

**THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE  
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL AND REGULATORY PANEL**

**HELD ON TUESDAY 27 NOVEMBER 2007**

- Present: Councillor M. Routledge (Chair)  
Councillors Mrs. M. Baird, Mrs. G. Bleasdale, R. Davison, A.J. Holmes, Mrs. A.E. Laing, R. Liddle, D. Milsom and D.J. Taylor-Gooby
- Objectors: S. Cudlip, Mrs. Wilkinson, Mr. Clark, Mr. Tarn, Mr. Duke, Mr. Haddick
- Agents/Applicants/  
Supporters Mr. & Mrs. Taylor, Mr. Reid, Miss Warburton
- Apologies: Councillors B. Bates, Mrs. E.M. Connor and C. Walker

1. **THE MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING** held on 6 November 2007 a copy of which had been circulated to each Member, were confirmed.

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

**2007/0263 SEATON WITH SLINGLEY (SEAHAM NORTH) - VARIATION OF  
CONDITION 4 ATTACHED TO PLANNING PERMISSION  
5/77/724/DM/RM01 TO REMOVE AGRICULTURAL  
OCCUPANCY RESTRICTION AT STOTFOLD BUNGALOW  
ROAD LEADING TO STOTFOLD FARM, SEATON FOR MR. A.  
BULMER**

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control Services which recommended that condition 4 of Decision Notice 5/77/724/DM/RM be removed. The proposed development was in accordance with Policies 1 and 3 of the District of Easington Local Plan.

**RESOLVED** that condition 4 of Decision Notice 5/77/724/DM/RM be removed.

**2007/0533 EASINGTON VILLAGE (EASINGTON VILLAGE AND SOUTH  
HETTON) – HOUSE AT LAND ADJACENT RECTORY FARM,  
HALL WALK, EASINGTON VILLAGE FOR MR. & MRS. T.  
McCABE**

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, sample panel to be constructed, archaeological works to be undertaken, tree protection, revised plans and contaminated

## Development Control and Regulatory Panel - 27 November 2007

land. The proposed development conformed with the planning policies referred to above.

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

Since the report was prepared, a letter of support had been received indicating that the area to the side of the property had been used as a garden for a number of years.

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

**2007/0554**

### **SEAHAM (SEAHAM NORTH) – HOUSE AND GARAGE AT LAND SOUTH OF GREEBA, STOCKTON ROAD, SEAHAM FOR MR. & MRS. D. TAYLOR**

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, contaminated land risk assessment, noise impact assessment, restriction on hours of construction work, landscaping, means of enclosure to be agreed, position of garage to be agreed and removal of permitted development rights. The proposed development was considered to constitute an acceptable departure from the Development Plan for the area together with its related policies.

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

Since the report was prepared, an objection had been received from Seaham Town Council explaining that it was a matter of opinion whether circumstances had changed. The site was no longer untidy and did not detract from the area. They were concerned that the site had increased by three times from the previous application. They felt that the Planning Authority should be consistent in decision making and this could open the floodgates for further development in the Green Belt. They felt that the report should not have made reference to an award of costs and was inappropriate.

The Principal Planning Services Officer explained that Seaham Town Council's objection contradicted and offered a different view to that of Officers. Officers had recommended approval on this site because of a particular set of circumstances and had taken account of case law and an award of costs was felt to be relevant. It was Officers obligation to advise Members as such. The application was referred to the Government Office for the North East but was felt that there was not sufficient conflict to call it in. It was contrary to policy relating to housing development in the Green Belt and countryside but there were no significant changes since 2004.

## **Development Control and Regulatory Panel - 27 November 2007**

Stan Cudlip explained that it was Seaham Town Council's contention that things had changed at the development site. The Panel should ask themselves in what way and also whether the changes amounted to all that much. It was the view of Seaham Town Council that significant changes had occurred specifically surrounding the key issue which was responsible originally for influencing the Panel to grant outline consent.

Seaham Town Council contended that planning permission was granted because the land was untidy and unkempt and was in a poor condition. If you had seen the development site recently, you could see a remarkable change. Things had changed significantly. The changes were very weighty and important and in their opinion, amounted to a material change in planning terms. The reason for this was because no one could now suggest that the land was untidy, no longer had a poor appearance and no longer was detrimental to the surrounding countryside. That set of previous circumstances had changed altogether.

There had been a noteworthy and meaningful change in the size of the plot. It was now three times bigger than the original one. Seaham Town Council contended that the increase in size was an important change and also amounted, in planning law, to a material one. They felt that the two changes were not minor issues. The original decision was heavily influenced by the untidiness of the site and the wish of the Planning Authority to see it cleaned up. These circumstances no longer applied. The site was tidy and fit into the countryside. The development plot was also now three times bigger than the original application. Surely, those two sets of circumstances amounted to material changes.

The report acknowledged the fact that it was at least an inappropriate, or indeed, a wrongful decision by the Planning Authority to grant outline planning consent but the recommendation now suggested that as Members of the Panel they should now effectively compound and reaffirm what was always a wrongful decision by the Authority.

The site was in an area designated as Green Belt. If the development was allowed to happen, he queried how an avalanche of similar applications could be stopped. All anyone would need to do was to deliberately spread a bit of rubbish around and keep a plot untidy for some time. They could then come before the Panel and argue on precedent grounds that the development should be approved.

In addition, if a flood of applications occurred, the Town Council was genuinely worried that Seaham's segregation or coalescence from the conurbation of Sunderland could be adversely affected and they would not want that to happen under any circumstances.

## Development Control and Regulatory Panel - 27 November 2007

The Town Council believed that it was irregular to be referring to a possible award of costs within the report. They believed that it unduly influenced and weighed upon the deliberations of the Panel and felt that such statements should be avoided in the future.

Mrs. Wilkinson explained that everyone agreed that the decision made in 2004 was not in accordance with the laws governing Green Belt. This development not only affected the people who lived in the ward but the whole of the community. Ten years ago, Members of the Community supported having a Green Belt. This was now being attacked and the people of Seaham did not know about it. She explained that she had done a straw pole of ordinary people of different age groups. To begin with, people did not know, 20% did not care and the older generation supported the Green Belt. The biggest supporters were mothers with children in push chairs. She felt that Seaham was getting full as it was and that they had failed the community.

The District Council played down the fact that there was a danger of future development. What would happen to the farmer who had the next plot of land. Mrs. Wilkinson explained that her association felt strongly about it and had forwarded papers onto the Planning Ombudsman to see how she regarded the whole process.

Mr. Clark explained that he was representing Seaham Environmental Association and no member of the association had any personal knowledge of the applicant and the opposition was based on non-personal reasons.

Mr. Clark explained that the site was within the Green Belt and it separated Seaham from Ryhope which at one time was part of Durham but now part of Sunderland. If the Green Belt disappeared it was inevitable that Seaham would be gobbled up by Sunderland. The rural land to the north of Byrons Walk was greatly prized by the people of Seaham and he queried if the people of Seaham had been consulted. He felt that a break into the Green Belt would spark another application with much bigger issues than building one house.

Mr. Taylor, the applicant, explained that the site was now tidy as he had hired a JCB to tidy it up after planning permission had been granted. He had been made redundant so therefore did not commence the building of the house. When he applied for planning permission for the stables, he had researched the history of the site and found that there were foundations from previous buildings of a bus depot. The plot had not increased by three times, he had just straightened a triangular piece of land to be square. When the original application was approved in 2004, all residents in the cul-de-sac had supported them, as well as Mr. & Mrs. Rochester who lived adjacent to the site.

## Development Control and Regulatory Panel - 27 November 2007

Mrs. Taylor explained that the plot had not increased in size and they had kept within the boundary lines. She had approached the Church Commissioners to buy some land to make the garden area larger for her children. The size of the land had increased but not the actual house. She added that this was her dream home and had been working towards it since 2004 and felt like it was now being snatched away from her.

The Principal Planning Services Officer explained that the house itself was on the original plot and only the garden area had increased. Officers had provided advice to Members and tried to resist any development in the countryside but this was a particular set of circumstances. The application had been accepted by Members who were minded to approve it and had been forwarded to the Secretary of State who had referred it back for the Council to make the decision. To be consistent, he felt that Members should approve the application. Members could also refuse the application but reasons would need to be documented.

A Member queried if a condition could be attached that the garden area would only be used for garden. The Principal Planning Services Officer explained that the Council would be removing permitted development rights and attach a condition that there would be no other development on the plot of land.

A Member referred to the foundations and queried if this was classed as a brownfield site. The Principal Planning Services Officer explained that there were still strong policy considerations in the countryside as it was not within the settlement boundary. The Head of Planning and Building Control Services explained that the policy for Green Belt was different to those policies for greenfield and brownfield.

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

**2007/0671**

### **HUTTON HENRY (WINGATE) – 7 NO. TERRACED HOUSES AT LAND AT BRIDGE TERRACE, STATION TOWN FOR LIFE PROPERTY GROUP UK LIMITED**

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control Services which recommended approval subject to conditions relating to amended plans, materials, contaminated land and underground pipework diversion. The proposed development was in accordance with planning policies referred to in the report.

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

Mrs. Martindale explained that she was worried regarding the traffic at the back of her property. They already had problems accessing the back lane and felt that this development would exacerbate it. The plans showed that there was a concrete

## Development Control and Regulatory Panel - 27 November 2007

post blocking the alleyway. She explained that the alleyway was a path that was overgrown and this would be blocked.

The Principal Planning Services Officer explained that the Council did consult with Durham County Council who were aware of the increase in traffic and did support the application.

A Member queried if the path was a right of way. The Principal Planning Services Officer explained that he was unable to confirm if the path was a public right of way.

Members explained that they were minded to approve the application subject to the footpath being investigated and found not to be a public right of way.

**RESOLVED** that Members be minded to approve the application subject to the pathway not being a public right of way. Delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning and Building Control Services to issue the decision.

**2007/0690**

**EASINGTON VILLAGE (EASINGTON VILLAGE AND SOUTH HETTON) - FRONT EXTENSION AT 19 CRAIG TERRACE EASINGTON FOR D. & K. DELANOY**

The Panel decided that the following two reports would be considered together.

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.

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

**2007/0702**

**EASINGTON VILLAGE (EASINGTON VILLAGE AND SOUTH HETTON) - TWO STOREY REAR AND SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSIONS AND CONSTRUCTION OF NEW VEHICULAR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED ROAD AT INGLEWOOD, STOCKTON ROAD, EASINGTON VILLAGE FOR MR. G. REID**

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, visibility splay and retention of hedge along the northeast boundary. The proposal was considered to be in accordance with policies 1, 35 and 73 of the District of Easington Local Plan.

**2007/0703**

**EASINGTON VILLAGE (EASINGTON VILLAGE AND SOUTH HETTON) - ERECTION OF HOUSE AT INGLEWOOD STOCKTON ROAD EASINGTON VILLAGE FOR MR. G. REID**

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

## **Development Control and Regulatory Panel - 27 November 2007**

subject to conditions relating to external materials, site levels and the fenestration on the south elevation. The proposal was considered to be in accordance with Policies 1, 35 and 67 of the District of Easington Local Plan.

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

The Principal Planning Services Officer explained that some correspondence on the pre-planning advice submitted by the applicant suggested that he had been the Officer giving that advice. The pre-planning advice was not intended to suggest that the Council had made a judgement or any pre-determination of the application. Pre-planning advice was a service which the Council provided and was informal and without prejudice. The applicants' architects had confirmed that he had not been the Planning Officer giving the advice. A letter had been received from the Architect that day explaining that there was an inaccuracy on the electronic planning application for the pre-application advice. Reference should have been made to the general planning office rather than Mr. Dobie personally. It was also made clear that any advice was informal Officer advice only and that it in no way prejudiced any future decisions made by Officers or Members of the Authority. Mr. Dobie had not been personally involved in any pre-application advice on the projects.

Mr. Tarn explained that he lived in Allenholme adjacent to the application site. He had submitted a six page letter of objection. The land surrounding Inglewood was designated as brownfield and residents gardens also qualified as brownfield sites. The Government had stated that gardens were not up for grabs. Communities and Local Government stated that local authorities had enough powers to protect gardens. Inglewood was not an old property and the site should not be demolished.

There had been a number of objections from residents and the Parish Council and he felt that the Case Officer had failed to give sufficient weight to the objections. He had compiled the report before taking into consideration the objections of the Parish Council. He understood that Government targets had to be met but a simple telephone call to the Parish Council could have solved the problem. The Planning Officer had given the application the green light before taking all objections into consideration.

There had been a flurry of activity and fresh plans submitted which were not water tight. There was a main sewer between his house and the new property and he did not know how this would fit in with the houses in Stockton Road. He felt that it would be overbearing and have a detrimental effect on residents.

## Development Control and Regulatory Panel - 27 November 2007

Mr. Tarn explained that the design statement was liberal by stating that the houses would match in with scale. The building would be behind the main building line and would be prominent from various angles. He felt that the garden setting had been demolished.

Mr. Duke explained that Policy 10 had been contravened and his greatest concern was over the access road. It was stated in the report that there had been no recorded accidents but there had been many near misses. The Police were often seen carrying out speed checks on Stockton Road as the 30 mph limit was often disregarded. The entrance was a short distance from Easington Community School and another exit would exacerbate the problem especially at 8.45am, 12.00 noon and 3.00pm.

The Government Inspectors' comments and the Local Plan were very relevant. There was no demand or need for further executive housing in Easington Village. The regeneration that was taking place was in Easington Colliery and was far from complete. Executive houses had been approved on the Craigallachie and Littlethorpe sites and there was no affordable housing.

On the application form submitted, it stated that there was neighbour and community consultation. Consultation had been with the Local Planning Authority and Highway Authority and this could not be categorised as neighbour or community consultation. He added that he lived at No. 8 Stockton Road and he had not been consulted.

Mr. Haddick explained that he often heard the terminology "infill" so it was OK, but this was not the case. He explained that at the outset, there was no legal presumption that residential brownfield windfall land was necessarily suitable for approval or that the whole of the curtilage should be developed either. The comments that this was a brownfield windfall site, sat within Policy 65 of the Local Plan but this was overridden by Policy 10. This was because Policy 65 clearly stated it must not conflict with specific policies which it did i.e. Policy 10 and did so most definitely. He would also strongly argue Policy 72 regarding amenities was contravened.

The use of Policy 67 on page 20 of the Planning Officer's report was incorrect. It covered agricultural workers and the adaptation of buildings in the countryside. It did not have the wording "must not conflict with general or specific policies in the Plan" which Policy 65 did. This was a material consideration and determining factor.

Mr. Haddick was concerned that Policy 10 had been given scant regard. In Env 3.47 under the heading of protection of trees and hedgerows, it clearly stated that trees and hedgerows on or adjacent to the development, should be treated as site constraints and should be given adequate



## **Development Control and Regulatory Panel - 27 November 2007**

protection. The Council held the hedgerows in trust for the community and not for the benefit of one individual. Policy 65 had to concede to Policy 10.

Policy 10 stated that where possible, trees and hedgerows were to be preserved. They could be preserved and he did not wish to see the hedgerow broken through for another access. It contravened the policy. Policy 10 also covered the point of Tree Preservation Orders if they were threatened.

Little had also been stated in the report about the significant trees around the site and how they were to be preserved by root surveys, Tree Preservation Orders etc. A singular access was only acceptable here assuming the trees around the site were protected if any work was undertaken. Root surveys were needed and consideration for Tree Preservation Orders. By singular access, he meant the existing access only.

Trees had been removed from the grounds of Inglewood prior to the request for planning which gave him little comfort from the applicant's submission that existing boundaries were to be maintained. He noticed from the very large number of complaints from residents that this scorched earth policy had caused outrage. It continued with cutting through the hedgerow. There had been more complaints than the seven mentioned in the report and perhaps this was one of timing rather than wrong Policy number i.e. 67.

Mr. Haddick explained that he would like to know what happened to the missing hawthorn hedge on the north western boundary of Inglewood which ran along the northern boundary at the rear of the site. The missing part of the hedge was part of the boundary for the farmers field as it ran down from the A19 to the entrance to Tudor Grange. The hedgerows were protected under the Hedgerows Regulation 1997 and it was against the law to remove them without permission. The applicant, in his submission, stated that the existing boundary would remain but he would like to know what had happened to the protected part of the hedgerow.

Concern was also expressed that the eastern hedgerow where the new access was proposed, was drastically pruned without the Council's permission. There had been a loss of wildlife housed in the hedge because of this action. The applicant had sterilised the wildlife habitat that existed and allowing access to the hedge added to this further.

In planning terms, he saw the extensions at Inglewood as unnecessarily forced to the eastern boundary. There was plenty of space to the western side, thereby creating a better balance. The report argued it was not prominent of the road scene. That certainly would be upon entering Tudor Grange and this fact had been overlooked as the comments related to Stockton Road.

## Development Control and Regulatory Panel - 27 November 2007

The alterations completely altered the character of Inglewood which contravened planning principles as to keeping local distinctiveness. The alterations, in his opinion, were more about getting Inglewood to conform with the new property. The combined effect was to adversely alter the character and appearance of the area.

The new property had windows facing Mr. Tarn and he felt there should be a 13.5m spacing to ensure privacy was observed. The windows on Mr. Tarn's side elevation lead to toilets, bedroom and hall areas. He was aware of how planners deemed habitable but the Oxford concise dictionary definition of habitable, was to occupy or dwell of which both applied. His house was not derelict which would eliminate both definitions.

Mr. Haddick explained that he thought six windows in all in a side elevation was most unusual. He did not know of any property in the village that had this. It was more than most main elevations. What if the applicant changed the glass when built, a cheap option to get what he wanted. Visual intrusion and adverse amenity effect was real. Policy 72 was contravened.

Gargrave tried to obtain planning permission in its grounds but was refused, therefore, granting planning permission here, allowed a precedent. A property could easily fit on the southern side of Gargrave as long as access to the highway was granted as was requested for Inglewood now. This would further alter the street scene, adversely affecting the character and appearance of the area. Neighbourhood amenity was damaged and local distinctiveness.

There was a significant change by way of scale to the site and a 10% extra rule without planning permission was therefore of concern going forward. An example of this was a further small rear sun porch at the rear which would affect the 21 metre spacing to 12 Tudor Grange, bearing in mind there was only a 4 metre spacing excess now and there was nothing that could be done to stop it. The trees mentioned in the report did not offer a dense barrier as mentioned.

Mr. Haddick explained that damaged hedgerows with Policy 10 not adhered to, was of major concern. It clearly stated that they should be protected. Nothing was said in the report about this or preserving existing trees by root surveys or Tree Preservation Orders. A new road access where others had not been allowed was of concern and it set a precedent for further submissions. It also contravened Policy 10 despite anything the Highways might have to say in respect of the road.

Under approved Structure Plan strategies section, page 6 para. 1.32, the third major aim stated environmental issues were therefore fundamental to all the policy areas addressed in the plan. So, environmental issues had a major waiting. If

## **Development Control and Regulatory Panel - 27 November 2007**

Policy 65 which covered development within settlement boundaries stated as it did not, and must not conflict with specific policies i.e. Policy 10, then Policy 10 and environmental policy in the environment section took preference.

Mr. Haddick requested that the application be declined as a minimum under policy 10 and Env 3.47. Also the six windows in the side extension were excessive, four of which could easily be replaced with clear glass. He deemed it still to be a visual intrusion and amenity issue when coupled with the wider amenity issues.

Bill Day explained that the Parish Council considered that the existing dwelling and extensive garden was similar to a number of other dwellings spread across the village which were an integral part of the character and was symbolic of its gradual development in the 20th Century. Such properties were now interspersed with modern and traditional dwellings yet were still part of the villages unique character.

Inglewood itself was well hidden in its own secluded grounds until the recent destruction of vegetation almost totally destroying its setting. The proposal to build a large dwelling within the garden would add further to the destruction of its setting and character, effectively removing any semblance of its isolation. The proposed new dwellings mass and position would still dominate despite amendments to site levels. It would be totally out of the scale and character of the section of Stockton Road, especially the relatively modest semi detached houses to the immediate south.

The Parish Council expressed its grave concern that if consent was given, it would set a dangerous precedent which could, or indeed, would lead to similar applications and similar situations around the village, removing more character to the detriment of other residents.

In the Planning Officers report in relation to design and effect on street scene, it was stated that the existing site at Inglewood was considered to be large enough to accommodate an additional dwellinghouse. This was stating the obvious but it did not justify that the house should be built there. Why destroy a large secluded garden. Whilst the proposed dwelling was stated to have been carefully designed to accord with the design of the existing house and had a neutral effect on the adjacent house to the south of the site, Allenholme, they only relate in reality to each other as they were totally out of character at the location. Combined with the substantial proposed extension to Inglewood, they would dominate the site. The garden should be in scale with the dwelling and therefore, could only be realistically proportionate to Inglewood itself. The Parish Council urged the Panel to refuse the application for a new dwelling at Inglewood but had no objection, in principle, to the extension.

## Development Control and Regulatory Panel - 27 November 2007

Irene Warburton explained that she lived at No.1 Tudor Grange. She had been retired for 5 years and had made it her challenge to tidy up the land on the edge of Tudor Grange. She had been told that this was no man's land and was not owned by any authority. She had contacted the Council twice during the year because the trees had rotted and the hedgerows that backed onto her property were overgrown. She had written to numerous organisations and had been told that it was owned by the Church Commissioners. She had written to them and been informed that it was not Church land. She had written to the Land Registry and the Land Registry confirmed that the verge that backed onto Inglewood was unregistered land.

Miss Warburton had paid for someone to trim her trees but had received objections. The workmen employed by the applicant were a professional company and when she asked about the hedgerows and the vine that was travelling rapidly down Tudor Grange, the men had informed her that it would spread and move towards Allenholme. She had asked the men when pruning the hedges, would they prune back the hedges which overhung her property and they had informed her that the trees had rotted away.

Jim Jones from the District Council had visited her property and he had agreed that the hedge was rotten and should have been pruned. Peter Bennett from the District Council had visited the property and commended her for having the trees pruned. She had approached two Parish Councillors and asked them to take it to the Parish Council but she did not want to go to the Parish Council because Mr. Haddick lived in Tudor Grange.

Miss Warburton explained that she did not oppose the extensions and new build property at Inglewood and the property was looked after much better than in recent years.

The Principal Planning Services Officer explained that a lot of the issues raised were covered in the report. The interpretation of the site was brownfield and a residential garden and was in accordance with Policy. An objector had referred to Policy 65 and this was incorrect as Policy 67 was the relevant policy which related to windfall sites. Policy 10 related to the protection of trees and hedgerows. The trees and hedgerows at Inglewood were not protected by law. They were not Tree Preservation Orders or in a Conservation Area and did not require consent for removal. Consultation had taken place with the Landscape Officer and no adverse comments had been received. With regard to executive housing, this was not relevant and any applicant could put forward development in their own land. Some windows in the side elevation had been removed and obscure glazing would be required in other windows that could not be removed. An objector had referred to Gargrave and a previous application but he could not comment because he did not know the details. He confirmed that consultation letters on the

## Development Control and Regulatory Panel - 27 November 2007

planning application had been sent to 1, 11 and 12 Tudor Grange, Allenholme and 1 Stockton Road.

Mr. Haddick referred to the Local Plan document and explained that it was Policy 65 and not Policy 67.

The Principal Planning Services Officer explained that Mr. Haddick had a draft copy of the Local Plan and in the final version it related to Policy 67 although Policy 65 in the Draft Plan and Policy 67 in the Final Plan were exactly the same.

G. Reid, the applicant, explained that he had submitted a planning application in the prescribed form adhering to planning legislation. The planning application had been assessed by Planning Officers from the District Council and Officers from other agencies and had been recommended for approval.

A Member queried how many trees were to be removed. G. Reid explained that no trees were being removed. There had been a lot of objection and comment about the condition of his garden. He explained that when he purchased the property, the garden was half an acre of wilderness and regardless of the planning application, the garden needed to be cut back. He had conifers 12 feet high which blocked light into his rooms. He had employed a professional firm of landscape gardeners to take everything out and had done this in conjunction with the Tree Officer at the District Council.

The objectors queried Policy 10 and the protection of hedgerows. The Principal Planning Services Officer read out Policy 10 which explained that the Council could seek to protect hedges. The application had been considered and a balanced judgement had been arrived at.

The Chair explained that he was concerned with the new access road. Having lived in the village for twenty two years, one of the most significant complaints he received was regarding traffic on Stockton Road and around the school. He had major concerns that a new access road would be a safety hazard and was concerned that no formal response had been received from Durham County Council.

G. Reid explained that Alan Glenwright from Durham County Council had visited the site and made his recommendation regarding visibility splays. He added that he would provide a copy of the letter to the Planning Officers.

The Chair explained that he still had concerns and despite the Highways Engineer's comments felt that the removal of the hedge would affect the appearance of Stockton Road.

**RESOLVED** that: -

(i) 2007/0702 - that the application be conditionally approved;

**Development Control and Regulatory Panel - 27 November 2007**

(ii) 2007/0703 - that the application be conditionally approved.

**2007/0725 PETERLEE (PASSFIELD) - RESTORATION WORKS AND ALTERATIONS TO PAVILION, INCLUDING INSTALLATION OF CCTV CAMERAS, SEATING, VIEWING PLATFORM, VISITOR INFORMATION PANELS AND LANDSCAPING WORKS AT PASMORE PAVILION, OAKERSIDE DRIVE, PETERLEE FOR DISTRICT OF EASINGTON**

The Principal Planning Services Officer explained that this item had been deferred from the Agenda.

**RESOLVED** that application No. 2007/0725 be deferred.

CERTIFIED TRUE RECORD

CHAIR .....

DATE .....

JC/CB/COM/DCRP/071103  
30 November 2007