768 EASINGTON VILLAGE (EASINGTON VILLAGE AND SOUTH  
HETTON) – Farm Shop at Plants R Ross, The Garden Centre,  
South Hetton Road, Easington for Plants R Ross**

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control Services which recommended approval, conditions relating to materials to be agreed, landscaping scheme and timing, means of enclosure, timing of access improvements, limit on retail floor space, limit on goods to be sold. The proposal was considered to accord with the relevant Development Plan Policies in particular Policies 1, 3, 35, 106 and 107 of the Easington District Local Plan.

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

**COUNCILLOR R DAVISON REJOINED THE MEETING.**

**2006/0889**

**SEAHAM (SEAHAM HARBOUR) – 12 Workshop/Office Units, Improved Slip Way, Dock Gates and Pontoons at Seaham North Dock, Seaham Harbour, Seaham for Seaham North Dock CIC Limited**

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control Services which recommended that the development be approved subject to the resolution of the outstanding issues referred to in the report and conditions relating to external materials, revised plans, if any and archaeological conditions. The proposed development complied with the relevant Development Plan Policies referred to and in the North Dock Design Brief.

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

**2007/0014**

**SEAHAM (DENESIDE) – Environmental Improvements including New Footpaths at Deneside School Allotment Site, Graham Way, Seaham for Seaham Town Council**

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control Services which recommended approval. The proposed development was in accordance with the Statutory Development Plan in particular Policies 1 and 35 of the District of Easington Local Plan. There were no material considerations which outweighed the support for the proposals.

The Senior Planning Services Officer gave a detailed presentation on the main issues outlined in the report.

Mr Howarth, an objector explained that at the last meeting it was made clear by Members that the application should be referred back for consultation with residents. One meeting had been held at Seaham Town Council at the request of residents. The timing had not been ideal and he had not been made aware of the meeting.

The history of the path showed that improving the footpath would increase anti-social behaviour. There had been a number of incidents reported to the police. He had spoken to Seaham Police and in the last 1½ years, there had been 30 reported incidents from local residents. The area was now overgrown and muddy and did not attract people, so the anti-social behaviour had reduced.

Newspaper articles had shown that improving play areas had attracted anti-social behaviour to East Shore Village. If the area was opened up and improved he felt it would encourage anti-social behaviour. He added that he felt that residents had not been fully consulted.

Mr Salt, an objector explained that he felt that tidying up the area would encourage anti-social behaviour and discourage people from using the area as it would give a park where youths could congregate. He queried that if he had not telephoned Mike Preston would the meeting with residents

## Development Control and Regulatory Panel – 20 March 2007

have taken place. He had contacted Mr Preston on Friday the previous week and no contact had been made previously by Seaham Town Council. If after the work was completed, a person applied for an allotment would the land be returned back to being an allotment. He thought the money that would have been spent would have been wasted.

Mr Salt explained that he would like clarification if the land was to remain designated as allotments. He had spoken to the National Association of Allotments who had advised that permission would need to be granted from the Secretary of State for re-designation and there was a lot of criteria that had to be met. Would the land be allocated for allotments or parkland?.

Mrs Anderson, a supporter explained that the site was very untidy and contained a lot of vermin. There was anti-social behaviour but this would happen whether the site was tidied or not. At present, youths could hide in the bushes and set fires and if the area was cleared and tidied there would be nowhere for the youths to hide. The Allotment Association never kept the area clean and Seaham Town Council had done nothing with it. She had been speaking to Seaham Town Council for the past three years to try to get the area tidied up. She felt that the residents in Weymouth Drive wanted to see the right of way closing off, but this was the responsibility of Durham County Council. She had a petition from residents who supported the application. She did support wildlife but there was no wildlife there at present, only vermin.

Mrs Murch, a supporter explained that she lived on Kingston Avenue near the allotment site. Seaham Town Council regularly cut the grass on the Linear Park and flowers were planted by Deneside School. If the allotments were tidied the same as the Linear Park, it would be kept looking very nice. Residents walked their dogs and in the summer months sat on the grass and youths could be seen when they gathered there. The area at the top of Kingston Avenue spoilt the look of the whole area by its untidiness and it was very dangerous for children.

Mr Muers, a supporter explained the land was overgrown and was a fire hazard and needed to be addressed properly.

Mr Humphries, a supporter explained that he had moved into his home four years ago because he liked the rural aspect of the surroundings which was ideal for his grandchildren to play. The allotment site was an eyesore, he had even seen people from houses in Weymouth Drive throwing rubbish over the fence. The pathway needed to be tarmaced and lighting installed and it would enhance the area. By enhancing the area it would benefit the local residents. He added that he had never seen much anti-social behaviour and there was a Neighbourhood Watch who kept an eye on the area.

Mike Preston explained that he was the Parks Manager for Seaham Town Council and the Project Manager of the proposal.

## Development Control and Regulatory Panel – 20 March 2007

It was suggested at the last panel meeting that residents of Weymouth Drive had evidence of misuse of the pathway which they felt would increase if the barriers were installed which would allow people to congregate. He stated that the plan submitted with the planning application did not in fact suggest or imply that barriers would be installed. What was being proposed was to install three concrete bollards to prevent access into the area by motor vehicles and quad bikes.

An issue raised at the last meeting related to the path widening. A resurfacing of rolled carboniferous limestone to a width of 1.8 metres wide would be applied. This was the existing width of the footpath as it extended from the rear boundary of Weymouth Drive properties to the former allotment fence boundary. It was also implied at the last meeting that three new roadways were being installed across the site and mentioned had been made of these being of a tarmac surface. It was in fact being proposed and was clearly stated on the development plans that the footpaths would link into the existing footpath network at Ivy Avenue and Kingston Avenue and that these would be of a standard 1.8 metre construction. The footpath links would be on the basis of 'permitted rights of way' and would not be public rights of way included on the definitive map.

Picnic tables and seating area had also been mentioned at the last meeting. He gave an assurance that Seaham Town Council had no intention whatsoever at present or in the future of installing any form of public seating or picnic tables in that particular area. The Development Plan did not show any picnic tables or seating as being part of the proposals and the intention was and had always been to site any such furniture well away from the houses in an open area of the Graham Way Linear Park.

It was suggested at the last meeting that doing nothing would be the best solution. From the point of view of other local residents to the east of the former allotment site, this would not be seen as a viable solution in terms of the general untidiness of the site together with the risk of fire, continuous dumping and damage to property from the materials from the former foundations of the allotment buildings. Seaham Town Council as a responsible local authority also believed the site could not and should not be left as it was. Doing nothing in their view was not in the best interest of everyone who lived there.

The steel security fence which fronted onto the properties of Ivy Avenue could not and should not stay there. It served no useful purpose as it was the old allotment boundary fence which became derelict and unlettable. The land was passed back to Seaham Town Council in a deplorable condition and he emphasised again that there was no barriers only bollards within the scheme. The changes to the footpath link would

## Development Control and Regulatory Panel – 20 March 2007

actually direct people away from the Weymouth Drive properties at the southern end of the estate.

Issues relating to wildlife on the site had been mentioned at the previous meeting and on subsequent occasions by the residents of Weymouth Drive. Both Seaham Town Council and Groundwork East Durham had carried out site surveys of the area of land and at no time whatsoever had any evidence been found that there was any wildlife other than vermin such as rats and mice actually living on the site. He was sure that foraging wild birds did visit the site which was attracted by the vermin which they devoured as food.

A site visit carried out in the last few days in conjunction with the District Council's Countryside Officer had confirmed that point and he had stated that he could find no evidence of any wildlife living on the site although he had suggested that it would be helpful from a wildlife point of view if a number of additional trees were to be planted on the site which would provide a feeding linkage between the allotments and the Graham Way Linear Park.

The Countryside Officer had also asked to sow the mounded area beneath the new trees with a wild floral mix which would not be regularly cut and would also serve to prevent anyone walking across or hanging about the site. Seaham Town Council would agree to follow that advice and plant extra trees as a continued linkage and also to sow the wild floral mixture on the mounds.

Mr Preston explained that he hoped the additional points of clarification were helpful to the panel in considering the application. The idea for the project to tidy up the site was first mooted by the residents of the Kingston Avenue area three years ago. The scheme had subsequently attracted grant aid funding from the District Council following the proposal meeting the aims and objectives of the Livability funding.

Stan Cudlip explained that he was Clerk to Seaham Town Council and the application accorded with Policies 1 and 35 of the Easington District Local Plan. The Planning Officer had also stated in the report that there were no material considerations which outweighed support for the Town Council's application. The Town Council believed their proposals would contribute in line with Policy 1 of the Local Plan to the better maintenance and enhancement of a good local environment. They also believed that the proposal accorded with Policy 35 of the Local Plan and that it would make available additional public open space and provide enhanced landscape features for the development site, all of which would benefit the community.

At the last meeting it was suggested that some additional consultation should take place. The Town Council had afforded residents in Weymouth Drive such an opportunity. They had taken the time to explain the full nature of the proposals and

## Development Control and Regulatory Panel – 20 March 2007

clarified the extent of the scheme as well as listening to residents concerns and their alternative suggestions.

The Town Council believed that the issues of anti-social behaviour raised by the residents were matters which should be properly directed to and addressed by the Police. The concerns centred around potential misuse of the public right of way and additional youths congregating who may behave anti-socially. The residents of Weymouth Drive accepted that the site which was the subject of the application was an absolute mess. It was worse than that. It was a total eyesore and looked like a tip. The residents recognised the need for improvement but had fears that anti-social behaviour would increase.

Seaham Town Council understood and respected the views made by residents in Weymouth Drive but firmly believed that it was right to proceed with the scheme. After listening to residents and taking account of Groundwork and the Countryside Officers views, Seaham Town Council had agreed minor amendments to the scheme which were outlined earlier by Mike Preston. However they were not prepared to withdraw the scheme or make major revisions as the scheme removed major areas of dereliction, improved access and accorded with the District Council's own targets for Liveability Fund applications.

It was felt that the proposed scheme was in the best interests of the community and would result in the site being tidied up, improve visibility and local amenity for everyone concerned.

The Police had once again been consulted and they were in full support of the scheme.

At the last meeting another suggestion was put forward that the public right of way should be closed. This was an idea which was first mooted by the Town Council more than eight years ago. They had been in touch with the Footpaths Officer at Durham County Council who was responsible for public rights of way. The County Council as Highway Authority had informed them that they would not support any suggestion involving possible closure of the public right of way. The County Council stated that when they inspected the right of way only a few days ago, their Footpaths Officer found five people using it. In their opinion, the right of way was well used and the County Council could not support any suggestion involving closure. Another important consideration was that any idea about the closure of the right of way was not an integral issue with regard to the application.

Seaham Town Council did not have any plans to put picnic tables on the land and could not envisage this happening in future years. The application did involve building three roadways/routes through the land but provided links to the Deneside estate. The Countryside Officer of the District Council had also been consulted and could assure that the

## Development Control and Regulatory Panel – 20 March 2007

proposals would in no way endanger, disturb, harm any existing wildlife on the site.

In addition, the residents of Kingston Avenue, Ivy Avenue and Jasper Avenue were present that evening with a petition supporting the Town Council's proposals. The residents were fed up with looking onto an area which was unsightly was regarded as an eyesore and a dumping ground for all sorts of things.

Seaham Town Council had consulted with and listened to the views of residents of Weymouth Drive. They had spoken to the police and sought their further views and had also been in touch with the County Council's Rights of Way Officer. In addition, they also sought views of the Countryside Officer from the District Council. All of the bodies supported Seaham Town Council's application.

Mr Cudlip explained that Mr Salt had raised the issue of designation of the land. At the moment, the land was unused derelict allotment land and this designation would be retained by Seaham Town Council. Seaham Town Council's policy clearly stated that as long as they provide allotment sites in Seaham, it was not essential that it was in this locality. At the moment there were 30 vacancies on allotment sites throughout Seaham. Allotments were not as popular as they once were and they were now falling into disrepair. If there was a request that the allotment should be reinstated, then this would be considered but he could not envisage huge demand to take up the current vacancies.

Mr Salt explained that he had sought advice and they had advised that Section 8 of the Allotment Act 1925 required consent of the Secretary of State for re-designation of allotment land.

A Member queried what supervision if any Seaham Town Council would have to make the area more friendly to wildlife. M Preston explained that there would be maintenance visits by Seaham Town Council and they had always wanted to merge this with the Linear Park at Graham Way. The area was self-policed by residents.

Mr Humphries queried if lighting would be installed. M Preston explained that there were no plans at present but if lighting was required then Seaham Town Council would work with other organisations to see if lighting could be installed.

Mr Howarth referred to consultation and queried how Seaham Town Council believed that they had consulted with residents as he had never been contacted. S Cudlip explained that the statutory requirement for consultation regarding the application lay with the District Council as planning authority. Seaham Town had been consulting with the people who had raised the issue of tidying the area for the past three years. He genuinely believed that they had been the only interested parties. He

## Development Control and Regulatory Panel – 20 March 2007

had not been aware before the last meeting that there were any other issues or objections. He had made an offer to Mr Salt for a meeting and explained that he could bring any number of residents as he so wished. Three representatives had attended from Weymouth Drive.

Mr Salt explained that he had contacted Mike Preston on Thursday of last week and a meeting had been arranged for 10.00 am the previous day. If people had not been at work, they would have attended and no one had been invited from the Deneside estate.

**RESOLVED** that the application be approved.

**2007/0026**

### **THORNLEY (THORNLEY AND WHEATLEY HILL) – Residential Development at Crossways Hotel and Land adjacent Dunelm Road, Thornley for Mr J E Hudson**

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control Services which recommended refusal. The proposal represented the development of a predominantly greenfield site outside the established settlement boundaries as identified in the District of Easington Local Plan. As such, the proposal could prejudice the development of previously developed sites in Thornley and undermine the Council's regeneration objectives and would be contrary to Durham County Structure Plan Policy 9 and District of Easington Local Plan Policies 3, 67, 68 and 69.

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 outlined in the report.

Councillor Nicholls explained that he was a member of New Thornley Partnership although he had not been involved in any discussions and took no part in the decision making process when giving their support to Mr. Hudson.

The Head of Planning and Building Control Services explained that the application was against national, regional and local planning policy. Since the development of the Regional Spatial Strategy, this was the first application of any size which was outside of the settlement boundary that needed to be considered in relation to the Local Development Framework. The Council was under restrictions and needed to adhere to its regeneration statement and bring forward key priorities. The District Council would be strictly process managed and if targets were exceeded then they would be pulled back. One key priority of the Council was the Seaham Colliery site which could be jeopardised if the application was approved.

Government Office North East had reinforced the point that if the District Council did not manage themselves then they would be managed. There was a lot of brownfield land in Thornley although it had not come to fruition as quickly as hoped. If the

## Development Control and Regulatory Panel – 20 March 2007

District Council went against the Regional Spatial Strategy then a price would be paid in the future.

Kevin Ord explained that he was Vice Chair of New Thornley Partnership who supported the application. The meeting was unanimous in its decision to give Mr Hudson full support for the redevelopment of Crossways. It was felt that houses would enhance the gateway into the village and the land in question was becoming an eyesore.

Mrs Oates explained that she had lived in Thornley for 26 years and worked at Crossways Hotel for 19 years. She was working there now more out of loyalty to Mr. Hudson as she did not want to work for a failed business. Part of the site was a brownfield site. With regard to Thornlaw South which was currently being cleared for redevelopment, some of the area was grassed over and some houses that remained had been set on fire. The proposal for the Crossways site was not the same standard of accommodation that would be expected on Thornlaw South and Coopers Close. Crossways site was located in the nicest part of Thornley and was thought by villagers to be the prestigious part of the village. She felt that it would give the village a lift. She now lived in Seaham and was aware of four housing estates that were currently being built and they were being boxed in. The Head of Planning and Building Control Services had referred to the Seaham Colliery site as being a key priority for the District Council but Seaham was not the be all and end all of the district.

Mr Hudson, the applicant explained that he had been the owner of Crossways Hotel for twenty years. The Planning Officer's report referred to the proposed development site as being located in open countryside. This was correct by definition in that it was outside of the existing settlement boundary and he had produced documentary and photographic evidence to show the historical links through the Thornley Greyhound Stadium and the geographical link of the natural boundaries of the A181, B1279 and the Mineral Railway Line (Miners Heritage Trail) which embraced this site as part of Thornley.

To say the site by definition was in the countryside stretched the imagination to refer it as 'open'. The perception of the community was that Crossways was and always had been an integral part of the village. This opinion was reinforced within the letter of objection stating "we are the oldest building in Thornley".

The recommendations made no reference to the historic and permanent links between the Crossways site and the village. The Heritage Stone monument opposite the hotel entrance depicting the site of the fore runner to the Durham Miners Gala. Not mentioned in the recommendations was that the Parish Council had no objections to the proposed development. In addition, the New Thornley Partnership had given total support by letter. The local framework criteria could be satisfied through the detailed planning stage, however, the

## Development Control and Regulatory Panel – 20 March 2007

question of sustainability had been adequately justified in the submission which he had previously circulated to Members.

The report questioned whether a residential development would not in itself represent a gateway to Thornley. If it was not, he queried what was, bearing in mind the Panel granted a development at the other end of the village referring to it as a more attractive gateway to Thornley as mentioned in paragraph 3.4 of his submission.

The recommendations also emphasised that the 'top field', area B in the submission, formally part of the Thornley Greyhound Stadium made the site predominantly greenfield. It was greater in size than the hotel developed site but only by one hundredth of an acre. This meant that brownfield was 49% and greenfield 51%.

The issue of settlement boundaries in smaller settlements such as Thornley would become less important in its current form as the focus shifted to Newcastle, Sunderland and Teesside. The policy shift would draw away from investment and regeneration in Thornley.

Some recent smaller developments had in fact been approved outside settlement boundaries, for example redundant petrol stations, a car showroom and a redundant Council depot plus others that Members would be aware of.

The Panel was currently working from its Local Plan which had a stated policy of housing led regeneration. The preparation of the Local Development Framework in line with forthcoming policy was shifting the focus towards development in the cities and city regions which, in the North East was served and connected by the A19 corridor. The move and focus would draw emphasis, development opportunities and resources away from the regeneration of the towns and villages served by most if not all of the Councillors.

The impact of the change in policy focus would be to leave the remainder of Easington district to feed its development on 175 houses per annum. The Planning Officers recommendation appeared to make the assumption that Councils which had agreed to developments prior to the imposition of the Regional Spatial Strategy would have their house building allowances retrospectively reduced.

Mr Hudson explained that his research into the aspect indicated were there were mixed views and interpretations on this. Some believed that the national legal backlash to any such move would prevent and discourage any such action by government. In its current form, Crossways provided for passing residents who added nothing to the financial sustainability of the village. They put no money into its economy whereas the redevelopment of the site offered permanent residents and members of the community which created an opportunity for investment in the village, its

## Development Control and Regulatory Panel – 20 March 2007

regeneration and sustainability. It would also help to address the drastically falling school roll as referred to by the headmistress's letter on page 10 and 11 of his submission.

Mr Hudson concluded that his submission was based on facts, expert witness and 23 years experience involved the hospitality industry. Do not infer from the current financial viability of the business that it had not been a success for 20 years at Crossways, it had. East Durham Business Service had commissioned a report which would give the answer as to why Crossways was no longer what customers wanted. Things happen, recessions and foot and mouth came and went, Shotton Hall came and remained. The £500,000 of public money was well spent, however for the last 14 years it had taken the predominant amount of the wedding and function business which was lost forever.

Things happen and things changed. Supermarkets for all their popularity had closed, petrol stations, milk rounds, traditional shops such as butchers, bakers, fish mongers. Whatever happened to the local cinema?. People now travelled to the Metro Centre, Boldon, Hartlepool or Teesside because things happen and things change because peoples aspirations change, their wants, desires and needs change and that is why things must change. He urged Members to grant the application as a justifiable departure from policy.

The Head of Planning and Building Control Services explained that part of the site was brownfield and this was not in dispute. He had been willing to talk to the applicant about the brownfield part of the site at the pre application stage. It was speculation as to what would happen with the Regional Spatial Strategy but the Council would be judged on the applications they had determined since 2004 and the outcome of the application would have an impact upon it.

A Member requested an update on progress on marketing and development on the other sites in Thornley. The Head of Planning and Building Control Services explained that it was unlikely that the other sites would be redeveloped for social rented housing. The land at Coopers Close would be brought forward but the intention was not to market the site for the next 2 – 3 years.

Mr Hudson explained that it was his understanding that Coopers Close would be approximately 10 – 15 years before the land was safe to build upon.

A Member queried if the area known as the old dog track was classed as brownfield. The Head of Planning and Building Control Services explained that this area was classed as greenfield.

The Chair queried why the hotel could not be developed into flats. Mr Hudson explained that the building structure was so diverse it was not suitable for conversion.

## Development Control and Regulatory Panel – 20 March 2007

A Member commented that there had been 62 new properties built in Thornlaw North and 26 two bedroomed bungalows built by Three Rivers in Thornlaw South. Peterlee was built with flat roofs and a lot of the funding from the villages had gone into upgrading those houses.

The New Thornley Partnership had been formed ten years ago when he joined as a Councillor. The village had lost out on a number of improvements over the years. Trees had been planted in the gateways to the village and he had worked with Groundwork to improve the look of the village. Crossways was deteriorating rapidly and there was no one coming into the village and using the hotel. There was not just the greenfield and brownfield issues which needed to be looked at but the future of the building. If the building deteriorated on the gateway into the village this would look terrible.

Numerous businesses had closed down in the village. Coopers Close was land banked and part of it was still waiting for a bat survey to be carried out. He realised that there was a policy but he felt that the villages in the west of the district had been held back so many times although the Council had tried to regenerate parts of Thornley.

Ten – twelve years ago there had been a bypass proposed from Wheatley Hill to Bowburn, linking the A1M to the A19 which would bring back some business to the villages. The figure quoted for the bypass some years ago was £6m but this now had risen to £9m. The Crossways Hotel was on a very bad junction and there had been fatalities over the years.

A Member commented that he was very sympathetic and he would be inclined to consider the site marked 'A' in the applicants submission more favourably than the whole site, if he entered into negotiation with the Council.

Members commented that they were sympathetic with the applicant that Crossways Hotel was partly on brownfield land but could not set a precedent on greenfield land outside the village boundary.

**RESOLVED** that the application be refused.

**2007/0045**

### **MURTON (MURTON WEST) – Classroom and Footpath at Sandhills rear of Davison Crescent, Murton for Mr J Naylor**

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control Services which recommended approval subject to conditions relating to the location of the building and footpaths. The proposal was considered to be in accordance with the Statutory Development Plan and Policies 1, 3, 31, 32, 35 and 86 of the District of Easington Local Plan.

The Principal Planning Services Officer explained that discussions were still ongoing regarding the placement of the

## Development Control and Regulatory Panel – 20 March 2007

footpath and requested that the application be deferred to continue with negotiations.

**RESOLVED** that application No 2007/0045 be deferred.

**2007/0049**

**SEAHAM (SEAHAM HARBOUR) – 15 Metre Monopole and Associated Equipment at George Street Garage, Seaham for O2 (UK) Limited**

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control Services which recommended refusal as the proposed mast would appear as an obtrusive and dominant feature within the street scene and wider locality to the detriment of amenity for nearby residents contrary to Policies 1, 35 and 82 of the District of Easington Local Plan.

**RESOLVED** that the application be refused.

**2007/0054**

**EASINGTON VILLAGE (EASINGTON VILLAGE AND SOUTH HETTON) – 6 No Houses (Approval of Reserved Matters) at Littlethorpe Farm, Easington for G R Properties (NE) Limited**

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control Services which recommended that subject to the receipt of a satisfactory landscaping scheme, details of tree protection measures and revised plans relating to the private drives, permission be granted and that authority to issue this decision be delegated to the Head of Planning and Building Control Services following the expiry of the consultation period and on the basis that no significant objections were received during the intervening period. The development complied with the Development Plan policies in the report and would not harm the amenities of local residents or the character of the locality.

**RESOLVED** that conditional approval be granted subject to the receipt of a satisfactory landscaping scheme, details of tree protection measures and revised plans relating to the private drives. Authority to issue the decision be delegated to the Head of Planning and Building Control Services.

**2007/0083**

**WINGATE (WINGATE) – Rear Extension at Heortnesse, Durham Road, Wingate for Mr V E Dicker**

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control Services which recommended approval. 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.

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