

**THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL AND REGULATORY PANEL
HELD ON TUESDAY, 2ND SEPTEMBER, 2008**

Present: Councillor M. Routledge (Chair)
Councillors Mrs. M. Baird, Mrs. E.M. Connor,
Mrs. J. Maitland, B. Quinn and D.J. Taylor-Gooby

Agent/Applicant

Mr. and Mrs. Mortimer, Mr. Scorer

Apologies: Councillors D. Milsom and C. Walker

1. **THE MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING** held on 27th July, 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 AND CONSERVATION AREAS) ACT 1990**

**2008/0005 SEAHAM (SEAHAM HARBOUR) - Retail Units and Apartments at 1
South Terrace, 4-7 Church Street, 20-22 Green Street, Seaham for
Mr. G. Bhondi**

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control Services which recommended that Members be minded to approve the application subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement relating to off-site open space provision and subject to conditions relating to timing of development, materials to be used, window design including dormer windows and rooflights and shop front design. Delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning and Building Control Services to issue the decision upon satisfactory completion of the Section 106 Agreement.

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.

Members raised concerns regarding the lack of provision of car parking. The Principal Planning Services Officer explained that the application did not lend itself to off-street parking and the current units did not have any.

A Member referred to the report and to the additional information that had been requested regarding access and deliveries and queried if any new information had been received. The Principal Planning Services Officer was unaware of this information having been received from the applicant.

Members were concerned regarding the car parking provision and how access and deliveries would be obtained and requested that the

Development Control and Regulatory Panel - 2nd September, 2008

application be deferred and further information be requested from the applicant.

RESOLVED that application No. 2008/0005 be deferred.

2008/0336 SEAHAM (SEAHAM HARBOUR) - Siting, Design, External Appearance, Means of Access and Landscaping, Associated with Residential Development Comprising 36 Flats (Reserved Matters) at Land at Station Road, Seaham for Esh Developments Limited

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 and subject to the conditions detailed in the report. The proposal was considered to be in accordance with the outline Planning Permission granted previously together with the Statutory Development Plan, in particular Local Plan Policies 1, 35, 36, 37, 45, 66, 67, 91 and 92.

RESOLVED that the application be conditionally approved subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement.

2008/0418 SEATON WITH SLINGLY (SEAHAM NORTH) - Replacement Dwelling at Sharpley Hall, Seaton for Mr. M. Mortimer

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control Services which recommended refusal, as having regard to the size of the proposed replacement dwelling in relation to the existing dwelling on the site, it was considered that the proposal constituted inappropriate development in the North Durham Greenbelt which would be contrary to National Planning Guidance contained in Planning Policy Guidance 2 'Greenbelts', Planning Policy Statement 7 'Sustainable Development in Rural Areas' and to 'saved' Policies 1, 3 and 4 of the former District of Easington Local Plan.

The Principal Planning Services Officer explained that refusal reason No. 2 in the report was now not relevant.

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.

The applicant had placed plans on display in the foyer for Members' information which gave an indication of the scale of the development in relation to the scale of the hotel development, which had been approved previously on the adjacent site. Two local Members, Councillors Mrs. S. Mason and Mrs. M. Nugent had informed Officers that they had no objections to the application. They felt that as there were already buildings on the site in the area, the dwelling would not be out of place and would enhance the area.

Mr. Scorer, the agent for the applicant, explained that the replacement dwelling did not constitute inappropriate development. The proposal was materially larger and Officers had explained that it was sufficient reason to refuse the application as this was classed as inappropriate development. Officers had also stated the application would have a

Development Control and Regulatory Panel - 2nd September, 2008

negative affect on the neighbouring property. Planning permission had been granted on land to the east for a golf course, club house and hotel and felt it would not unduly prejudice this because of the sheer size and scale of the development. The adjacent development would also have the provision of a 14 bay driving range which would be open until 10.00pm, and an annex arrangement for a further 42 car parking spaces. He felt this application would be surrounded by mass development. PPG2 referred to essential and recreational facilities and the Council had deemed this to be appropriate in the Green Belt. He queried what elements of the development were essential and felt that a hotel was not. All of the facilities were not essential and an inconsistent approach had been given to the application.

A planning permission had been approved for an extension to Sharpley Hall which would be significantly greater than the replacement dwelling. He acknowledged that extensions to existing buildings were acceptable but Officers had recommended that it was inappropriate. The replacement dwelling would be comparable to either side of the site.

Mr. Scorer referred to a recent application in September 2007 for land south of Greeba, Stockton Road. The application was in the Green Belt and had been approved against all policies. He felt that a precedent had been set and consistency should be applied.

Mr. Mortimer, the applicant, explained that himself and his wife had invested their lives in Easington and his business employed 85 people in the area and wished to remain in the local community. He wanted to secure his future and achieve his aims without detriment to the Council.

The Principal Planning Services Officer explained that the scale and size of the hotel and club house had been considered in a previous outline planning permission prior to the Green Belt being designated. Outdoor recreation was classed as appropriate development. Extension and alterations could be approved as long as they were in scale and character with the building. With regard to Greeba at Stockton Road, this had been simply a renewal of permission although the initial decision had been contrary to Officer advice.

A Member queried when the planning permission had been approved for Sharpley Hall and how long it would last. The Principal Planning Services Officer explained that planning permission had been approved in June 2005 and lasted for 5 years.

A Member commented that on visiting the site, you would not know the building was there until you drove down the drive. She felt the proposal would be huge and stand out and would be big difference to what was there at present.

Mr. Mortimer explained that he had purchased the bungalow and wanted to build his own house. The bungalow had bad subsidence and this was the reason he had applied for a two storey house. When coming out of Seaton you could not see the house but the hotel would be huge.

RESOLVED that the application be refused.

2008/0481 MURTON (MURTON EAST) - Kitchen and Bathroom Extension at 3 Oak Terrace Murton for Mr. R. Kelly

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control Services which recommended that Delegated Authority be granted to the Head of Planning and Building Control Services to approve the application upon expiry of the additional consultation period, on the basis that no new issues were raised as a result of the consultation. The proposal was considered to be in accordance with Statutory Development Plan policies detailed in the report.

RESOLVED that authority be delegated to the Head of Planning and Building Control Services to approve the application upon expiration of the additional consultation period.

2008/0487 SEAHAM (SEAHAM HARBOUR) - Multi-use Building to House Public Library, Café, Office and Ancillary Accommodation at St. Johns Square, Seaham for Mr. G. Edwards, Durham County Council

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control Services which recommended approval subject to conditions relating to materials, parking scheme, travel plan, renewable energy scheme, landscaping scheme. It was considered that the proposal conformed to relevant planning policies and guidance as well as promoting the regeneration of this part of Seaham.

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.

The Principal Planning Services Officer explained that Members had raised concerns on the site visit regarding parking provision and one of the conditions was that car parking would be provided prior to the building being occupied. This could be amended to parking be provided before work commenced on site.

A Member commented that she had spoken to the Regeneration Officer prior to the meeting and 120 car parking bays had been earmarked and there were other ones which would become available.

A Member referred to the travel plan provision for buses and explained that there was only one lay-by that was provided instead of a bus station. The Principal Planning Services Officer explained that the travel plan would cover a whole range of transport issues.

RESOLVED that the application be conditionally approved.