

DURHAM COUNTY COUNCIL
AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE (CENTRAL AND EAST)

At a Meeting of **Area Planning Committee (Central and East)** held in the **Council Chamber, County Hall, Durham** on **Tuesday 12 July 2022** at **9.30 am**

Present:

Councillor D Freeman (Chair)

Members of the Committee:

Councillors L A Holmes (Vice-Chair), L Brown, J Cosslett, S Deinali, J Elmer, C Hood, D McKenna, R Manchester, J Quinn, K Robson, K Shaw and A Surtees

Also Present:

Councillors L Hovvels, D Nicholls and R Ormerod

1 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors I Cochrane, C Kay and C Marshall.

2 Substitute Members

There were no Substitute Members.

3 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 14 June 2022 were confirmed as a correct record by the Committee and signed by the Chair.

4 Declarations of Interest

Councillor L Brown noted she was a member of the City of Durham Trust, however she was not a Trustee and had not been party to their submissions in objection to the applications. She noted in respect of Item 5c, she had been party to the objections put forward by the City of Durham Parish Council and would not take part in that item.

The Lawyer (Planning and Highways), Neil Carter noted Councillor L Brown should retire from the Chamber during the consideration of the item.

The Chair, Councillor D Freeman noted he was a Member of the City of Durham Parish Council, however, he was not a member of their Planning Committee and had not been party to their submissions in objection. He noted he was also a member of the City of Durham Trust, however he was not a Trustee and had not been party to their submissions in objection to the applications.

Councillor D Nicholls noted he was a Local Member for Deerness, not a Committee Member, and was in attendance to speak as regards Item 5d. He noted he had taken advice from the Lawyer (Planning and Highways) and explained that he lived very close to the application site and would wish that to be known in advance of speaking in relation to the application.

5 Applications to be determined by the Area Planning Committee (Central and East)

a DM/21/02982/FPA - Sunridge Farm House, Thornley, Durham DH6 3EE

The Principal Planning Officer, Leigh Dalby, gave a detailed presentation on the report relating to the abovementioned planning application, a copy of which had been circulated (for copy see file of minutes). Members noted that the written report was supplemented by a visual presentation which included photographs of the site. The application was for change of use from agricultural to off road motorcycle training centre, with creation of motor track and was recommended for refusal.

The Chair thanked the Principal Planning Officer and asked the Committee Services Officer to read out a statement from Local Member, Councillor J Miller:

'I am writing this statement and requesting it is read out at the planning committee this morning, regarding the planning application being discussed for the off-road bike track in Thornley, within my Division. Firstly, I want to apologise for not being there this morning. But due to unforeseen circumstances I am not able to attend.

I welcome any planning application that looks to resolve the issues that we are all facing with off-road bikes. We all know just how much time, effort and money it is costing not just the council, but the police, fire service and other agencies in reacting to the damage that is being caused.

I understand that some people have concerns about the noise that the track would cause, but I would much rather the noise was coming from an off-road bike track, rather than off-road bikes destroying grassed areas near homes and schools or being anti-social on the highways. I also understand the concerns around the sensitivity of it being within close proximity to a cemetery. However, ongoing conversations can take place between the applicant and Thornley Parish Council, to ensure the track is not used when a funeral is taking place.

If the committee was mindful to approve the application today, that isn't the end of the matter, nor the concerns raised. The Council Planning Department has an enforcement team that would be able to handle any future concerns and reports of breaches, and deal with them as they seem fit. But at least as a council we have tried to take a different approach to dealing with off-road bikes, rather than the current approach that doesn't seem to be working.

However, if the committee were mindful to object to the application, I would ask the committee to consider asking for a deferment of the application, in order to allow for a full and proper noise assessment to be completed, which the applicant has already agreed to within the report papers. This would also ensure that, as a council, we have tried all avenues to try and prevent further incidents of off-road bikes causing criminal damage to our grassed areas. That is not to say that I am accusing the Planning Officers of not completing thorough due diligence, because I know they have worked hard on this application. But I think, when such an application has presented itself, as a council we should be trying all avenues to try and make it a success and part of the solution to a problem that we are all facing.

I ask that my statement is taken into consideration when the Committee is deciding upon the application. Thank you'.

The Chair thanked the Committee Services Officer and asked Councillor L Hovvels, Local Member to speak in relation to the application.

Councillor L Hovvels thanked the Chair and Committee and noted the problems in County Durham with off-road bikes and quads and the associated costs. She explained it was better to have a place for the bikes to be used, with the site already having been used since 2021. She noted the pandemic had exacerbated the issues in terms of the lack of activities for young people and noted that if the site turned out right, it could be very positive for local communities. She asked that the Committee look at the assessments carried out in terms of noise and look at conditions to manage the site, such as improved signage.

Councillor L Hovvels noted the consultation with Durham Constabulary, querying which area of the Constabulary should have been consulted, and noted the concerns they had raised relating to the roadworthiness of vehicles. She noted that screening that was referred to and that Committee could include further mitigation within any conditions they imposed. Councillor L Hovvels asked Members to defer the application, pending further work in relation to noise issues, and for it to come back to Committee at a future meeting.

The Chair thanked Councillor L Hovvels and asked Mr Michael Emery, speaking on behalf of the Applicant, to speak in support of the application.

Mr M Emery echoed the comments made in the statements from the Local Members as regards the scourge of off-road bikes and noted, with Police appearing not to be responding to the issue, the applicant had sought to provide a controlled environment for those bikes. He added that since the recommendation for refusal, there had been a lot of changes which help with the concerns raised. He explained that there was a three metre high bund and there would be additional landscaping and planting of trees to help screen the site and to reduce noise. He noted the proposals were for the track to be open 52 days a year and that a reduction to 40 days could be offered. He added that all bikes would be checked in terms of noise levels with decibel meters, and reiterated that the site was not a racetrack, rather a training and time-trial facility with limited numbers on site at any one time. Mr M Emery explained that the nearby cemetery was screened from the track by 25 metre high trees and it was not possible to see the track from the cemetery, noting the sound bund and footpath were also along this boundary. He noted the track was welcomed by the community and would help prevent anti-social behaviour. He explained the repair workshop, with supervised repairs, would help encourage bikes to be stored at the site.

Mr M Emery noted that the Local MP, Graeme Morris had addressed the Parliamentary Committee on the matter of anti-social use of off-road bikes, that reiterated that Police did not appear to be dealing with the problems and supported the project in principle. He concluded by noting that the applicant would adhere to any conditions as applied and look to be able to bring the project to fruition.

The Chair thanked Mr M Emery and asked the Principal Planning Officer for comments on the points raised.

The Principal Planning Officer noted consultation with the Police was with Durham Constabulary's Police Architectural Liaison Officer, as was standard practice. He noted that, should Members be minded to approve the application, there were a number of issues that would require further information to be submitted by the applicant.

The Lawyer (Planning and Highways) explained that in terms of any potential deferral of the application for a number of noise assessments to be undertaken, there were other reasons that Officers had felt meant that the application was unacceptable. He noted the noise assessments had not been undertaken as Officers had felt the application was unacceptable and therefore to require the applicant to carry out such assessments was unreasonable when the proposals were not acceptable in principle. He noted that the decision was for Members, however, he noted the in principle issues as set out within the Officer's report.

The Chair thanked the Officers and asked Members of the Committee for their comments and questions.

Councillor J Elmer noted the application was very tricky and noted the loss of agricultural land and the lack of Police objection, though their concerns as regards the roadworthiness of the vehicles. He noted that Environmental Health had not requested a noise assessment adding he felt it was not possible to understand the impact without such an assessment. He added that he has been involved in such assessments previously and understood as regards the amount of information required in terms of receptors, the nearby cemetery, the public right of way and nearest settlement. He noted that it was needed to be able to help inform as regards the impact, though noted the comments from the Lawyer (Planning and Highways) in terms of the application not meeting approval in principle. Councillor J Elmer noted that there was no information in terms of the number of users and therefore it was not possible for the Highways Section to be able to assess the impact upon the highway network. He noted he would wish for the application to be deferred, not only to obtain further information in terms of noise, but also on other those other matters.

Councillor J Quinn noted he agreed with Councillor J Elmer in terms of needing more information and also suggested a site visit in addition to be able to understand the proximity to the cemetery. He added he agreed with the statement from Councillor J Miller in that, if successful, the scheme could be seen as a pilot for other areas. He noted that legally, the landowner could use the land for such use every day. The Principal Planning Officer noted that track itself required permission as it was engineered and added that the hypothetical level of use the applicant would be able to generate themselves would likely not be sufficient for a change of use. Councillor J Quinn noted he felt the application was trying to help reduce anti-social behaviour asked if not in the type of place as within the application, then where? He seconded Councillor J Elmer's motion for deferral.

Councillor C Hood noted that the application site was in the neighbouring Electoral Division to his and his area had a similar blight of anti-social use of off-road bikes. He too asked if not in such places, then where would such tracks be developed. He agreed in terms of deferral or support for the application, noting that tackling the issue of off-road bikes could not continue to be kicked down the road.

Councillor LA Holmes noted that in his area, Spennymoor, after 6.00pm it could be guaranteed that young people wearing balaclavas would be seen on off-road bikes. He explained he felt he should support the application, adding that tackling such anti-social behaviour was important, noting the economic impact with investment less likely where there were high levels of anti-social behaviour. He noted his concerns with the application related to noise impact, especially on the cemetery, and how the bikes would arrive at the site, noting if the young people were riding to the site, how was the track keeping them from riding on the roads?

Councillor D McKenna noted he liked the idea in principle, however, he asked how it would work in practice in terms of how the bikes and young people got to the site, how would the young people behave, and that behaviour be managed. He noted they were unlikely to join a club or association and there was the issue raised in terms of the roadworthiness of the bikes. He reiterated he could not see how it was a solution to the off-road bike problem and added that the application required more thought.

Councillor S Deinali noted that there were issues with off-road bikes in her Division and noted the applicant had noted bikes would be taken to the site, repaired and stored on-site. She noted that younger children had nowhere to go in terms of such facilities in terms of learning to ride and repair bikes in a responsible manner.

Councillor K Robson noted he had listened carefully and added there were similar issues in his area, Aycliffe. He explained that there must be a cost implication, who was paying for the work, and asked that that information be brought forward, should the application be deferred.

Councillor L Brown noted the comments of previous Members and asked whether the scheme would actually take such anti-social off-road bikes off the street. She referred to the County Durham Plan (CDP) and noted it was willing to overlook policies in cases where there were special circumstances. She asked if, during a financial crisis, whether people would be willing to pay to access such a track. She noted she supported deferment, though the Lawyer (Planning and Highways) had spoken against deferment. The Lawyer (Planning and Highways) noted that there had been a motion for deferment put by Councillor J Elmer, seconded by Councillor Quinn.

He reiterated that the point he had made that deferral to obtain further information relating to noise may not address the other issues that warranted the refusal recommendation from Officers. He asked if the reasons were purely in relation to noise, and for site visit to take place.

Councillor S Deinali suggested that other issues that may required additional information could include the business case for the track, details of how the bikes would be stored, timings and costs/operating model, for example support for children who may not be able to pay a full rate. Councillor A Surtees noted that deferral would also allow for information in terms of the proposed reduced number of operating days and the 3 metre bund and screen planting. She asked how many complaints had been received as regards the site since it began operating in 2021. The Principal Planning Officer noted he did not have that information to hand, however, if the application was deferred it could be obtained. The Lawyer (Planning and Highways) noted that a transport statement could be useful information Members may wish to have, should they defer the application.

Councillor J Elmer noted he agreed with the points raised in connection to deferral and for information to come back on those points and in relation to noise levels, key receptors, how to reduce the impact. He also noted a site visit, and information on the business model and how young people may be able to use the site if they were unable to afford costs. He added that further information on how vehicles would get to the site, parking at the site, storage and roadworthiness of vehicles would also be useful.

Upon a vote being taken it was:

RESOLVED

That the application be **DEFERRED**, to allow further information to be brought forward relating to noise, transport, business and cost, storage and repair, and for a site visit to be arranged prior to consideration of the application by Committee.

b DM/22/00042/FPA - 48 Highgate, Durham, DH1 4GA

The Planning Officer, Michelle Penman, gave a detailed presentation on the report relating to the abovementioned planning application, a copy of which had been circulated (for copy see file of minutes). Members noted that the written report was supplemented by a visual presentation which included photographs of the site. The application was for the construction of roof balcony and first floor bay window to front and installation of first floor balcony and French doors to rear (resubmission of DM/21/01877/FPA) and was recommended for refusal.

The Chair thanked the Planning Officer and asked Councillor R Ormerod, Local Member, to speak in relation to the application.

Councillor R Ormerod thanked the Chair and Committee and explained that Highgate was an excellent development, the best in the city, though now with many of the properties occupied by students, not the development's intended use. He noted the intention was for the development to be for high level professionals, and the studentification presented issues in terms of persuading families to stay in the city, adding that we needed families to stay in the city and therefore he was in favour of the application. He noted some existing properties at Highgate already had bay windows and the proposed roof balcony was similar to those on properties opposite to Highgate. He noted that if the proposals were rejected it could appear that there was one rule for individuals and families and another rule for large developers. He reiterated that he would support the proposals by this family.

The Chair thanked Councillor R Ormerod and asked Mrs Eileen Grimes, the Applicant, to speak in support of her application.

Mrs E Grimes thanked the Chair and Members and noted that it was one single property that permission was being sought for at Committee, with many houses in multiple occupation (HMOs) at Highgate having been considered under delegated authority. She noted the proposals for the master bedroom and bay window and cited numerous similar examples within the city in terms of the proposals for the room within the roof space and balcony, many of which were opposite the World Heritage Site (WHS). She gave The Bowers as a specific example. She noted the photographs shown in the presentation were old and that trees had grown since that time.

Mrs E Grimes explained that the Millburngate development opposite to Highgate had three large terraces, and included uses such as food preparation, bar and barbecues, effectively party terraces that looked directly into her home. She noted the City of Durham Trust commented that the balcony to the rear of the property will enhance the mews style of the houses and enhance the street appearance. She noted the proposals were to help improve their quality of life and noted the impact of the pandemic in terms of loss of the driveway, their only outdoor space, as a result of parking passes being removed by the Council. She concluded by asking Members to consider the application and to either approve the application or defer pending further work as may be deemed necessary by Members.

The Chair thanked Mrs E Grimes and asked Officers for their comments on the points raised.

The Principal Planning Officer, Paul Hopper noted the proposed external alterations to the dwelling, explaining as regards the previous C4 use of the property and the current C3 use. He added the key issue was the impact upon the Conservation Area (CA) and WHS, which was explained in some detail within the Committee report. He noted the development at Millburngate referred to was not directly comparable to the application proposals as it was located within the commercial city centre and related to the redevelopment of the former passport office and as such the relationships to the castle, cathedral and conservation area were different to those at Highgate.

The Chair thanked the Principal Planning Officer and asked the Committee for their comments and questions.

Councillor J Elmer noted some sympathy with the issues raised by the applicant, and the freedom for individuals to develop their properties. He added, however, there was also a need for restraint in terms of the impact upon the CA, WHS and in turn tourism. He noted the apparent inconsistency in terms of small scale versus large scale development, such as the hotel developments and the Council's at one time new HQ building, however, he noted the Council's Heritage Team had stated there needed to be a line held. He added it had been noted that it had been felt that the bay window proposed could be brought in line with requirements and the proposed balcony to the rear had a lesser impact. Councillor J Elmer noted the main issue was that of the proposed roof space balcony, with it having a significant impact on the currently continuous roof line, noting that there had been considerable thought at the time of the original Highgate development in terms of this. He noted that he felt the application should be deferred in order to remove the proposed roof balcony and bring the application in line with the heritage of the city.

Councillor J Quinn explained he had issue in deferring the application, noting he felt the Applicant had worked to minimise impact.

Councillor L Brown referred to plans on the projector screen highlighting the proposed balconies. She noted the Conservation Officer's comments were fairly damning, citing conflict with CDP policies 44, 45 and Durham City Neighbourhood Plan (DCNP) policies H1, H2 and asked what could be achieved by deferring the application. She noted she supported the Officer's recommendation for refusal.

Councillor A Surtees acknowledged the context of the CA and WHS and noted the bay window and rear balcony did not appear to be big issues. She noted the roof balcony did not appear to present too much of a change and asked why not explore the issue.

She felt there was an opportunity to help a resident to continue to stay in the city centre and added she would support deferral of the application.

The Chair noted that Members had few concerns relating to the bay window and rear balcony, with the main point being the roof terrace. He noted that Officers stated that element was contrary to policy in terms of the CA and impact upon the WHS. He noted the comments from Councillor R Ormerod in terms of the context of the proposals against the development opposite at Millburngate and added that the value of the Highgate development had already been damaged by that development opposite and that Highgate was less valuable than it was before. He noted the issues raised and those of an existing development when compared to a new development. He noted the proposal for deferral by Councillor J Elmer, seconded by Councillor A Surtees.

Councillor J Elmer noted the many incursions into the heritage of the city centre and the need to look at developments and ask where one should stop.

The Principal Planning Officer noted the different elements to the application, firstly the bay window, with the Applicant willing to make changes as required. He noted that in terms of the roof balcony, the Design and Conservation Officer had made it clear they were opposed to that style and any potential incursion in that way would result in a potential objection. He added that if Members were minded to defer the application, he could not see an easy route to a solution, however, Officers would of course engage with the Applicant.

The Lawyer (Planning and Highways) noted that Members had noted certain elements were acceptable, however, the Committee must determine against the proposals as set out, in terms of refusal if they agreed with the Officer's recommendation, approval if they did not, or to defer. He added the issue with deferment was that the Applicant had been invited to amend the application in order to make it more acceptable, however, they had chosen not to do so. He added that if Members refused the application, that would not prevent the Applicant submitting an amended scheme in the future.

The Chair noted Councillor L Brown had proposed refusal of the application, however, did not have a seconder. Councillor J Elmer noted that, further to the comments from Officers, he would withdraw his motion for refusal. Councillor J Cosslett noted he would second Councillor L Brown's motion for refusal.

Councillor A Surtees asked for clarification, if the application was refused, another application could come forward, however, that would have the associated costs of a new application.

She noted she had the impression from the Applicant from their comments at Committee that they would work with Planners to try and progress their application. The Principal Planning Officer noted that Officers always looked to work proactively with applicants, however, that did not represent a guarantee that an application could progress, noting the concerns as previously stated.

Councillor C Hood asked that if the application was refused, the Applicant would need to pay a new fee for another application. The Principal Planning Officer noted that the original application had included a free resubmission, however, this had been already undertaken and a new application fee would be required. Councillor C Hood proposed the application be deferred.

The Chair noted that there was a motion for refusal by Councillor L Brown, seconded by Councillor J Cosslett.

Councillor R Manchester noted he was surprised Councillor J Elmer had withdrawn his motion for deferral, adding he felt he could accept the application in its current form and therefore he felt the application could be made acceptable if deferred. Councillor J Elmer noted he withdrew his motion subsequent to advice from Officers.

Councillor L Brown noted her understanding was if the application was deferred and it came back including the roof terrace, that Officers could not support that in any way, and it would be again recommended for refusal. She added that if the application was deferred, could any changes make a material difference. The Lawyer (Planning and Highways) noted Members could not change the application and added that issues raised by the Planners and Design and Conservation Team were for the Applicant to take on board. He noted the doubts as raised by the Principal Planning Officer, however, the willingness of Officers to work with the Applicant. Councillor L Brown noted that therefore she would prefer deferment of the application.

The Chair asked if the Applicant would prefer deferral of the application in order to look again at the application. Mrs E Grimes noted they would be happy to work with Planners to look at the issues raised. She noted they had lived in the city for a long time and wished to protect the CA and WHS and thanked Officers and the Members for their consideration.

Councillor L Brown noted she withdrew her motion for refusal. Councillor J Elmer again proposed the application be deferred, he was seconded by Councillor C Hood.

Upon a vote being taken it was:

RESOLVED

That the application be **DEFERRED**, to seek amendment to the bay window and alteration/removal of the roof terrace.

Councillor L Brown left the meeting at 11.02am

c DM/22/00139/FPA - The Beauty Spot, Saddlers Yard, Saddler Street, Durham, DH1 3NP

The Senior Policy Officer, John Russell, gave a detailed presentation on the report relating to the abovementioned planning application, a copy of which had been circulated (for copy see file of minutes). Members noted that the written report was supplemented by a visual presentation which included photographs of the site. The application was for a proposed 4 Bed HMO with accompanying communal living area and kitchen in existing loft spaces, a dormer link will be formed to connect the two loft spaces (amended proposal) was recommended for approval subject to conditions.

The Chair thanked the Senior Policy Officer and asked Councillor R Ormerod, speaking on behalf of the City of Durham Parish Council, to speak in relation to the application.

Councillor R Ormerod noted the Parish Council had objected to the original scheme, with the main concerns as set out within its letter of February 2022, notably the scheme being in conflict with the CDP, National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the DCNP. He noted the revisions that had taken place and that the Parish Council welcomed those relating to cycle storage and other issues set out at paragraph 36 of the report and noted the concerns relating to the nationally described space standards had been addressed.

Councillor R Ormerod noted that the Parish Council noted the number of Class N Council Tax exempt properties within 100 metres of the application property and that including 7-8 Silver Street it would take the percentage up to 70.4 percent, which within the commercial heart of the city was not unacceptable in terms of balanced communities. He noted CDP Policy 9 related to town centre development and explained the Parish Council believed that upper floor use was not in conflict with policy. Councillor R Ormerod noted DCNP Policy E3 and support for the development of upper floors if lower floors were retained for retail use. He noted the Parish Council believed The Beauty Spot was no longer trading, however, requested that the lower floor be retained for retail use.

He added that Saddler Street was very narrow, and the Parish Council would be concerned if a partial or total diversion of the road occurred and noted Condition 8 referred to a Construction Management Plan following the granting of permission, however, the Parish Council would request that the CMP be submitted prior to works commencing in order to assess the impact upon the WHS and CA. The Principal Planning Officer, Paul Hopper noted the application did not include any proposed change to the ground floor use. He noted that the CMP would be secured by condition, and highways were satisfied in terms of arrangements.

Councillor J Elmer moved that the application be approved, though noted concerns relating to the CMP not being submitted. The Principal Planning Officer noted it was not usual to see a CMP prior to planning approval, however, access issues would form part of the CMP. Councillor J Elmer asked if Officers were confident, the Principal Planning Officer noted highways colleagues had not objected to the proposals. The Principal DM Engineer, David Battensby noted Condition 8 set out no development shall take place until a CMP was submitted and approved and added it would be something that would be looked at carefully.

Councillor J Elmer was seconded by Councillor K Robson.

Upon a vote being taken it was:

RESOLVED

That the application be **APPROVED**, subject to the conditions as set out within the report and an amended Condition 9 to include the requisite drawing numbers.

*Councillor D McKenna left the meeting at 11.33am
Councillor L Brown entered the meeting at 11.34am*

d DM/21/01141/FPA - Land to the rear of Rock Terrace, New Brancepeth, DH7 7EP

The Senior Planning Officer, Lisa Morina, gave a detailed presentation on the report relating to the abovementioned planning application, a copy of which had been circulated (for copy see file of minutes). Members noted that the written report was supplemented by a visual presentation which included photographs of the site. The application was for the erection of 11 bungalows and was recommended for approval subject to conditions and a s106 agreement.

The Chair thanked the Senior Planning Officer and asked Councillor D Nicholls to speak in relation to the application.

Councillor D Nicholls reiterated that he had sought clarification in terms of being able to speak on the application from the Council's legal team. He noted he was a resident of New Brancepeth and noted that the site had been a key concern for residents in the area for a number of years at the New Brancepeth Residents' Association. He thanked the Officer for their report and noted the current untidy state of the site. He noted there had been a number of applications in the past and wondered whether it would be possible for the site to be tidied up as soon as possible, noting issues such as used car batteries on the site. He added that, as a resident, he welcomed the conditions in terms of noise suppression and dust control and the s106 allocations to the local area.

The Chair asked Officers for their comments. The Senior Planning Officer noted that scheme would be brought forward as soon as possible, however, a timescale was not set out. She added Section 215 Notices had been served upon on the site and that if development was not forthcoming the notices would be the fallback position. The Lawyer (Planning and Highways) noted there did not appear to be such a situation to impose an additional condition to the application in terms of tidying the site, and the legal tool was the Section 215 notice should the development not take place. He advised that Councillor D Nicholls should leave the Chamber while the Committee decided upon the application.

Councillor D Nicholls left them meeting at 11.46am

The Chair thanked the Officers and asked the Committee for their comments and questions.

Councillor A Surtees noted she welcomed the type of application as proposed, infill of an area left to wrack and ruin, with homes for elderly people, or families, including the affordable home. She noted she fully endorsed the proposals and moved the application be approved. Councillor J Elmer seconded the application, asking as regards loss of open space and whether the s106 contribution could be used to offset that locally.

The Principal Planning Officer, Paul Hopper noted that s106 monies were usually retained within the Electoral Division for local provision, with input from Local Members.

Councillor L Brown noted she agreed with Councillors A Surtees and J Elmer and noted a lack of shops in New Brancepeth and asked as regards bus stops and services to Langley Moor or Ushaw Moor.

She also noted that Condition 5 stated a 7.30am start time for works and suggested 8.00am maybe preferable. Members agreed as regards the suggested amended time. The Principal Planning Officer noted that he could confirm there were bus stops within 200 metres of the site.

Upon a vote being taken it was:

RESOLVED

That the application be **APPROVED**, subject to the conditions and s106 agreements as set out within the report and an amended Condition 5 to change start times of works from 7.30am to 8.00am.

6 Special Meeting and Site Visit

Members were asked to note the upcoming Special Meeting of the Committee, to be held 9.30am, Monday, 18 July 2022, with a site visit to take place on the afternoon of Friday, 15 July 2022 at 12.30pm.