

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

HELD ON TUESDAY 29 APRIL 2008

- Present: Councillor M. Routledge (Chair)
Councillors B. Bates, Mrs. M. Baird,
Mrs. G. Bleasdale, Mrs. E.M. Connor,
R. Davison, A.J. Holmes, Mrs. J.
Maitland and C. Walker
- Objectors: Mr. & Mrs. Williams
- Applicants: Mr. & Mrs. Stephenson
- Apologies: Councillors Mrs. A.E. Laing, D.
Milsom and D.J. Taylor-Gooby

1. **THE MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING** held on 8 April 2008, 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 IN CONSERVATIONS AREAS) ACT 1990**

2007/0579

**HUTTON HENRY (WINGATE) - STABLES, BOUNDARY
ENCLOSURES AND HARDSTANDING AT LAND ADJACENT TO
76 NEWHOLME ESTATE, STATION TOWN FOR MR. P.
STEPHENSON**

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control Services which recommended approval subject to conditions relating to materials, means of enclosure, use of stables, landscaping, specific plans. The proposal was considered to be in accordance with Policies 1, 3 and 35 of the District of Easington Local Plan and PPS7 - Sustainable Development in Rural Areas.

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 report.

Mrs. Williams explained that her property was closest to the proposed stables and she would like to know how far away from the boundary the stables would be built. She explained that conditions related to materials, means of enclosure, use of stables and landscaping and queried if she would be able to see any plans at the meeting that evening.

The Principal Planning Services Officer explained that the conditions were what the applicant had to adhere to. The Council had adequate control over the future use of the stables. He added that the distance was twenty seven

Development Control and Regulatory Panel - 29 April 2008

metres away at the nearest point. The plans had been altered slightly and the stables were slightly closer to the residential houses.

Mrs. Williams explained that originally she had no objection but was concerned about the flies and odour in the summer months when she would sit in her garden. If the stables were built closer, then they could be more of a problem. She asked if the Council could guarantee that they would not suffer any detrimental effect from the flies and odour. The Principal Planning Services Officer explained that Environmental Health had commented that the proposal would not have a detrimental effect on nearby residents.

Mrs. Williams queried where the horse manure would be placed. Mr. Stephenson, the applicant, explained that the horse manure would be taken away every week on a trailer. He had ran stables for twenty years and the objectors lived next to a farm in the country and therefore had to expect some amount of flies and odours. There were pigeon sheds adjacent to her property which would also cause flies.

A Member queried how many stables would be built. The Principal Planning Services Officer explained that there would be ten individual stables in one block.

A Member commented that a condition should be attached that livery would not be kept there and the stables should only be for personal use.

RESOLVED that the application be conditionally approved.

2008/0082

SHOTTON (HASWELL AND SHOTTON) - 86 NO. DWELLINGS AT LAND EAST OF WINDSOR PLACE, SHOTTON COLLIERY FOR HASLAM HOMES NORTH EAST

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control Services which recommended approval subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement relating to off site open space provision, affordable housing and habitat enhancement works, and subject to conditions relating to materials, means of enclosure, landscaping, tree protection works, hours of construction, contaminated land risk assessment, Environment Agency requirements, revised access layout. Delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning and Building Control Services to issue the decision on satisfactory completion of the Section 106 Agreement.

RESOLVED that the application be conditionally approved subject to completion of the Section 106 Agreement. Delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning and Building Control Services to issue the decision.

2008/0102 EASINGTON VILLAGE (EASINGTON VILLAGE AND SOUTH HETTON) - INDUSTRIAL UNITS (B1, B2 AND B8 USE) INCLUDING SMALL RETAIL UNIT (OUTLINE) AT LAND AT MILL HILL, PETERLEE FOR KANS AND KANDY LIMITED

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control Services which recommended approval subject to the receipt of satisfactory details relating to off site highway work and surveys and details relating to the preservation of the existing wetland area. Conditions relating to highway works, wetland area, retail element of future development and full details of future development. Delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning and Building Control Services to issue the decision on satisfactory completion of the Section 106 Agreement. The proposed development was considered to comply with the Development Plan Policies 1, 53 and 105 of the District of Easington Local Plan.

The Principal Planning Services Officer explained that the situation with the newts was now resolved and only required a planning condition. With regard to highways, information had been received from the applicant but needed to be assessed by the highway authority.

RESOLVED that the application be conditionally approved on satisfactory receipt of details relating to highway works. Delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning and Building Control Services to issue the decision.

2008/0108 SHOTTON (HASWELL AND SHOTTON) – Factory Extension at 2 Mill Hill, Peterlee for Mr J Peacock, Roballo Engineering 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. The proposal was considered to be in accordance with Policies 1, 35, 36, 37 and 53 of the District of Easington Local Plan.

RESOLVED that the application be conditionally approved.

PRIOR TO CONSIDERATION OF THE FOLLOWING ITEM OF BUSINESS, COUNCILLOR C WALKER, MRS G BLEASDALE AND MRS M BAIRD DECLARED A PERSONAL AND PREJUDICIAL INTEREST AND LEFT THE MEETING

3 APPLICATION FOR SECTION 106 FUNDING - PROVISION OF CHILDREN'S PLAY AREA AT DENESIDE PARK

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control Services which gave details of a request from Seaham Town Council for funding from the Section 106 Agreements to upgrade Deneside Park. The budgets for the works were detailed in the report and £34,500 was requested, a copy of which had been circulated to each Member.

Development Control and Regulatory Panel - 29 April 2008

RESOLVED that the release of the sum of £34,500 from Section 106 Agreement monies be granted.

COUNCILLORS C WALKER, MRS G BLEASDALE AND MRS M BAIRD REJOINED THE MEETING

4 PLANNING – VALIDATION CHECKS

Consideration was given to the Head of Planning and Building Control Services which advised Members of the proposed adoption of planning validation checklists which had been the subject of public consultation and to seek adoption of the checklist, a copy of which had been circulated to each Member.

The Principal Planning Services Officer explained that the contents of validation checklists had been discussed with all Development Control Managers across the county and a consultation exercise had been carried out with statutory consultees, planning agents and regular customers.

The validation of planning applications were interpreted differently throughout the county and across the country. The regulations were in part ambiguous which led to inconsistency in the way in which they were interpreted.

From 6 April 2008, there were mandatory national requirements specified in the Town and Country Planning General Development Procedure Order which set out the minimum information that must accompany all applications for planning permission. It was proposed to adopt a local validation checklist to operate alongside this, in accordance with details previously notified to Panel Members.

It may be necessary to make future amendments to the checklist to reflect any changes to national or local planning policy or any standardisation of procedures necessary because of Local Government Review. It was considered that such amendments could be addressed by the Head of Planning and Building Control Services although any fundamental changes to the process would be brought before Members.

RESOLVED that the local validation checklist be adopted and brought into immediate effect.

JC/CB/com dev/080500
2 May 2008