

THE MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING
OF THE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL AND REGULATORY PANEL
HELD ON THURSDAY 26 APRIL 2007

Present: Councillor M Routledge (Chair)

Councillors Mrs E M Connor, J Haggan,
A J Holmes, Mrs J Maitland, M Nicholls
and R Taylor

1

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 MRS J MAITLAND DECLARED A PERSONAL AND PREJUDICIAL
INTEREST AND LEFT THE MEETING.

2006/0045 MURTON (MURTON WEST) – Proposed 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 as 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 the consultation period had not ended. He requested that delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning and Building Control Services to issue the decision on expiry of the consultation period.

RESOLVED that the application be approved subject to no adverse comments being received upon the expiry of the consultation period. Authority be given to the Head of Planning and Building Control Services to issue the decision.

COUNCILLOR MRS J MAITLAND REJOINED THE MEETING.

2007/0028 EASINGTON VILLAGE (EASINGTON VILLAGE AND SOUTH
HETTON) – Proposed Change of Use from Residential to
Dental Surgery (D1 Use) at 6 Southside, Easington Village for
Mr S Frampton ADP Company Limited

2007/0112 EASINGTON VILLAGE (EASINGTON VILLAGE AND SOUTH
HETTON) – Proposed External Alterations to Front Elevations
at 6 Southside, Easington Village for ADP Holdings Limited

2007/0028 Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control Services which recommended approval subject to conditions relating to use of

Special Meeting of the Development Control and Regulatory Panel – 26 April 2007

rear car park by staff, revised plans and details of disabled ramp.

2007/0112 Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control Services which recommended approval subject to a condition relating to the details of the disabled ramp.

The proposed development was considered to comply with the relevant policies referred to and did not harm the amenities of local residents or the part of the Easington Village Conservation Area.

The Principal Planning Services Officer explained that Members had visited the site that day and were familiar with the location and setting. Details of the disabled ramp had been received therefore a condition in this regard was no longer required.

Mr Ball, the Applicant, explained that the provision of dental care was a national issue. This site was chosen as Easington Colliery already had a dentist but Easington Village did not. The property was suitable for conversion and all concerns about the car parking and access had been resolved. He felt that this would be an asset to the community, a local facility in the heart of the village.

RESOLVED that application numbers 2007/0028, 2007/0112 be conditionally approved.

2007/0062

HAWTHORN (EASINGTON VILLAGE AND SOUTH HETTON) – Proposed Two Storey and Single Storey Rear Extensions and Side Conservatory (Resubmission) at Gamekeepers Cottage, Hawthorn for Mr Tsang

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control Services which recommended approval subject to conditions relating to finishing materials, details of all windows and doors, full details of earthworks showing existing levels, proposed grading and mounding of land areas, relationship of proposed excavation to rear of garden curtilage to minimise the impact on natural character of adjacent North Dene and surrounding landform. The proposals were considered to be in accordance with relevant Development Plan policies in particular Policies 1, 35 and 73 of the District of Easington Local Plan and there were no material planning considerations which outweighed the support for the application.

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

RESOLVED that the application be conditionally approved.

2007/0097

SOUTH HETTON (EASINGTON VILLAGE AND SOUTH HETTON) – Proposed Residential Development Comprising of 16 Dwellings at Land at Windermere Road, South Hetton for Mr E Alder, Gladedale (Sunderland) Limited

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control Services which recommended that the panel be minded to grant planning permission subject to the satisfactory completion of a Section 106 Agreement relating to the financing of the provision or enhancement of off site children's recreation facilities. Conditions relating to external materials, landscaping, restriction of means of enclosure, permitted development rights, contaminated land risk assessment. Authority to determine the application at the end of the consultation period be delegated to the Head of Planning and Building Control Services as long as no significant objections had been received.

The Principal Planning Services Officer explained that Mr Alder from Gladedale had been unable to attend that evening and had requested that a statement be read out.

“On behalf of Gladedale (Sunderland) Limited, he would like to thank the committee for their time and understanding of the application and their ethos to provide low cost family homes for local people. They were pleased to have overcome the issues by working alongside the District of Easington and were delighted to hear this proposal was now recommended for approval. The amendments to the design had resulted in a loss of nearly 300 square feet of developable area. However, the Council's estates division had eventually accepted a slightly reduced capital receipt and they were still prepared to proceed with the development as quickly as possible. He looked forward to continuing their investment in the regeneration of South Hetton village following approval of the scheme”.

A Member queried if the concerns about the main drain had been resolved. The Principal Planning Services Officer explained that the developers would now move the main drain which would make for a better development.

RESOLVED that:-

- (i) the application be granted subject to satisfactory completion of a Section 106 Agreement;
- (ii) delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning and Building Control Services to issue the decision, as long as no significant objections were received.

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

2007/0119

PETERLEE (PASSFIELD) – Proposed Sports Hall Extension at East Durham and Houghall Community College, Beverley Way/Burnhope Way, Peterlee for East Durham and Houghall Community College

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control Services which recommended approval subject to conditions relating to external materials to match the existing building. The proposed development conformed with the relevant planning policies referred to above and did not harm the amenities of local residents or the locality in general.

RESOLVED that the application be conditionally approved.

COUNCILLOR MRS E M CONNOR REJOINED THE MEETING.

2007/0145

TRIMDON FOUNDRY (WINGATE) – Proposed 10 No Houses at Land East of Cinnamon Drive, Trimdon for G Wimpey (North Yorkshire) Limited

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control Services which recommended refusal as the application site contained no substantial evidence of it being previously developed and currently had the appearance of a paddock/agricultural land and was considered to be a greenfield site. Policy 67 of the District of Easington Local Plan only supported housing development on previously developed land. It was considered that should the application site be developed contrary to policy, then the local authority housing provision targets would be jeopardised and a precedent would be set for other similar applications to be submitted within the district which would be difficult to resist. In view of this, the proposed development was considered to be contrary to Policies 1 and 67 of the District of Easington Local Plan.

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

RESOLVED that the application be refused.