

# Item no.

Report to: **Development Control and Regulatory Panel**

Date: **20 March 2007**

Report of: **Head of Planning and Building Control Services**

Subject: **Applications under the Town and Country Planning Acts  
Town and Country Planning Act 1990  
Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990**

Ward: **All**

## **A INTRODUCTION**

Members are advised that in preparing the attached report full consultation responses are not presented. Care is taken to ensure that principal issues of all relevant responses are incorporated into the report. Notwithstanding this Members are invited to view all submitted plans and consultation responses prior to the Panel meeting by contacting the Head of Planning and Building Control Services.

The Easington Local Plan was adopted by the District of Easington on 28<sup>th</sup> December 2001. Together with the Durham County Structure Plan it is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. All relevant policies have been taken into account in making recommendations in this report. A view as to whether the proposals generally accord with policies is identified in the relevant section.

Section 54A of the 1990 Town & Country Planning Act (as amended) requires the Local Planning Authority to have regard to the development plan policies when they are relevant to an application and hence are a material consideration. Where such policies are material to a proposal, section 54A requires the application to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan policies unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The recommendations contained in this report have been made taking into account all material planning considerations including any representations received and Government guidance in Planning Policy Guidance Notes and Circulars. Consideration has been given to whether proposals cause harm to interests of acknowledged importance.

Members attention is drawn to information now provided in respect of time taken to determine applications. Following each recommendation a determination time is provided based on a decision at this Panel. Where a decision time exceeds the 8 week target a reason for this is given in brackets.

In considering the applications and preparing the report the District of Easington has fully taken into account the duties imposed on Local Planning Authorities by the Human Rights Act 2000. In particular, regard has been given to Articles 6, 7, and 8, the First Protocol and Section 6. Where specific issues of compliance with this legislation have been raised these are dealt with within each report.

# Item no.

## **B SPEAKING AT THE PANEL**

The District Council is one of the few Councils in the country who allows verbal representations when decisions on planning applications are being made. The Panel has to balance listening to views with the efficient conduct of the business of the Panel. The following procedures have therefore been agreed. These procedures will be adhered to in respect of the items within this report. Members of the public will also be expected to follow these both in their own interests and that of other users of the service.

1. The Planning Officer will present his report.
2. Objectors and supporters will be given the opportunity to speak. Five minutes will be given to each speaker. If there is more than one speaker upon an issue, the District Council recommends the appointment of a spokesperson and that speakers register their request prior to the Panel meeting.
3. After registered speakers have had their say the Chair of the Panel will ask if there is any other member of the public who wishes to speak. Those who do may be allowed to speak. The Chair of the Panel will exercise discretion in this regard. Where the number of speakers or the repetitive nature of the points that may be raised may impact on the other business of the Panel then the Chair will restrict the number of speakers and progress the matter.
4. The applicant or representative may then speak for a duration of up to five minutes.
5. At the discretion of the Chair, objectors or supporters or applicants may ask officers questions then may be asked questions by Members and Officers
6. The Members of the Panel will then finally debate and determine the application with the assistance of officers if required.

## **C RISK ASSESSMENT**

A risk assessment has been carried out in respect of individual cases. Overall, it is concluded that any risks to the Council, for example relating to an appeal being lost and costs awarded against the Council, are low, provided that decisions are made in accordance with recommendations. Risks will increase when decisions are made contrary to recommendations, and the degree will vary depending on the particular case.

# Item no.

## D GENERAL APPLICATIONS

### PLAN/2006/0768

**EASINGTON VILLAGE (EASINGTON VILLAGE & SOUTH HETTON) – Farm Shop at Plants R Ross, The Garden Centre, South Hetton Road, Easington for Plants R. Ross.**

#### Planning History

98/513 – Polytunnel - Approved  
99/363 – Polytunnel - Approved  
00/391 – Polytunnels – Approved  
00/364 – Dwelling (outline) - Withdrawn  
00/469 – Dwelling (outline) – Refused  
01/52 – Dwelling (outline) – Approved  
02/570 - Polytunnel – Approved  
05/210 – Garden Centre (outline) - Approved

#### Consultations

The application has been advertised in the local press and by a site notice. Neighbouring properties have also been consulted. No letters of representation have been received in relation to this application.

Easington District Council, Planning Policy Officer, comments:

- The proposed development is considered to be in accordance with policy 107 of the Local plan. However the scale and character of the building is considered to be contrary to Policy 35 of the Local Plan. Part 2 of Policy 35 makes reference to the scale and character of proposed buildings in terms of site coverage, height, roof style, detailed design and materials and that it should reflect adjacent buildings. The area and height of the building are considered excessive and the character does not reflect the adjacent buildings.

Easington District Council, Environmental health Officer, comments:

- I have no comments to make in relation to this application.

Durham County Council, Highway Authority, comments:

- No highway objections are raised. The details of the improvements to the existing access shown on the submitted plans are acceptable.

East Durham Business Service, comments:

- No objections to the application in principle which demonstrates increased growth and investment by a local company coupled with employment creation.

Easington Village Parish Council, comments:

- No comments received.

#### Development Plan Policies

##### *District of Easington Local Plan*

GEN01 - General Principles of Development

# Item no.

ENV03 - Protection of the Countryside  
ENV17 - Identification and Protection of Wildlife Corridors  
ENV35 - Environmental Design: Impact of Development  
ENV41 - Control of Non- agricultural building sin the countryside  
SHO106 - Garden centres  
SHO107 - Farm shops

## **Comment**

Planning permission is sought to use the application site as a garden centre including other associated development, such as a tearoom and farm shop. The existing covered sales area is to be extended and a display garden is to be provided. It is proposed that the vehicular access to the site be improved and car parking provided adjacent to the proposed building and display garden. The application site is situated on South Hetton Road approximately mid way between Easington and South Hetton

As the planning history reveals, planning permission has been granted on a number of occasions for growing tunnels. Outline consent has been approved previously under planning application 05/210 for the site to be used as a formal garden centre. Although the current application is for full permission rather than the reserved matters associated with the previous application, it is considered that this previous application sets a precedent for use of the application site as a garden centre.

The original application for outline consent allowed for the erection of a covered sales area and shop on the application site. The reserved matters associated with the outline permission have not been submitted; these details would need to be subject to a further application in order to implement the outline consent.

The current application includes the erection of a tearoom, farm shop, and covered sales area and includes the creation of a display garden and parking areas. In principle the proposed covered sales area and display garden are considered to be acceptable; the previous application set the precedent for the use of the site as a garden centre and these two elements of the scheme are in keeping with this use. It is therefore considered that the erection of the proposed farm shop/tea room is the main consideration in determining the application.

The current proposal includes the erection of a steel framed brick and wood panelled building adjacent to the western boundary of the application site. The proposed structure is to be used as a tearoom and farm shop. In principle the proposed uses are acceptable in this location; it is considered that they are in keeping with established use of the whole site, and would be ancillary to the main use of the site as a garden centre. However, concerns have been raised relating to the scale of the proposed building and floor area to be used for retail sales specifically relating to the Farm Shop.

The relevant policy with regard to the creation of Farm Shops is Policy 107 of the Local Plan. The proposal is considered to accord with the relevant development plan policy: it is not considered that it will have any detrimental effects on nearby village shops, the proposed vehicular access to the site is to be improved, adequate parking is to be provided, and because of its siting it is not considered that the proposed shop will have any detrimental effects upon occupants of adjacent properties. It is proposed that a condition be

# Item no.

attached to any grant of planning permission limiting the type of goods to be sold from the premises.

In terms of the design and scale of the proposed building it is considered that it is in broad compliance with the relevant development plan policies. Although it is clearly not in keeping with existing buildings on the site, which include polytunnels and a domestic bungalow, the proposed building is considered to be acceptable in this location. The proposed building is rural in appearance and is similar to other structures visible on adjacent agricultural premises. It is proposed that a condition to agree materials and finishes for the proposed structure will allow the Local Planning Authority to ensure that the building is built in accordance with its setting and surrounds.

It is considered that the proposal is in broad accordance with the relevant development plan policies. The access to the site is to be improved and the car parking provision is to be increased. It is suggested that a landscaping scheme is made a condition of any grant of planning permission to ensure the proposed structures are not too prominent in this rural location. Durham County Council Highways Authority have no objection to the proposed improvement of the vehicular access or car parking provision.

## **Conclusion**

The principle of the use of the site as a garden centre has been established under the previous outline planning permission. It is accepted that the proposed additions to the site as part of the current application are in accordance with this established use. The application should be approved subject to the suggested conditions.

**Recommend:** Approval. Conditions to include: 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.

## **Reason for recommendation:**

The proposal is considered to accord with the relevant development plan policies. In particular policies 1, 3, 35, 106 and 107 of the Easington District Local Plan.

**Decision time** Over eight weeks. Target missed due to further information being required.

# Item no.

## **PLAN/2006/0889**

**SEAHAM (SEAHAM HARBOUR) – 12 Workshop/Office Units, Improved Slipway, Lock Gates and Pontoons at Seaham North Dock, Seaham Harbour, Seaham for Seaham North Dock CIC Ltd.**

### **Planning History**

No recent planning history.

A Design Brief for the North Dock was produced by this Council and the County Council Conservation Team, in 2006 and a summary of its contents is reproduced in the commentary below.

### **Consultations**

Town Council – No comments received.

Seaham Environmental Association – No comments received.

Council Regeneration Officer – Fully supports the application.

County Highways – No objections but suggests gated access may need widening to accommodate trailers etc.

Northumbrian Water – No objections.

Landscape/Ecological Officer – No objections as the adjacent SSSI will not be affected by the development.

Natural England – No objections to the proposals.

County Council Archaeology Officer – Some concerns over possible damage to Listed structures from services provision to the new workshops. Also concerns over the removal of the two existing mooring posts in the harbour. Requests conditions.

Environment Agency – No objections.

Conservation Officer – Comments as follows :

- Workshop/Office units – No objections to the siting or design but some concerns over its size in relation to the lime kilns and former lifeboat house.
- Pontoons – No objection in principle as they will not affect the dock walls. Concerns over the loss of the two existing mooring posts in the dock basin.
- Lock Gates – No objections providing existing gate fittings are not affected by the new gates.
- Further comments on the above matters are expected, but recommends that subject to the satisfactory resolution of these

# Item no.

concerns, permission be granted. Listed Building Consent will be needed for some of the work. (Application now submitted).

## **Development Plan Policies**

### *District of Easington Local Plan*

ENV15 - Protection of sites of Special Scientific Interest and National Nature Reserves  
ENV22 - Preservation and Enhancement of Conservation Areas  
ENV24 - Development Affecting Listed Buildings and their Settings  
GEN01 - General Principles of Development  
S28 - North Dock area

North Dock Design Brief:

*“North Dock lies at the heart of the town, which grew up around it close to the main commercial area based on Church Street and next to the seafront promenade centred on Terrace Green. It is also at the heart of current regeneration activity in the town. A new shopping complex “Byron Place” has recently been approved on the cliff top above the Dock that will create a new public space opposite the entrance to the harbour and the former Londonderry Office, now Marquess Point, has recently been refurbished for residential use with some new build. North Dock is one of the most significant historic assets for the town and its proposed restoration and re-use as a marina and tourist destination is a key component of the regeneration strategy for Seaham.”*

*The first phase of the regeneration of the dock has been completed. It involved land acquisition and works to allow the public to parts of the North Dock that were previously denied, as well as restoration of the limekilns and viewing areas and some secondary sea defence works.*

*The project is now in its second phase. Phase 2 aims to bring the economic life back into North Dock by creating the conditions to support a marina for leisure and fishing craft. The project will provide:*

- 1. New buildings on the quayside for marine businesses and water sports centre.*
- 2. New anti-surge hydraulic lock gates and wave screen to ensure water levels are managed to enable leisure craft to use the dock*
- 3. Dredging operations to create a suitable environment for leisure craft*
- 4. pontoons within the dock to allow boats to be moored*
- 5. An improved slipway and waiting pontoon for craft to use when the dock gates are closed.*

*This work will need to be supported by new surface treatment of the dock and the provision of new harbour furniture.*

*The third phase of the scheme aims to fully develop the economic and cultural potential of the North Dock and North Pier by creating a heritage-based tourist attraction whilst also further developing the marine activities”.*

# Item no.

## Comment

The proposals relate to the provision within the North Dock area of Seaham of

- 509 square metres of workshops and offices with public toilets and Managers Office,
- Improved slipway and waiting pontoon,
- Provision of a lock gate,
- Provision of 56 marine berthing pontoons.

It is proposed to erect the workshop building on an existing concrete plinth on the north east side of the dock. It will be two storeys high, externally finished in render and timber cladding. There are to be 12 units of accommodation.

The design of the new building is considered to be contemporary but with visual associations with the dock included within the design. Photo montages of the building indicate that whilst it will be some 9 metres high and 35 metres long, it will not have a dominating affect on nearby existing buildings and structures.

The external materials of render and timber including the slate roof are considered to be acceptable in the context of the dock area and its original buildings.

The new slipway will consist of a re grading of the existing concrete structure to a shallower level to enable easier use of the facility.

The Pontoons are to be free standing timber platforms located within the main dock, and not directly attached to the Listed Dock Walls except for one point. They will be moored to posts sunk into the dock floor. There are concerns relating to the loss of the existing mooring posts and this issue will be taken up with the applicants.

The lock gate details are considered to be in sympathy with the character of the remaining dock area however, concerns remain relating to their location within the recess of the former gates, and these issues will be raised with the applicants.

In summary the proposals are considered to accord with Policies and will positively enhance the attractiveness and vitality of the North Dock area and assist in the regeneration of this particular part of Seaham.

This application has been submitted after substantial consultation with relevant third parties such as the Highway Authority, Regeneration and Planning/Conservation Officers and as such it is considered to be acceptable overall except for the outstanding issues referred to above and summarised as follows:

- The loss of the existing Listed Mooring Posts,
- The precise location of the new lock gates
- Confirmation that the scale of the new building is acceptable to the Conservation Officer.



# Item no.

**Recommend:** That the development be approved subject to the resolution of the outstanding issues referred to above and subject to the following conditions: External materials, revised plans if any, archaeological conditions.

**Reason for recommendation:**

The proposed development complies with the relevant Development Plan policies referred to above and the North Dock Design Brief.

**Decision time** 9 weeks – target not achieved due to full details not being supplied in time for an earlier decision.

## PLAN/2007/0014

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

### Planning History

No recent planning history on this site.

### Consultations

A site notice has been posted and local residents consulted. A letter of objection has been received supported by ten Weymouth Drive signatories and nine members of the Deneside Allotment Association. The following issues have been raised :

- The existing pathway is misused by local youths who regularly conduct anti social behaviour in the area such as drinking alcohol, drug taking, intimidation of local residents and motorcycle riding along the path.
- Improving access to the area will encourage the above behaviour to increase, resulting in a further deterioration in the amenities of local residents.
- Cycle barrier should be located at the ends of the footpath to avoid people congregating in an isolated position.

Dalton le Dale Parish Council – Support the concerns expressed by the local residents and are also concerned about the loss of wildlife habitat that the existing allotment site currently provides.

County Highway Authority – No objections.

### Development Plan Policies

#### *District of Easington Local Plan*

GEN01 - General Principles of Development  
REC90 - Protection and provision of outdoor sports facilities  
REC92 - Protection of amenity open space

# Item no.

S20 - Small landscaping scheme  
S25 - Safeguarding open space/play areas  
TAC47 - Footpaths and other public rights of way

## **Comment**

This application was considered by Members at the last Meeting where it was deferred to enable the applicants to consider a revised scheme in association with local residents and the police with a view to limiting the likelihood of anti social behaviour being increased as a result of the development.

The applicants were informed of this decision, however they wish the current scheme to be reconsidered by Members, and they hope to attend the Meeting with the Police and the County Footpaths Officer with a view to supporting their application.

The site comprises of an overgrown former allotment site and access pathway between Graham Way and Deneside adjacent the open grassed area on Graham Way, Seaham.

Housing lies to the east and west and active allotments lie to the north; cleared residential land, earmarked for redevelopment lies to the northwest.

It is proposed to clear and grass the derelict area and improve the footpath links in and around the site. The existing connecting footpath will be widened to 1.8 metres and surfaced with a grey aggregate; improved barriers will be installed to deter vehicular access. Trees and mounding of the grassed area will also be carried out.

The applicants state that approaches were made to them by local residents to improve the disused allotment area to discourage anti social behaviour, and to amalgamate the area into the existing open space alongside Graham Way. This is clearly at odds with the comments received from local residents to this planning application.

The consideration of anti social behaviour is a material planning consideration, for example opening a hot food takeaway near to dwellings may often result in people congregating nearby and causing disturbance to residents.

This proposal is intended to reduce such problems by improving the local environment by making it more accessible to the general public and therefore unattractive to people undertaking anti social behaviour. In addition the proposed works will result in a visually improved environment compared to the existing situation.

On balance therefore it is considered that the proposed works will be likely to have the effect of discouraging anti social behaviour and will positively enhance the character of the area by introducing a landscaped area and improving the footpath network in the locality.

**Recommend:** Approval

# Item no.

## **Reason for recommendation:**

The proposed development is in accordance with the Statutory Development Plan, in particular Policies 1 and 35 of the District of Easington Local Plan, and there are no material considerations which outweigh the support for the proposals.

**Decision time:** 10 weeks – Target not achieved due to deferral for further consideration.

## **PLAN/2007/0026**

**THORNLEY (THORNLEY & WHEATLEY HILL) – Residential Development at Crossways Hotel and Land Adjacent Dunelm Road, Thornley for Mr. J.E. Hudson.**

### **Planning History**

None relevant.

### **Consultations**

The application has been advertised in the local press and by a site notice. Neighbouring properties have been consulted. Two letters of representation have been received in relation to this application. One letter has been received supporting the application on the following grounds:

- The proposed development will help to regenerate Thornley by enticing new families to live in Thornley. The new families will help to support local services such as shops and schools.
- The site to which the application relates is becoming an eyesore; visitors to Thornley are not getting the right impression. The proposed development is a real opportunity to improve the village.
- 

One letter of objection was received containing 7 No. individual signatures. Objections have been raised on the following grounds:

- Crossways Hotel is one of the oldest buildings in Thornley and has historic importance as being the site of the first “Miners Gala”.
- There is no need to build on the greenfield at the edge of the village; there are brown field sites within the village that would be more suitable for development. This application could set a precedent for other development on greenfield land around the village.
- The loss of Crossways will have a negative effect on jobs and tourism in the locality. Crossways is the only Hotel in the locality and is considered to be an asset to the village. Crossways Hotel employs approximately 15 people.
- There is an existing problem with traffic adjacent to the Crossways Hotel; the proposed residential development will exacerbate the existing difficulties at the junction between the B1279 and the A181.

# Item no.

Easington District Council, Planning Policy Officer, comments:

- The application site is situated outside the settlement boundary of Thornley and is considered to represent development in the countryside. The site is not allocated for housing in the Local Plan and is consequently a windfall site. National, County and Local Plan policies aim to approve housing development on previously developed sites within towns and villages; as the application site falls outside the village of Thornley and includes an area of “greenfield” the proposal is considered to be contrary to the relevant national and local plan policies.
- The Draft Regional Spatial Strategy limits the number of dwellings that should be provided in the District to 175 per year until 2021. If the Council is to continue its regeneration programmes and achieve its vision, it needs to use this limited allocation where it will best meet the needs and demands of the whole District. Allowing this current proposal will detract from this objective as the Council will not have sufficient housing provision to meet planned regeneration requirements.
- The proposed development of this site is contrary to the policies outlined above and the arguments presented in the supporting statement do not justify a departure from the Local Plan policies. It is therefore recommended that this application be refused.

Easington District Council, Countryside Officer, comments:

- No objection to this proposal from an ecological point of view. The application site is considered to be a low risk to bats, however, it is recommended that any demolition is undertaken outside the bat hibernation season, November to April, and that building roofing materials are carefully removed in case bats are found.

Easington District Council, Environmental Health Officer, comments:

- Contaminated land and noise risk assessments should be carried out.

Durham County Council, Planning policy, comments:

- The proposed development would conflict with the Durham County Structure Plan Policy 9 because of its location in the countryside outside the settlement boundary.

Durham County Council, Highways Authority, comments:

- No highway objection is raised. The proposed access and visibility splays are considered to be acceptable.

East Durham Business Service, comments:

- Consultation has taken place with the Economic Development Team and I can therefore say that EDBS does not have a view on the above development.
- EDBS are currently conducting a business review of the Crossways Hotel at the owners request. The report to be produced as part of this review is not currently available.

Northumbrian Water, comments:

- Standard comments relating to connections and sewerage requirements.

# Item no.

## **Development Plan Policies**

### ***Durham County Structure Plan***

CSP01 - General Principles for Development  
CSP03 - Development within main towns  
CSP09 - Strategic Locations for New Housing

### **District of Easington Local Plan**

ENV03 - Protection of the Countryside  
ENV31 - Urban Fringe Improvements  
GEN01 - General Principles of Development  
HOU66 - Provision of outdoor play space in new housing development  
HOU67 - Windfall housing sites  
HOU68 - Housing development in the countryside  
HOU69 - Rural workers dwellings  
HOU70 - Re-use and adaptation of buildings in the countryside for residential use

## **Comment**

The proposal is for Outline Planning Permission for the erection of a residential development. This application deals purely with the principle of development on this site. The layout of site, scale of buildings, appearance of buildings, access to site, and landscaping of site are reserved and would be subject to a subsequent application if planning permission were to be granted.

The proposal is for outline permission for the erection of a residential development on a 1.1-hectare site to the south of Dunelm Road adjacent to Thornley. The application site consists of the Crossways Hotel and associated grounds and an area of grassland. The application site is bounded to the northwest by Dunelm Road, to the southwest by the A181, the northeast by residential properties at the edge of Thornley Village, and to the southeast by the Heritage Trail, a public footpath.

## **The Applicants' Supporting Statement**

The applicant has submitted a statement with the application in support of the proposed residential development. He has stated that by allowing the development of the site the uncertainty over its future would be removed; and that the proposed development would contribute to the regeneration and sustainability of Thornley.

The supporting information submitted by the applicant claims that the hotel is not financially viable. Information has also been provided from estate agents who have actively marketed the property as a hotel over the last few years; the hotel site has been offered for sale unsuccessfully on the open market. It is argued that the hotel's size, position and facilities make it unattractive to hotel developers and that it offers little, if any contribution to the tourism strategy of the District.

Within the supporting statement the applicant has provided information to show that the conversion of the existing hotel buildings to form residential units has been investigated and subsequently rejected as not representing an economically viable option.

# Item no.

The applicant has argued that the application site lies within a prominent location adjacent to one of the main routes into Thornley and that it represents a “gateway” site the development of which would benefit Thornley as a whole. The application site, is situated adjacent to the existing settlement boundary and would be accessible by foot from Thornley; due to its location next to the A181 it is argued that the site represents a sustainable location in terms of public transport.

The applicant has outlined the need for a capital contribution towards a community/sports facility in the village, which was raised at a local meeting regarding the proposal. He has stated that a legal agreement could be attached to any grant of planning permission to link the provision of funds for the community facility with the development of the Crossways Hotel site.

In conclusion the applicant has stated that the proposal will improve the regeneration and sustainability of Thornley by offering attractive homes; which in turn would bring new families to the village to maintain the essential services of transport, school, shops and library and encourage more services to locate in Thornley.

## **Planning Considerations**

The site of the proposed development is located to the south west of Thornley outside the settlement boundary as defined in the District of Easington Local Plan. The Councils policies therefore identify this proposal as being residential development in the countryside. The site is not identified as a potential housing site in the Local Plan and is consequently a windfall site. Therefore the Draft Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) and Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing and Planning Policy Statement 7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas are considered relevant in this case.

### National Planning Policy

Planning Policy Statement 7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas (PPS7) is the national planning guidance relating to development in the countryside. PPS7 states that Local Planning authorities should strictly control new house building in the countryside, outside established settlements or areas allocated for housing in development plans. It continues by making it clear that new houses in the countryside will require special justification for planning permission to be granted. Special justification could for example relate to the essential need for a worker to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside, or to the exceptional quality and innovative nature of the design of a proposed dwelling. The proposal is not considered to accord with the advice contained within Planning Policy Statement 7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas as a possible exception to policy.

Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing (PPS3) is the national planning guidance relating to housing development. Government policy in PPS3 is to maximise the re-use of previously developed land, and requires a sequential approach to the identification of housing sites, which prioritises previously developed land in urban areas. As the proposal relates to a partly “greenfield” site outside the settlement limits as outlined in the Local Plan it is not considered to accord with the advice contained within Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing.

# Item no.

## County Durham Structure Plan

County Durham Structure Plan Policy No.9 deals with the locational criteria relating to new housing, it requires that the principal locations for new housing should be well related to the main towns. Furthermore, County Durham Structure Plan policy No.14 deals with Housing in the Countryside and states “new housing development should be allowed in the open countryside only where there is an essential full time agricultural or forestry employment justification”. The applicant has provided no justification for the proposed development. Durham County Council have objected to the application on the grounds that the proposed development would conflict with Structure Plan Policy No. 9 because of its location outside a town or village.

## District of Easington Local Plan

The District Council considers that housing development should normally only be approved on sites within the towns and villages of the District. There are a number of reasons for this: firstly, new development within the settlements helps to maintain the compact and coherent village form, which is most appropriate for the support of shops and facilities. Thornley has seen a fall in its population in recent years as unsuitable/low demand housing has been cleared, for example: Thornlaw North; Thornlaw South; and Coopers Close. All of these sites are within the village boundary and their redevelopment would maintain the compact and coherent village form as well as sustain the village's population and local businesses. Redevelopment of these “Brownfield” sites takes priority over sites which are outside the village boundary, such as the current proposal. Indeed, development of sites outside of the settlement boundary can undermine the regeneration of the village as a whole.

Policy 67 of the Local Plan states that housing development will be approved on previously development sites within settlement boundaries of established towns and villages. The application site is situated outside the village of Thornley as outlined in the Local Plan. It is accepted that part of the application site, specifically the existing hotel and associated gardens and parking area, can be considered to be previously developed land under the definitions contained within PPS3. However, the majority of the site including the fields which surround the hotel, are clearly “greenfield”; and are currently used for the grazing of horses. On this basis the application site cannot be considered to be previously developed or “Brownfield”, and the proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to policy 67 of the local plan.

Local Plan Policies 3 and 68 severely restrict development, in the countryside. Policy 3 deals with development in the countryside in general and states that it will not be approved. Policy 68 deals with Housing in the Countryside. It states, “other than provided for in policies 60 (re-use of dwellings in the countryside), 69 (rural workers dwellings) and 70 (re-use and adaption of buildings in the countryside for residential use) housing development in the countryside will not be approved. This proposal would represent new-build in the countryside and does not include the conversion of any existing structure; furthermore, the applicant in relation to this proposal has identified no agricultural need. It is therefore considered that the proposal is contrary to the relevant development plan policies.

## Regional Spatial Strategy and the Easington Development Framework

The Easington Development Framework is currently being prepared and will replace the Local Plan. The Development Framework will aim to plan the location of new housing developments to meet the needs of Easington's

# Item no.

residents. The evidence available identifies the need to provide a better mix of housing that is affordable and at an appropriate density, in sustainable locations, as well as provide for those with special needs.

As outlined previously in relation to windfall housing development, planning policy permits the redevelopment of “Brownfield” sites for housing where they are within existing settlement boundaries. This has led to a high number of permissions given for windfall housing across the whole of the District, and whilst the vast majority of development has been on “Brownfield” land, the scale of this development puts at risk the councils ability to achieve the aims of the Easington Development Framework. In 2004/05 nearly half of all permissions for housing were unplanned. The Draft Regional Spatial Strategy limits the number of dwellings that should be provided in the District to 175 per year until 2021. If the Council is to continue with its regeneration programmes and achieve its vision, it needs to use this limited allocation where it will best meet the needs and demands of the whole District, this includes the brownfield land within Thornley. Allowing the currently proposed development will detract from this objective, and reduce the Council’s capacity to achieve planned regeneration requirements and priorities.

PPS3 states that local planning authorities should set out in Local Development Documents their policies and strategies for delivering the level of housing provision, including identifying broad locations and specific sites that will enable continuous delivery of housing, for at least 15 years from the date of adoption, taking account of the level of housing provision set out in the RSS. As mentioned above the Council has a number of sites coming forward as part of regeneration programmes, which will meet the RSS allocation. Coopers Close, Hartlepool Street and Thornlaw South being examples of areas within the settlement boundary of Thornley that are in need of regeneration. It is therefore concluded that this proposal will undermine the Council’s ability to regenerate the District as a whole and Thornley in particular.

## Responses to the Applicants submission

The arguments put forward by the applicant in support of this proposal are not considered sufficient to outweigh the policy objections outlined previously.

The viability of the existing business is obviously a concern for the applicant, however, in this instance the questions over the future of the site are not sufficient to allow the development of a predominantly “greenfield site” outside the established settlement boundary. If the existing structure were to become disused and fall into a state of disrepair planning policy would allow for the conversion of the existing structure, although the development of the entire site as currently proposed would still be opposed by the Local Planning Authority.

The applicant’s view that the application relates to a “gateway” site is also questioned. Whilst the Crossways Hotel occupies a prominent position adjacent to one of the main accesses to Thornley, residential development would not of itself represent a gateway feature. Furthermore, as stated previously it is the Local Planning Authority’s view that the development of the Crossways site would undermine the Council’s ability to regenerate more appropriate sites within Thornley.

The suggestion that the provision of funding for a community/sports facility within Thornley could be linked to any grant of planning permission by way of a Section 106 Legal Agreement would only need to be discussed by Members if



# Item no.

they were minded to approve outline planning permission. Such an offer by the applicant does not make the development acceptable.

## Other Considerations

Whilst East Durham Business Service have confirmed that they have no comments to make in relation to this application, they have confirmed that they are currently working with the applicant in completing a business review to assess the viability of retaining the hotel as an operating business; the findings of this are not available at the time of preparing this report.

The Highways Authority has been consulted in relation to this application; no highway objections are raised to the proposal.

Easington District Council, Environmental Health Officers, have suggested that contaminated land and noise risk assessments should be a condition of any grant of planning application.

## **Conclusion**

The proposed development of residential properties on the application site clearly contravenes relevant national, regional, County and District Council policies and in principle planning permission should be refused.

The applicant has submitted information to show that the existing hotel is not a viable business but this does not outweigh the fundamental objection to the development of an inappropriate site.

The applicant states that redevelopment will have regeneration benefits for Thornley and end the uncertainty over the future of the hotel site. However, the arguments put forward by the applicant are not considered sufficient to outweigh the strict policy objections to the proposal.

The Councils policy is to prioritise the development of previously developed land within existing settlements for residential development. The current proposal relates to an application outside the established settlement boundaries on a predominantly “Greenfield” site, and therefore should not be supported. Indeed the proposed development of this site could prejudice the development of more appropriate sites on previously developed land within the settlement of Thornley, which are vital to the regeneration of the village.

## **Recommend:**

Refusal for the following reasons:

The proposal represents 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.

## **Decision time:**

10 weeks. 13 week target achieved.

# Item no.

## **PLAN/2007/0045**

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

This application is brought before Panel as the applicant is related to a Member of this Council.

#### **Planning History**

04/560: Community gardens and associated meeting building – Approved 09/04 for temporary period.

06/50: Community gardens and associated meeting building (renewal) – Approved 04/06 (for temporary period of 3 years).

06/94: Toilet block – Approved 04/06

#### **Consultations**

Parish Council: No response other than to enquire as to whether any objections had been received.

DCC Highways: No objections but alternative footpath line suggested, whereby the pathway would link to the rear of adjacent parking spaces rather than to the front.

Northumbrian Water: Cautionary advice relating to a sewer and mains in the vicinity of the site.

EDC Environmental Health: No comments.

EDC Asset & Property Management: Discussions still proceeding on terms relating to the use of the land.

Neighbours: No response.

Press/Site Notices: No response.

#### **Development Plan Policies**

##### *District of Easington Local Plan*

ENV03 - Protection of the Countryside

ENV31 - Urban Fringe Improvements

ENV32 - Community Woodlands

ENV35 - Environmental Design: Impact of Development

GEN01 - General Principles of Development

REC86 - Countryside recreation

#### **Comment**

This application relates to a further development of the Sandhills Project for Youth Recreation and Leisure (SPYRAL) community garden activities on a former allotment site to the north of Murton, just outside the settlement boundary.

# Item no.

The proposal involves the erection of a 3m x 6m timber building for use as a classroom to teach children and disabled people horticultural techniques and animal husbandry. It also proposes the construction of footpath links to the site from existing public footways in the adjacent housing area, the pathways being across an area of open space where it is considered that no adverse effects would be caused to local residents.

The development is in accordance with Local Plan policies but the footpaths are proposed across Council-owned land and agreement has not yet been reached over the detailing of the paths. While this aspect is not in itself a material consideration in the determination of the application, the Highway Authority has suggested that an alternative footpath arrangement would be a safer option; also, Northumbrian Water have advised that underground apparatus, which must not be built over, exists in the vicinity of both the paths and the building. Taking these three matters together and on the basis that the proposal appears acceptable in principle, it is considered to be expedient to grant permission for the development but to condition the permission in such a way as to require final details of the location of the paths and the position of the building to be agreed before the development is commenced. This would allow all the matters to be resolved fully while still ensuring that the application is determined within the statutory period. It is not considered that the repositioning of the building and footpaths would have any adverse implications for adjacent or nearby residents.

Consultations and discussions relating to these unresolved matters are continuing at the time of preparation of this report and any information on any progress made before the Panel meeting will be presented verbally.

**Recommend:** Approval subject to the following conditions: Location of building, location of footpaths.

## **Reason for recommendation**

The proposal is considered to be in accordance with the Statutory Development Plan and the following related policies; 1, 3, 31, 32, 35 and 86 of the District of Easington Local Plan.

**Decision time** 8 weeks (target achieved)

## **PLAN/2007/0049**

**SEAHAM (SEAHAM HARBOUR) – 15M Monopole and Associated Equipment at George Street Garage, Seaham for O<sub>2</sub> (UK) Ltd.**

### **Planning History**

None relevant.

### **Consultations**

The application has been advertised by a site notice and neighbouring properties have been consulted. Four letters of representation have been received; objections have been made on the following grounds:

# Item no.

- The proposed telecommunications mast would have a detrimental effect on the value of adjacent residential properties.
- The proposed telecommunications mast would have a detrimental effect on the character of an area of land currently being considered for conservation area designation.
- The proposed mast would be a blight on the landscape to the detriment of the recent regeneration of the town.
- Although the evidence that telecommunication masts have harmful effects on health is inconclusive, where there is doubt, it is felt that a precautionary approach should be taken and such masts should not be sited adjacent to residences.
- The need for the mast in this location has been questioned; it is suggested that there are other more suitable sites.

Durham County Council, Highways Authority, comments:

- The proposed installation is set back from the public highway within a fenced off compound area and is therefore acceptable from a highway point of view.

Seaham Town Council, comments:

- It is the Town Council's view that the erection of a mast of such size will be obtrusive in that location and will be capable of being seen for considerable distances by occupiers of residential dwellings.
- The Town Council are of the view that the applicant should look into sharing one of the other existing telecommunications masts in the locality with another provider rather than erecting a new one.
- Seaham Town Council is concerned regarding the health risk to residents from telecommunications masts. The Town Council feel that the District Council should take a precautionary approach and reject telecommunication mast on sites close to residential properties.

## **Development Plan Policies**

### ***District of Easington Local Plan***

GEN01 - General Principles of Development

ENV35 - Environmental Design: Impact of Development

IND54 - Existing Small Industrial Estates

TAC82 - Control of large telecommunications developments

## **Comment**

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a 15m high Alifabs monopole and the installation of associated base station equipment on land at St George's Garage in Seaham. The mast is to be 15m in height giving a total height for the installation including the antennas of 17.5m. The associated equipment cabinet is to be sited adjacent to the base of the mast; the entire installation is to be set on a concrete base and enclosed by a two-metre high steel mesh fence. Due to the existing planting and boundary treatments the base of the mast and associated equipment cabinet will be unseen from the public highway. The site to which the application relates is raised compared with the adjacent street level.

# Item no.

The proposed mast is to be sited on the southern side of Herbert Terrace to the east of Seaham town centre. The application site is raised from the road, being sited adjacent to the railway line to the southwest. The application site is situated within an existing small industrial estate. The application specifically relates to an area of land at the southeastern end of the Industrial Estate. The site is bounded to the southwest by the Railway line across which lie residential properties on Grants Crescent; to the northwest lies George Street Garage within the curtilage of which the mast is to be erected; residential properties situated on Herbert Terrace and Adolphus Street face the application site from the east and northeast.

In support of their clients proposal the agent has submitted the following statement:-

*There is a need by the operator to introduce network services to this locality. The proposed development will address this identified need in line with the operators license requirements and customer demands.*

*In accordance with PPG8 an assessment of the site has been undertaken and discussions were held with the Local Planning Authority. The site that has been identified is the most appropriate location and meets the required criteria for this cell.*

*The telecommunications infrastructure proposed as part of this application has been designed and sited, having regard to technical, engineering and land use planning considerations, in order to minimise its impact on the local environment. Accordingly the proposed development is considered to conform with national and local planning policies guidance.*

They have confirmed that these telecommunications proposals are designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency (RF) public exposure guidelines on the International Commission on Non-Ionising Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) as expressed in EU Council recommendation of 12 July 1999 "on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields. Standards have been set by the ICNIRP to ensure that the telecommunications equipment operates at low power levels.

Central Government's general policy on telecommunications is contained within Planning PPG8 'Telecommunications' (August 2001) and seeks to facilitate the growth of new and existing systems.

Local Planning Authorities are advised by PPG8 not to question the need for the services which a proposed development is to provide and are encouraged to respond positively to telecommunications development proposals, especially where the proposed location is constrained by technical considerations, while taking account of the advice on the protection of urban and rural areas in other planning policy guidance notes.

The Government encourages mast and site sharing where appropriate. Operators are required to provide evidence to suggest to Local Planning Authorities that they have carefully considered the use of existing masts, buildings and other structures before seeking to erect any new mast, regardless of size.

In seeking to arrive at the best solution for an individual site, authorities and operators are encouraged to use sympathetic design and camouflage to minimise the impact of the development on the environment in terms not only of masts and structures but also materials and colouring.

# Item no.

In response to growing concerns from the general public the Government commissioned the 'Independent Expert Group on Mobile Phones' to examine the impact of telecommunications apparatus on health. Sir William Stewart chaired the Commission and the report was published in May 2000.

The Stewart Report encouraged mast sharing and recommended that as a precautionary approach the International Commission on Non Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines for public exposure be adopted for use in the UK rather than the National Radiological Protection Board (NRPB) guidelines.

In respect of base stations the Stewart Report concluded that "the balance of evidence indicates that there is no general risk to the health of people living near to base stations on the basis that exposures are expected to be small fractions of the guidelines. However, there can be indirect adverse effects on their well-being in some cases".

The Group recommended a precautionary approach comprising a series of specific measures to the use of mobile phone technologies until we have more detailed and scientifically robust information on any health effects.

For example PPG8 'Telecommunications' states:-

*Health considerations and public concern can in principle be material considerations in determining applications for planning permission and prior approval. Whether such matters are material in a particular case is ultimately a matter for the courts. It is for the decision-maker (usually the Local Planning Authority) to determine what weight to attach to such considerations in any particular case.*

*However, it is the Government's firm view that the planning system is not the place for determining health safeguards. It remains central Government's responsibility to decide what measures are necessary to protect public health. In the Government's view, if a proposed mobile phone base station meets the ICNIRP guidelines for public exposure it should not be necessary for a Local Planning Authority, in processing an application for planning permission or prior approval, to consider further the health aspects and concerns about them.*

*The Government's acceptance of the precautionary approach recommended by the Stewart Group's report "mobile phones and health" is limited to the specific recommendations in the Group's report and the Government's response to them. The report does not provide any basis for precautionary actions beyond those already proposed. In the Government's view, Local Planning Authorities should not implement their own precautionary policies e.g. by way of imposing a ban or moratorium on new telecommunications development or insisting on minimum distances between new telecommunication development and existing development.*

It should be noted that the High Court has recently overturned several appeal decisions where telecommunications development was refused due to the perception of fear against the health and well-being of the resident population. The High Court in allowing the development made clear that so long as the development is undertaken in accordance with the ICNIRP standards then it should not be necessary for a Local Planning Authority in processing an application to consider the health effects further.

# Item no.

The applicants have indicated that the proposed telecommunications equipment is “designed to be in full compliance with the requirements of the radio frequency (RF) public exposure guidelines on the International Commission on Non-Ionising Radiation Protection (ICNIRP), as expressed in EU Council recommendation of 12 July 1999”.

The Town And Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) requires that Local Planning Authorities must determine applications for planning permission in accordance with the development plan in force for the area unless material planning considerations indicate otherwise.

The Council’s current policies and standards in relation to developments of this kind are included within the Easington District Local Plan. Policies 1, 35 and 82 of the Local Plan set out the material planning considerations to be taken into account when considering a proposed development of this kind.

In general council policies state that wherever possible new telecommunications equipment should be located on existing sites; where this is not possible it is stated that the significance of the proposals to the national network and the particular locational and technical requirements of the proposal will be taken into account. New sites for telecommunication developments will only be approved where they would not have a significant adverse effect on the amenity of the surrounding area, and where they would not cause significant interference with existing electrical equipment.

Four letters have been received from local residents objecting to the proposed telecommunications installation. Seaham town Council have also objected to the proposal. The main issues raised include: the impact of the development on the visual amenity of the site and immediate surrounding area; the impact of property values in the area; and its impact on the health and well-being of the resident population.

The concern and anxiety expressed by local residents in terms of the impact of the development on their health and well-being has been considered by the Local Planning Authority. However, it is felt that such concern cannot be seen as a reason in itself for refusal of planning permission given that the equipment is strictly regulated by central Government under the terms of the Telecommunications Code Systems Licence. The application site is not considered to represent a specific risk where a precautionary approach could be adopted. The Minister for Housing and Planning has recently written to all Local Planning Authorities making it clear that if a proposed development meets with the ICNIRP guidelines then it is not necessary for an authority in processing an application to consider the health effects further.

In terms of the effect the proposed telecommunication installation will have on property value in the locality, this is not considered to be a valid planning consideration when determining the application.

With regard to the concerns over the effect the proposed mast would have on the character of the area, it is accepted that the proposal would be visible from residential properties to the detriment of residential amenity.

Due to its siting on a raised prominent position it is considered that the proposed mast would represent an obtrusive and dominant feature in the street scene to the detriment of amenity for nearby residents. The siting of the

# Item no.

proposed mast on a raised area of land adjacent to the railway line will further increase the effect that the development would have on the character of the area; the proposed mast would be a dominant feature in the locality as there are no other features of comparable height. If the proposal were to be approved residential properties situated on Adolphus Street would look directly onto the proposed mast being sited less than forty metres away and seen against the skyline, which is considered to be unacceptable.

## **Conclusion**

The proposal is considered to be contrary to the relevant development plan policies as it would have a significant adverse effect on the amenity of the surrounding area.

Although the applicant has demonstrated a need for the proposed installation in this location and has investigated and subsequently discounted site sharing with an existing provider in the locality, the fact that the proposed mast will be visible directly opposite residential properties and on an elevated area of land is considered sufficient to warrant refusal of the application on residential amenity grounds in this instance.

**Recommend:** Refusal for the following reason:  
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.

**Decision time** 7 weeks. Target achieved.

## **PLAN/2007/0054**

**EASINGTON VILLAGE (EASINGTON VILLAGE & SOUTH HETTON) – 6 No. houses (Approval of Reserved Matters) at Little Thorpe Farm, Easington for G.R. Properties (NE) Ltd.**

### **Planning History**

01/420 Outline application for 36 dwellings – Withdrawn.  
05/359 Outline permission granted for residential development July 2005. Specific condition attached restricting maximum number of new dwellings to six. Tree Preservation Order authorised for existing trees in the locality and confirmation is awaited.

### **Consultations**

A site Notice was posted and local residents consulted. – At the time of drafting no responses have been received.

Highway Authority – Requests some alterations to site layout and access.



# Item no.

Tree Officer – Requires details of tree protection measures during construction.

Countryside Officer – Comments received indicate that site will not be likely to be of importance in relation to Bat roosts.

Parish Council – No comments received.

## **Development Plan Policies**

### *District of Easington Local Plan*

ENVO3 - Protection of the Countryside

ENVO6 - Strategic Gap between Easington Village and Peterlee

GEN01 - General Principles of Development

TAC47 - Footpaths and other public rights of way

ENV 35 – Design

## **Comment**

Members may recall considering an outline planning application for this site in 2005 when it was resolved to grant planning permission for residential development providing it was for no more than six dwellings, (in line with the guidance included within the Urban Capacity Study). The site is occupied by storage buildings which have been established as “brownfield” land and buildings.

At the time of the outline application there was considerable local concern that a permission would “open the floodgates” for major residential development of this site in the future, despite there being a specific condition attached to the planning permission restricting numbers to no more than six dwellings.

The current detailed application is for six detached two storey houses on the site of a number of storage buildings on the north side of Littlethorpe. The site is set back from the main road running through the village and access is to be gained via the existing long track which runs from the western edge of the village.

The proposed houses are large – 5 bedrooms – but their height is restricted to 8 metres, and together with hipped roofs, their scale does not tend to over dominate the locality. The designs reflect others prepared by the applicants, most recently at the old nursing home site at Thorpe Road Easington.

It is intended that the access to the site is to be brought up to adoptable standards and as such its visual impact will be increased in comparison with the existing unmade track. To this end it is considered important that a substantial landscaping scheme is prepared which will help assimilate the new access into this rural location. Landscaping has been identified on the application forms as a reserved matter for consideration by this Authority, however no detailed scheme has been submitted. It is anticipated that one will be available in time for the Meeting.

The Highway Authority have requested certain changes to the private driveway layout and it is expected that these details will also be available at the Meeting.

# Item no.

In summary it is considered that the development will not harm the character of Littlethorpe and complies with the requirements of the outline planning permission and the Urban Capacity Study referred to above. Providing an appropriate landscaping scheme is agreed it is considered that planning permission should be granted.

The consultation period relating to the site notice does not expire until 26 March 2007 and a decision cannot be issued until after that date.

**Recommend:** 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. Following expiry of the consultation period, and on the basis that no significant objections are received during the intervening period.

## **Reason for recommendation**

The development complies with the development plan policies referred to above and will not harm the amenities of local residents or the character of the locality.

**Decision time** 7 weeks – Target achieved.

## **PLAN/2007/0083**

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

This application is reported to the Development Control and Licensing Panel because the applicant is an employee of the Council.

## **Planning History**

73/6256, extension, approved 27.09,1973.  
87/475, double garage, approved 7.09.1987.

## **Consultations**

Neighbours notified, no representations received.  
No comments from the Parish Council

## **Development Plan Policies**

*District of Easington Local Plan*

ENV35 - Environmental Design: Impact of Development

# Item no.

GEN01 - General Principles of Development  
HOU73 - Extensions and/or alterations to dwellinghouses

## **Comment**

The proposals are essentially on the footprint of an existing single storey extension at the rear of the property with a new extension at the side towards Kings Road. The works also include pitched roofs over the altered and extended areas.

The adjoining property has been extended at the rear and the pitched roof above the living room area is likely to have a minor impact for a conservatory which adjoins the boundary between the two properties. This elevation is south facing and any impact will be marginal.

The proposed design and materials to be used are considered to be acceptable.

**Recommend:** Approval

## **Reason for recommendation**

The proposal is considered to be in accordance with the Statutory Development Plan and the following related policies; 1,35 & 73 of the District of Easington Local Plan.

**Decision time**                      6 weeks – target achieved.

## **E Background Papers**

The following background papers have been used in the compilation of this report.

Durham County Structure Plan  
District of Easington Local Plan  
Planning Policy Guidance Notes  
Planning Policy Statements  
Regional Spatial Strategy  
DETR Circulars  
Individual application forms, certificates, plans and consultation responses  
Previous Appeal Decisions



**Graeme Reed**  
Head of Planning and Building Control