



Area Planning Committee (Central and East)

Date Tuesday 8 December 2015
Time 1.00 pm
Venue Council Chamber, County Hall, Durham

Business

Part A

1. Apologies for Absence
2. Substitute Members
3. Minutes of the Last Meeting held on 10 November 2015 (Pages 1 - 8)
4. Declarations of Interest, if any
5. Applications to be determined by the Area Planning Committee (Central & East Durham)
 - a) DM/15/02572/FPA - Southernwood, 17 Quarryheads Lane, Durham, DH1 3DY (Pages 9 - 22)
Erection of part two-storey/part single-storey extension at side and rear of dwelling and erection of first floor extension to front.
 - b) DM/15/03050/AD - Bristol Street Motors, Pity Me, Durham (Pages 23 - 28)
Display of 9 internally illuminated fascia signs, a 5.885metre totem sign, a welcome sign and a directional sign.
6. Such other business as, in the opinion of the Chairman of the meeting, is of sufficient urgency to warrant consideration

Colette Longbottom
Head of Legal and Democratic Services

County Hall
Durham

30 November 2015

To: **The Members of the Area Planning Committee (Central and East)**

Councillor P Taylor (Chairman)
Councillor A Laing (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors A Bell, G Bleasdale, J Clark, P Conway, M Davinson,
K Dearden, D Freeman, S Iveson, C Kay, J Lethbridge, R Lumsdon,
B Moir, J Robinson and K Shaw

Contact: Jocasta Lawton

Tel: 03000 269707

DURHAM COUNTY COUNCIL

AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE (CENTRAL AND EAST)

At a Meeting of **Area Planning Committee (Central and East)** held in Council Chamber, County Hall, Durham on **Tuesday 10 November 2015 at 1.00 pm**

Present:

Councillor P Taylor (Chairman)

Members of the Committee:

Councillors A Bell, G Bleasdale, J Clark, P Conway, M Davinson, D Freeman, A Laing, J Lethbridge, J Maitland (substituting for Councillor R Lumsdon) and B Moir

1 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors S Iveson, R Lumsdon, J Robinson and K Shaw.

2 Substitute Members

Councillor J Maitland substituted for Councillor R Lumsdon.

3 Minutes

The Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Committee held on 22 September 2015 and the Meeting of the Committee held on 13 October 2015, were confirmed as correct records and signed by the Chairman.

4 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

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

a PL/5/2011/401 and PL/5/2011/402 – Hardwicke Hall Manor Hotel, Hesleden Road, Hesleden, TS27 4PA

The Committee considered a report of the Senior Planning Officer regarding the development of four detached residential properties including private vehicular access road (PL/5/2011/401) and the partial demolition of Grade II listed garden wall and proposed repair of remainder, partial demolition of boundary wall within curtilage of Hardwicke Hall Manor Hotel in association with residential development of four dwellings (PL/5/2011/402) at Hardwicke Hall Manor Hotel, Hesleden Road, Hesleden, TS27 4PA (for copy see file of Minutes).

The Senior Planning Officer provided the Committee with a detailed presentation which included photographs of the site and a plan of the proposed layout. Members of the Committee had visited the site and were familiar with the location and setting.

Councillor R Crute, local Member, addressed the Committee, to speak in support of the applications on behalf of himself and fellow local Member Councillor L Pounder. Members were advised that both Members had noted that planning consent had been granted in 1999 for the development of a number of apartments at Hardwicke Hall Manor Hotel, followed by a subsequent similar consent in 2005. As such the local Members were surprised that the current application had been recommended for refusal.

Councillor Crute advised that the NPPF fully supported and promoted a strong, prosperous economy, the modernisation of existing facilities and the provision of good quality housing, all of which were strong features of the current application. No objections had been raised by the Ecology officers of any statutory consultees and while it was noted that objections had been submitted by Design and Conservation and Landscape officers, Councillor Crute believed that the benefits of the proposals far outweighed the partial removal of the listed walls.

Members were advised that the Hall was a long established business which was frequented by local, regional national customers. It was the only hotel of its type in the East Durham area and so had many tourism and social contact benefits. Councillor Crute advised that if the business did not prosper, which was the key aim behind the planning proposals, then some 31 jobs would be at risk and the building would remain in a state of disrepair, including the wall.

Councillor Crute highlighted that the proposals were supported by the East Durham Business Service and he reiterated that previous consents had already been granted. The small scale enabling development would prove richly rewarding for the surrounding area, with strong economic benefits.

Mr Bradley, applicant, addressed the Committee. Along with his brother, he was joint owner of the hotel and had been for 29 years. The hotel was a beautiful building which did reasonably well, however proved hard to maintain just off normal income. It was essential that the building was preserved and well maintained. The fabric of the building needed money spending on it and repairs were ongoing all the time.

The Senior Planning Officer responded to points raised as follows:-

- Previous Planning Consents – The current application was not the same as previous applications which had been approved. Previous applications had been for managed apartments rather than standalone dwellings. There was no extant permission for the hotel;
- Wall – Issues which had been raised regarding the proposals for the wall were as much to do with setting as they were to do with the fabric of the wall;
- Enabling Development – Other enabling development proposals which came forward would normally be supported with a detailed plan of the works to be undertaken and more specific proposals for how revenue from the enabling development would be spent. The current application lacked such detail.

Councillor J Clark was opposed to the officer recommendation and was fully in support of both planning applications. She refuted the suggestion that the location was isolated as several properties lay on the access into the hotel. Furthermore, in referring to paragraph 123 of the report, Councillor Clark believed the benefits of the applications far outweighed any negatives, especially when taking into consideration the improvements which would be made to the access road.

Councillor B Moir agreed and found that the applications accorded with part 1 of the NPPF and saved Local Plan Policy 36. The location was not isolated nor would there be any disturbance caused by the proposals. He further highlighted that in terms of residential amenity and ecology, there were no grounds to refuse the applications.

Further to the reference made to paragraph 123 of the report by Councillor J Clark, the Solicitor took the opportunity to clarify the 2 tests which were set by paragraphs 14 and 55 of the NPPF and explained that given the issues of a listed building and isolated dwellings, there was a presumption against development. As such, in granting approval, there would need to be confidence that benefits of the proposals did outweigh the harm, to which considerable importance and weight had to be attached.

In response to a query from Councillor M Davinson the Senior Planning Officer clarified that all trees within the site were covered by a blanket Tree Preservation Order. While there was an understanding in broad terms of the impact development would have on the trees, because of the lack of detail regarding the enabling development and details on the actual works, a condition would be required should planning permission be granted.

The Senior Planning Officer further advised that there had been a lengthy delay in the application coming forward because the applicant and the Planning Authority had held numerous meetings to attempt to iron out all issues with the application.

Councillor Lethbridge supported the proposals, he found the development site to be a wilderness that would do well with development as long as the archaeologist investigations were supportive.

Councillor P Conway felt that the case for the public benefits of the application and the economic sustainability had been demonstrated by Councillor Crute. However he was uncomfortable with the lack of detail regarding the desired works to be undertaken with the receipts from the enabling development. Taking all matters into consideration, he was in support of the application.

Councillor G Bleasdale felt concerned about the impact the development would have on trees and she hoped that the new dwellings would blend in with the hotel. The Senior Planning Officer clarified that the proposed dwellings were of traditional design, as such officers did not have any issues with their proposed appearance.

Mr Bradley, applicant, advised that he had submitted some details of the works to be undertaken following the enabling development such as works to the wall, roof, carpark and outside structures of the hotel. In relation to the style of dwellings,

Members were also advised that the applicant had submitted four alternative design proposals.

In light of those statements by Mr Bradley, Councillor Conway queried the validity of paragraph 54 of the report which suggested that inadequate evidence had been submitted regarding future works and that detailed costings had not been provided.

The Senior Planning Officer clarified that paragraph 54 was only the comment of one internal consultee. However, it was accurate that in context, the Planning Authority did require the specific details of the enabling development. Although a wall survey had been submitted, it remained unclear what works or costs would be involved to preserve it. Such detail would be expected to be provided in the form of a well-rounded enabling development application.

Councillor A Bell suggested that it may be prudent to defer consideration of the application to allow more specific details to come forward. While it was clear that the hotel did require investment, costing details would be beneficial.

Councillor Laing highlighted that if the development did not go ahead, then 31 jobs were at risk.

Seconded by Councillor B Moir, Councillor J Clark moved approval of the application.

The Solicitor provided guidance as to the tests which the Committee would need to satisfy to justify approval.

Councillor Clark stated that she did not believe the site was outside of the settlement boundary or that it was isolated as there were dwellings in close proximity. Councillor Moir agreed, stating that while the site was divorced from its neighbouring property, it was somewhat closer than what he would consider to be isolated.

Councillor Clark added that the benefits to the access road would be a benefit to the locality and she fully accepted the enabling case. Furthermore, she advised that during the site visit she had struggled to see the inner listed wall and also noted that the application site was not a public site and that the public did not have access to the listed wall. The benefits outweighed any residual harm.

Following advice from the Solicitor, Councillor Clark clarified that in moving approval of the application, she also moved that authority be delegated to officers to draft appropriate conditions and S106 agreement.

Resolved: “That the application be **APPROVED** subject to appropriate conditions and S106 agreement to be prepared by officers”.

b DM/15/02514/OUT – Land adjoining Bowburn South Industrial Estate, Durham Road, Bowburn

The Committee considered a report of the Senior Planning Officer regarding an outline application, including access details, for a retail food store, incorporating car park, landscaping and new vehicular access at land adjoining Bowburn South Industrial Estate, Durham Road, Bowburn (for copy see file of Minutes).

The Senior Planning Officer provided the Committee with a detailed presentation which included photographs of the site and a plan of the proposed layout. Members were advised of an error at paragraph 80 of the report, which should actually detail that the petrol station was not to be included.

Members were further advised that should planning permission be granted, an additional condition would be required to restrict the floorspace to 4184sqm gross.

Seconded by Councillor Lethbridge, Councillor Moir moved approval of the application, both commenting that the store would be a welcome addition to the area.

Resolved: “That the application be approved subject to the conditions detailed within the report and an additional condition to restrict the gross floor space to 4184sqm”.

c DM/15/02694/FPA – 32 Whinney Hill, Durham, DH1 3BE

The Committee considered a report of the Planning Officer regarding the erection of part two storey/part single storey extension at rear of dwelling and construction of pitched roof over existing flat roof at side (for copy see file of Minutes).

The Senior Planning Officer provided the Committee with a detailed presentation which included photographs of the site and a plan of the proposed layout. Members of the Committee had visited the site and were familiar with the location and setting.

Members were advised that paragraph 23 of the report should reflect an objection being raised by Whinney Hill Community Group and not Whinney Hill Resident Group.

Councillor Freeman advised that as local Member for the area, he had been approached by Whinney Hill Community Group who had wanted the application to come before the Planning Committee, however unfortunately were not able to be represented at the meeting. Their case was however detailed within the report.

Councillor Freeman advised that for the past two years the property had been advertised for rent as a 6 bed let, as such there were concerns locally that the proposals would mean the property would have between 8 and 10 occupants, making it a HMO. It was felt that the proposals would have an adverse effect on the character of the area, an area of which 75% of the population were students. Councillor Freeman advised that in that regard, the proposals contravened saved Local Plan Policy H9 which sought to preserve the character of an area, as well as saved Policy Q9.

Members were advised that the proposals had originally been opposed by Design and Conservation Officers on the grounds of poor design. The current application only slightly reduced the height of the elevation next to 31 Whinney Hill, it was therefore unclear how any significant changes had been made in relation to the visual effect.

The Senior Planning Officer clarified that the application proposed a 6 bed let and not a HMO. Should additional bedrooms be created, it would take the property over the limit to a HMO and so would require a change of use. As such it was suggested that should approval be granted, an informative be placed on the certificate to that affect.

In response to a concern raised by Councillor J Clark, the Senior Planning Officer clarified that there would be no windows overlooking no.31 Whinney Hill. With that assurance, Councillor Clark was satisfied with the application and moved approval.

Councillor Lethbridge seconded the motion for approval. He felt that the current flat roof at the property was unattractive and noted that flat roofs could be problematic. He was therefore pleased with the proposed pitched roof design. It was not up to the Committee to presume whether the property might become a HMO and so with the assurance from officers, Councillor Lethbridge was satisfied with the proposals.

Councillor Conway accepted that the property would be improved visually but could not understand why the applicant wanted to extend the property if it was to remain as a 6 bed let.

Resolved: "That the application be approved subject to the conditions detailed within the report".

d DM/15/01743/FPA – Cheveley House, Brackendale Road, Belmont, Durham

The Committee considered a report of the Senior Planning Officer regarding the demolition of care home and construction of 26 dwellings and associated works at Cheveley House, Brackendale Road, Belmont, Durham (for copy see file of Minutes).

The Senior Planning Officer provided the Committee with a detailed presentation which included photographs of the site and a plan of the proposed layout. Members of the Committee had visited the site and were familiar with the location and setting.

Councillor Conway moved approval of the application. While he recognised that there had been previous objection from local residents, he was satisfied that many concerns had been settled throughout the consultation process. The site was in real need of attention and the proposals would greatly improve the appearance of the site.

Councillor Moir seconded the motion for approval. While it had been regrettable that Cheveley House had closed as a care home, there had been significant problems

with the building. The proposed development would be attractive and Councillor Moir welcomed the S106 proposals and the 20% affordable housing.

Resolved: “That the application be approved subject to the conditions detailed within the report”.

e DM/15/02242/FPA – Land South of 58 Cuthbert Avenue, Sherburn Road Estate, Durham

The Committee considered a report of the Senior Planning Officer regarding the development of 16 no. houses, 23 parking bays and new adopted turning head at land south of 58 Cuthbert Avenue, Sherburn Road Estate, Durham (for copy see file of Minutes).

The Senior Planning Officer provided the Committee with a detailed presentation which included photographs of the site and a plan of the proposed layout.

Councillor Conway moved approval of the application. The site had previously been a residential area however was now an eyesore, he was therefore delighted that it was to be returned to housing. Furthermore he welcomed the level of affordable housing which was to be provided.

Councillor Moir seconded the motion for approval. Four Housing already had a proven track record in the area and so he was happy to support the application.

Resolved: “That the application be approved subject to the conditions detailed within the report”.

f DM/15/02400/FPA – Grampian House, Grampian Drive, Peterlee, SR8 2LR

The Committee considered a report of the Senior Planning Officer regarding the demolition of existing care home building and construction of 55 bedroom care home with associated landscaping and car parking at Grampian House, Grampian Drive, Peterlee, SR8 2LR (for copy see file of Minutes).

The Senior Planning Officer provided the Committee with a detailed presentation which included photographs of the site and a plan of the proposed layout.

Councillor A Laing moved approval of the application. The applicant had a proven track record for developing high quality care homes and so the proposals were welcomed. Councillor Lethbridge seconded the motion for approval.

Resolved: “That the application be approved subject to the conditions detailed within the report”.

This page is intentionally left blank

COMMITTEE REPORT

APPLICATION DETAILS

APPLICATION NO:	DM/15/02572/FPA
FULL APPLICATION DESCRIPTION:	Erection of part two-storey/part single-storey extension at side and rear of dwelling and erection of first floor extension to front.
NAME OF APPLICANT:	Mr A Blair
ADDRESS:	Southernwood, 17 Quarryheads Lane, Durham, DH1 3DY
ELECTORAL DIVISION:	Elvet and Gilesgate
CASE OFFICER:	Lisa Morina Planning Officer 03000 264877 lisa.morina@durham.gov.uk

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND PROPOSALS

The Site

1. The application site is a two-storey detached residential property located on the north side of the street approximately 140m west of the busy road junction at Quarryheads Lane, Church Street Head, Stockton Road and South Road. The property is located within the Durham City Centre Conservation Area and is sited within an area where the character changes from dense urban to semi-rural with a mixture of larger properties.

The Proposal

2. This application seeks the erection of a first floor bedroom and ensuite extension at the front of the house above the existing dining room, an extension to the eastern side of the dwelling to provide a garage and study at ground floor with an en-suite and dressing area above within the roof space with dormers to the front and rear, and extensions to the rear of the site at both two-storey and single-storey levels. The application originally proposed a full two-storey extension to the side and a detached garage in the front garden area, however, the proposals have been amended at the request of planning officers.
3. This application is being referred to the planning committee at the request of Cllr Ormerod due to the proposal having an adverse effect on the conservation area, views through to the peninsula and on neighbouring properties.

PLANNING HISTORY

4. There is no relevant planning history on this site.

PLANNING POLICY

NATIONAL POLICY:

5. The Government has consolidated all planning policy statements, guidance notes and many circulars into a single policy statement, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), although the majority of supporting Annexes to the planning policy statements are retained. The overriding message is that new development that is sustainable should go ahead without delay. It defines the role of planning in achieving sustainable development under three topic headings – economic, social and environmental, each mutually dependant.
6. The presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in the NPPF requires local planning authorities to approach development management decisions positively, utilising twelve 'core planning principles'.
7. The following elements are considered relevant to this proposal;
8. NPPF Part 4 – Promoting Sustainable Transport. Encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion. Developments that generate significant movement should be located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes maximised.
9. NPPF Part 7 – Requiring Good Design. The Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment, with good design a key aspect of sustainable development, indivisible from good planning.
10. NPPF Part 12 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment. Working from Local Plans that set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, LPA's should require applicants to describe the significance of the heritage asset affected to allow an understanding of the impact of a proposal on its significance. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Development which will lead to substantial harm or loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, permission should be refused, unless the harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits.

The above represents a summary of the NPPF considered most relevant the full text may be accessed at: <http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/nppf>

LOCAL PLAN POLICY:

City of Durham Local Plan

11. Policy E3 (World Heritage Site – Protection) sets out that development should be restricted to safeguard local and long distance views to and from the cathedral and castle and peninsula
12. Policy E6 (Durham City Conservation Area) sets out the Council's aim to preserve the character, appearance and setting of the Durham City Conservation Area by ensuring high quality design.
13. Policy E22 (conservation Areas) sets out that the authority seeks to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area by ensuring that development proposal should be sensitive in terms of siting, scale, design and materials where appropriate reflecting existing architectural features

14. Policy Q1 (Design) sets out that the layout and design of all new development should take into account the requirements of users including personal safety and crime prevention and the access needs of everybody including people with needs of disabilities.
15. Policy T1 (General transport Policy) requires all development to protect highway safety and/or have no significant effect on the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring properties.
16. Policy T10 (Parking – General Provision) states that vehicles parking should be limited in amount, so as to promote sustainable transport choices and reduce the land-take of development.
17. Policy Q9 (Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties) state that extensions will only be approved when they met a set of specific criteria for example, including impact on residential amenity of neighbours and impact on streetscene.

RELEVANT EMERGING POLICY

The County Durham Plan

18. Paragraph 216 of the NPPF says that decision-takers may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to: the stage of the emerging plan; the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies; and, the degree of consistency of the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the NPPF. The County Durham Plan was submitted for Examination in Public and a stage 1 Examination concluded. An Interim Report was issued by an Inspector dated 15 February 2015, however that report was Quashed by the High Court following a successful Judicial Review challenge by the Council. As part of the High Court Order, the Council has withdrawn the CDP from examination. In the light of this, policies of the CDP can no longer carry any weight at the present time.

CONSULTATION AND PUBLICITY RESPONSES

STATUTORY RESPONSES:

19. County Highways Authority has not offered any objection to this proposal subject to the amendments received.

INTERNAL CONSULTEE RESPONSES:

20. Design and Conservation raises no objection to the proposal given the amendments received.
21. Ecology - The Bat Risk Assessment indicated low risk of works impacting on bats or a bat roost, no further survey work is therefore required. If planning permission is granted then condition compliance with the working methodology in the bat consultant's report is required.

PUBLIC RESPONSES:

22. The application has been advertised with a press notice and on site by way of a site notice and neighbouring residents were also notified individually of the proposed development. At the time of report preparation, 5 letters of representation have been received from neighbouring properties and 1 letter from a consultant on behalf of a neighbour.

23. An objection has also been raised from the City of Durham Trust and the Elvet Residents Association.

24. The issues raised are as follows:

- No pre-application has been sought from the Council
- The gaps between the buildings allow significant views towards the World Heritage Site and the Cathedral and the wooded river gorge provides a green backcloth to Quarryheads Lane which greatly enhances the individual and collective setting of the dwellings in this area. This will be lost by the extension which will close off these views adversely affecting the character and appearance of the area and the conservation area in which the property is sited.
- The addition of the double garage in the front garden area will destroy the building line and the green frontage to the buildings which is a characteristic of the area and the extensions to the front would also not be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area.
- The development massively overwhelms the existing dwelling so that there would be none of the original character remaining and is much larger than anything else in Quarryheads Lane.
- The proposal would be overdevelopment of the site by virtue of its scale and design and significantly alter the scale and appearance of the property by around 50%.
- The proposal by virtue of its position, height, size and proximity to no. 18 would be visually dominant and overbearing. Light will be significantly reduced to the windows in the side elevation of the neighbour at no. 18 given the close proximity to the dwelling and what are considered habitable room windows having an adverse impact on the quality of life for the residents. The windows at ground floor are obscurely glazed but do provide a lot of light into the property. The window at first floor is a bedroom/study and the room would become uninhabitable.
- The extension to the rear would extend beyond the rear building lines of either neighbour.
- The proposed cinema room could lead to potential noise issues.
- A wind tunnel could be created between the extension and no. 18.
- The design and materials of the proposal are unacceptable for various reasons
- There is a difference in land levels which makes the proposals worse.
- The use of some of the materials in particular the front fenestration does not respect its intrinsic character.
- The proposal would set a precedent for others.
- An application was refused at no. 19 for reasons of the views of the world heritage site and the Peninsula and the appearance and character of the conservation area.
- The validity of the Ecology report is questioned
- Issues relating to the use of the property as student accommodation have been raised.
- The property is already too big for the site and the proposed extension will make the house look ridiculous compared to its neighbours
- The extension will block views for pedestrians and that of neighbouring properties look out across their front gardens
- Further consultation should have been carried out due to the changes in the scheme as the Council has a Legal Duty to consult in accordance with the Development Management Procedure Order and that it should be carried out on a case by case basis and not just a reduction rule.
- The Council's approach amounts to pre-determination of an application.

Following re-consultation of the amended scheme a further three letters have been received with the following comments as well as a further letter from the City of Durham Trust:

- The removal of the front garage is welcomed however the driveway and turning area is at odds with the character of the area.
- The design of the integral garage will necessitate the driver reversing in and stopping exactly opposite the door into the house in order to exit the vehicle.
- The proposal with respect to scale will be out of keeping with the neighbours and the design and conservation advice is incorrect when mentioning the property is flanked by larger properties.
- The eastern most extension is still going to have an effect on the amenity of the neighbour and there is a clear case of right to light.
- The amendments are not good enough and the detrimental effect the extension will have on the amenity of the immediate neighbours and the quality of the environment has not been considered.
- Extensive issues raised regarding the proposal in relation to the Conservation Area Appraisal and the comments of the Design and Conservation Officer including the impact on the world heritage site, the conservation area and the streetscene.
- The windows in the neighbour's elevation are key sources of light and the proximity of the proposal remains over dominant and is considered to change the standards of amenity to this neighbour to an unacceptable level.
- Further emphasis on the refusal reasons of no. 19 in respect of scale, size, height, position and the impact this will have on no. 18.
- Loss of view between the properties
- The windows in the side elevation of no.18 are habitable and necessary light sources. The first floor room will be left unusable with no natural light.
- The agent has made no mention of the appraisal and doubt raised on the sensitivity of the architect involved.

APPLICANTS/AGENTS STATEMENT:

25. My client being born and raised in Durham is very passionate about the city and holds it in extremely high regard.
26. My client is aware of the responsibility that comes with redevelopment and believes the proposed will make a positive impact on the surrounding area. We have specified high quality, authentic materials to greatly enhance the existing building. For instance, to replace existing UPVC windows with timber and introducing quarried stone cills and lintels.
27. The proposed plans will help bring the house into the 21st century and make it more suitable for modern living. Providing spacious living accommodation whilst also improving the environmental efficiency of the building. Furthermore, it is surely more sustainable to adapt existing housing stock in this way, compared to constructing new build housing on Greenfield sites.
28. The precedent for re-development on Quarryheads Lane has already been set. The proposed plans would simply continue the improvement of the street as seen at numbers 23 and 25.
29. This application has been submitted in the greatest faith. We have listened to the advice given by the planning, conservation and highway officers made changes to

the proposal in line with their comments to achieve a design that they are happy to support and hope the committee will agree that planning permission should be granted.

30. A letter was also received from Roger Lee Planning Limited on behalf of the applicant in response to the objections received from R&K Wood Planning and the occupiers of no. 18 with the following comments:

- The windows are subsidiary to the main windows of other rooms and are in place to obtain additional light into the property. As such, the impact of the extension on the level of amenity into these rooms would not be significant and the fact that there are no windows proposed in the side elevation of the proposed extension will ensure that there are no privacy issues. In reality the extension would actually improve privacy having regard to the existing open arrangement to much of the eastern side of the application property. In this respect we are of the view that the proposals wholly comply with Policy Q9 in terms of protecting privacy.
- There are rendered properties within the street therefore, the suggestion that white render cannot be found is incorrect.
- The double garage has been removed.
- The house with the extensions added to it, would be proportionally in scale and would appropriately reflect the mix and variation of design and materials along the Lane. The reference to a 50% increase in the volume of the property does not carry any specific implications – there is no limit on the size of extension in urban situations like this.
- The concerns expressed about the impact on the world heritage site are misplaced and it is noted that the Council's conservation officer finds no fault with the amended plans.
- The concerns expressed about the ecological impact are also misplaced as the Council's ecologist accepts the findings and recommendations of the bat survey.
- The draft Conservation Area Appraisal, but this is a consultation document only at this stage and no weight can be given to it in the decision making process. We note that this view is shared by Mr Hall in his revised comments.
- The points raised in Mr Orr's letter, the context of the quotations from the consultation comments of the conservation officer, Lee Hall, dated 5 October are not accurately set out however, notwithstanding this all these points have subsequently been addressed in the amended plans and we note that Mr Hall has now responded positively on the application.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS AND ASSESSMENT

31. Having regard to the requirements of Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 the relevant Development Plan policies, relevant guidance and all other material planning considerations, including representations received, it is considered that the main planning issues in this instance relate to the principle of the development, the impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties, highway safety issues, impact on the amenity of the area, ecology issues and any other issues.

Principle of the Development

32. The application is proposed as an extension to a residential property as such the principle of the development is considered acceptable as extensions are considered

acceptable to dwellings in accordance with policy Q9 of the Local Plan subject to relevant criteria being met.

33. Concern has been raised that the property could be considered as a student let, however, there is no indication of this and the property has not been previously occupied for this use, therefore, the Council has no reason to believe that there will be a change of use. However, any future change of use would have to be investigated if and when it occurred, having regard to permitted development rights for changes from C3(dwellinghouse) to C4 (small HMO).

Impact on residential amenity

34. Objections have been raised that the proposed extensions, due to their positions, would have a significant negative impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties in particular no.18 which would result in a significant loss of quality of life to these residents, and that there is a change in land levels which further impacts on the outlook of the development.
35. The extension to the front and the rear extensions are considered to be located in positions which are not considered to cause a significant loss of amenity to the neighbouring properties through overshadowing or loss of light issues. Concern was raised over the fact that the extensions would extend beyond the rear building line of both neighbours, however, such extensions are typical on rear elevations and they are considered to be located in a position where they would not have a detrimental impact on the neighbours. The proposals are located some 6m from the gable elevation of the neighbour to the west with the neighbours to the east being located in excess of 10m from the front extension, with the rear extensions not extending beyond the existing single-storey building line of this neighbour and the two-storey elements being located around 4m from the neighbour.
36. The extension to the side was originally proposed as a two-storey extension along the common boundary. Given the position of habitable room windows in the side elevation of the neighbour at no. 18, this element was considered unacceptable and amendments were sought.
37. The proposed side extension has been amended to reduce the overall roof height and set the extension back behind the existing window at first floor level which is considered to be a habitable room window. Although it is acknowledged that some loss of amenity may still occur, this is not considered sufficient enough to warrant a refusal of this application. This is due to the fact that the proposal is not now directly in front of the window in question and is set back from this window. In addition to this, the roof line has been set down significantly. Based on this amendment, there will no longer be an unacceptable level of visual intrusion or overshadowing.
38. Overlooking issues are not considered to occur given there are no windows located on the side elevations other than an en-suite window in the side elevation facing no. 16, however, this will be conditioned to be obscurely glazed. The dressing room window which will be in close proximity to the bedroom/study window at no. 18 will also be conditioned to be obscurely glazed and with part of the glazing fixed in order to prevent overlooking issues from occurring to the neighbour at no. 18.
39. The windows at ground floor level in the side elevation of no. 18 are obscurely glazed and secondary or non habitable room windows, therefore, the proposals are not considered to cause a significant loss of light into these rooms given there are other windows which serve both the dining room/second living area and a kitchen.

40. Concern was also raised that the cinema room proposed would give rise to noise issues; however amendments have been received which remove this element in favour of a garage being provided along the side elevation, therefore, this issue is no longer considered relevant. A further concern was that a wind tunnel would be created. While the proposal would reduce the current gap between the properties, this would not affect amenity to such a degree as to justify refusal. In addition, the amendments to the proposal have reduced the scale of the new gable wall facing No. 18.
41. Given the amendments received, it is considered that the proposal represents a development which is not considered to have a significant detrimental impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties as a significant loss of light/amenity is not considered to occur to either neighbour.
42. The application is therefore considered an appropriate addition in relation to policy Q9 of the Local Plan with regards to impact upon amenity of adjoining neighbours.

Highway Safety Issues

43. The Highways Officer has offered no objection to the scheme however commented that they felt that an improved turning area could be provided on the site.
44. Amendments have been provided to which the highways officer raises no objection, therefore, the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of highway safety.

Impact on the visual amenity of the area.

45. As the property is located within the Durham (City Centre) Conservation Area and falls within the setting of Durham Cathedral and Castle World Heritage Site, the application should be assessed against Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 which requires the proposal to either preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
46. Concerns were raised by objectors that the proposal results in a development which is out of keeping with the host property by overdeveloping the site, the impacts on the conservation area in which it is sited and would spoil views of the world heritage site given the extension to the side and the detached garage proposed in the front garden area. This was considered by objectors to create a development not in keeping with the area and significantly affecting the character and appearance of the conservation area.
47. The detached garage has been removed from the application as officers also considered it would have a detrimental impact upon the streetscene and the conservation area in which the property is located. The extension remains set back from the front boundary line, in line with the current front building line at ground floor level.
48. The proposal as it currently stands does substantially increase the size of the property, however, this is not considered by officers to be excessive and would result in creating a building which is comparative in scale and size to the surrounding built form particularly given the two properties either side of the proposal are larger than the host property. The overall massing is considered to be broken up given the differing roof heights. In addition to this, lateral spread is not considered to occur given the property currently extends boundary to boundary albeit the garage is at

single-storey level. The increase in height of the extensions proposed still sits below the height of the main roof.

49. Although the extensions are considered appropriate, concern was raised by officers over the materials, and amendments have been sought which change the materials. They are now considered more appropriate with timber windows being installed and roof and walling materials matching. Render is also being introduced and whilst concern has been raised by objectors regarding the use of render and that there is no precedent within this area, this is not considered to be the case. Other properties within the street do contain render and this would also help to mask the various phases of brickwork. The proposal is not considered overdevelopment of the site given the plot size and the size of the dwelling sitting comfortably within this.
50. The proposal is, therefore, considered acceptable in terms of its relationship with the host property.
51. Turning to the impact on the streetscene/conservation area, as stated above, the proposal is considered to result in a development which brings the property in line in terms of size with neighbouring properties and the existing property is considered to have a neutral impact on the conservation area, therefore is more adaptable to changes. The use of render is considered to mask unsightly brickwork matches and is in keeping with others within Quarryheads Lane which have been rendered in the past. The materials changes are considered acceptable and the proposal would result in the merging of contemporary/traditional design features which is considered to make a positive contribution to the streetscene and the conservation area in which the property is sited thereby enhancing the conservation area.
52. Concern has also been raised by objectors that the proposal given the two-storey height extension would infill the gap between the host and no.18 and that this would reduce the views of the World Heritage Site and the Cathedral and remove views of the wooded river gorge.
53. Para 132 of the NPPF states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional. Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monument, protected wreck sites, battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.
54. The gaps between the existing buildings along the north side of the street are an important characteristic of the area as they allow views through towards Durham Cathedral. The side extension would naturally intrude upon the present gap and view through due to its sheer presence, but increasing the height and extent of the building will not interrupt views significantly, with the historic woodland still visible as the backdrop above the ridge line of the new addition.
55. There are no direct views to the Cathedral from this gap whilst the trees are in leaf, however, now that the leaves have fallen there is actually a view between the application site and the neighbouring dwelling, no.18, of Durham Cathedral's Central Tower

56. An impressive view of the Cathedral can be gained across the playing fields at the east end of Quarryhead's Lane, but when travelling along the street the level of visibility and significance of the views diminish. Between the application site and the neighbouring property the Cathedral Tower is still greatly shielded by the tree cover on the edge of the River Wear Gorge, and the view here cannot be described as being principle, significant or complete, as it represents only a fleeting snap-shot gained in one direction walking west-east along the footpath in front of the property. Users of the footpath on the opposite side of the road would similarly only benefit from brief glimpsed views when passing the site.
57. The side extension would intrude but only to a minor degree on what is a low key partial view, as such the resultant level of impact on the setting of Durham World Heritage Site and Durham City Centre Conservation Area as designated heritage assets would be insubstantial, accommodating negligible effects which would actually only occur during certain times of the year.
58. Given this, it is considered that the impact of the proposed side extension would be insubstantial on the view and the setting of the World Heritage Site and is not considered to contravene the NPPF or saved local plan policy seeking to safeguard the World Heritage Site and its setting
59. It is acknowledged that a property two doors away in the same row, No. 19, has had an application refused for loss of views of the Cathedral. However, it is not considered that the current situation affords the same views from a public viewpoint. The gap between no. 18 and no. 19 is considered to provide a significant view of the Cathedral which should be protected. This is not considered to be the case for this current gap based on the reasons above.
60. Concern has been raised by objectors that the proposal has not been formally assessed correctly by the conservation officer and planning officer in respect of the impact of the area taking into account the Conservation Area Appraisal. The appraisal is currently in draft format only and currently going through public consultation and therefore, weight cannot be given to this as part of the planning proposal. In addition to this, it is considered that the above paragraphs set out the views of the relevant officers and that this has been assessed in an appropriate way.

Ecology Issues

61. Questions have been raised that the accompanying bat report may not be accurate and correct; however, the Ecology team have commented on this application and have raised no concerns providing a condition is added for the works to be carried out in accordance with the method section of the report.

Other Issues

62. Concern has been raised by objectors that the proposal would set a precedent for others. However, each application is dealt with on its own merits.
63. Concern has also been raised that pre-application advice has not been received from the Council prior to the submission of the application. Although this service is available it is not a requirement that this is carried out and this is at the applicant/agent's own choice and is not a legitimate reason to refuse an application. It should be noted that failure to seek pre-application advice has not prevented planning officers from negotiating amendments to the initial scheme, partly to reduce potential adverse impacts on the neighbouring property.

64. A further re-consultation procedure was carried out which allowed objectors to comment further on the amended scheme submitted. Legal duties in terms of consultation under the Order have therefore, been met.
65. Comments were made to an objector that if the scheme was to be amended to reduce the impact then the proposal would be likely to be recommended for approval. It is not felt that this is pre-determination of an application, only an officer's informal opinion of what is an acceptable scheme. Indeed, the application is before the planning committee for consideration and determination.

CONCLUSION

66. The proposed developments for an extension to a residential property are considered acceptable in principle given its current use. The proposal is also considered to be in keeping within the existing area and is not considered to have a significant detrimental impact on the surrounding residents. It is considered to have a positive impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area in which it is sited, in accordance with the requirements of local policies and Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 that development should preserve or enhance the Conservation Area.
67. The views of the World Heritage Site and wooded areas are not considered to be negatively impacted upon.
68. Highway Safety issues are not considered to be an issue as suitable off-street parking has been provided.
69. As such, it is considered that the proposed development would be in accordance with saved policies E3, E6, E22, T1, T10, Q1 and Q9 of the City of Durham Local Plan and parts 1, 4 and 12 of the NPPF.

RECOMMENDATION

That the application be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions;

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in strict accordance with the following approved plans:

Plan Ref No.	Description	Date Received
015/041/1/PD/REV C	Proposed Plans and Elevations	26 October 2015
015/041/1/LP/REV C	Site Plan and Location Plan	26 October 2015
None	Bat Survey Report Prepared by Peter	14 Sept 2015

Reason: To define the consent and ensure that a satisfactory form of development is obtained in accordance with policies E6, E22, T1, T10, Q1, Q9 and H9 of the City of Durham District Local Plan.

3. Notwithstanding any details of materials submitted with the application no development shall commence until samples of the external walling and roofing materials, window details and render colour and texture have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of the appearance of the area and to comply with policies E6, E22, T1, T10, Q1, Q9 and H9 of the City of Durham District Local Plan.

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or in any Statutory Instrument revoking or re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no further windows or other openings shall be formed in the side elevations of any of the extensions approved by this application facing east towards no.18 Quarryheads Lane and west towards no. 16 Quarryheads Lane without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority upon an application submitted to it.

Reason - In order that the Local planning authority may exercise further control in this locality in the interests of the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties and to comply with policy Q9 of the City of Durham District Local Plan.

5. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order) the glass to be used in the window located at first floor level housing the en-suite in the side elevation facing west towards no. 16 Quarryheads Lane shall be obscure to level 3 or higher of the Pilkington scale of privacy or equivalent as may be previously agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the privacy of the neighbouring occupier and to comply with Policy Q9 of the City of Durham District Local Plan.

6. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order) the dressing room window located at first floor level on the front of the extension at the east side of the dwelling shall be of fixed pane design with no opening elements, and the glass in this window shall be obscure to level 3 or higher of the Pilkington scale of privacy or equivalent. These requirements shall apply in perpetuity for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: In the interests of the privacy of the neighbouring occupier and to comply with Policy Q9 of the City of Durham District Local Plan.

7. Notwithstanding the details shown on the submitted application the works shall be carried out in complete accordance with the working method section of the Bat Survey Report Prepared by Peter Middleton dated 5 Sept 2015 .

Reason - To conserve protected species and their habitat in accordance with Section 11 of the NPPF.

STATEMENT OF PROACTIVE ENGAGEMENT

In dealing with the application, the Local Planning Authority has worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner based on seeking solutions to problems arising during the application process.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

- Submitted Application Forms, Plans and supporting documentation
- City of Durham Local Plan 2004
- National Planning Policy Framework
- Internal consultee responses
- Public responses
- Responses from statutory and other consultees
- National Planning Policy Guidance

<p>Durham County Council</p> <p>Planning Services</p>	<p>Erection of part two-storey/part single-storey extension at side and rear of dwelling and erection of first floor extension to front at Southernwood, 17 Quarryheads Lane, Durham, DH1 3DY Application reference DM/15/02572/FPA</p>
<p>This map is based upon Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of Her Majesty's Stationary Office © Crown copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceeding. Durham County Council Licence No. 100022202 2005</p>	
<p>Date October 2015</p>	

This page is intentionally left blank

COMMITTEE REPORT

APPLICATION DETAILS

APPLICATION NO:	DM/15/03050/AD
FULL APPLICATION DESCRIPTION:	Display of 9 internally illuminated fascia signs, a 5.885metre totem sign, a welcome sign and a directional sign.
NAME OF APPLICANT:	Mr Adrian Mitchison
ADDRESS:	Bristol Street Motors, Pity Me, Durham.
ELECTORAL DIVISION:	Framwellgate and Newton Hall
CASE OFFICER:	Susan Hyde, Planning Officer, 03000 263961 susan.hyde@durham.gov.uk

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND PROPOSALS

1. Bristol Street Motors is an established Vauxhall car dealership garage located to the south of the Arnison Shopping Centre. The site lies within an established employment area in the settlement of Pity Me. The garage fronts onto Abbey Road and exhibits an existing totem sign, directional sign and fascia signs on the building.
2. Advertisement consent is sought for new signage on the garage which replaces the existing totem sign and directional sign and introduces different fascia signs on the garage.
3. The application is being reported to Committee at the request of Framwellgate Moor Parish Council due to parking problems associated with the garage.

PLANNING HISTORY

4. Planning consent granted in 2011 for the erection and display of 10 no. 5m high advertisement flagpoles to front of existing car showroom.
5. Planning consent was granted in 2014 for alterations to the front elevation to create extra floor space to the existing showroom area.

PLANNING POLICY

NATIONAL POLICY

6. The Government has consolidated all planning policy statements, guidance notes and many circulars into a single policy statement, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), although the majority of supporting Annexes to the planning policy statements are retained. The overriding message is that new development that is sustainable should go

ahead without delay. It defines the role of planning in achieving sustainable development under three topic headings – economic, social and environmental, each mutually dependant.

7. The presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in the NPPF requires local planning authorities to approach development management decisions positively, utilising twelve 'core planning principles'.

8. In accordance with paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework, the weight to be attached to relevant saved local plan policy will depend upon the degree of consistency with the NPPF. The greater the consistency, the greater the weight. The relevance of this issue is discussed, where appropriate, in the assessment section of the report below.

9. The following elements of the NPPF are considered relevant to this proposal;

10. Part 1 - The Government is committed to securing economic growth in order to create jobs and prosperity, building on the country's inherent strengths, and to meeting the twin challenges of global competition and of a low carbon future.

11. Paragraphs 67-68- Control over outdoor advertisements should be efficient, effective and simple in concept and operation. Only those advertisements which will clearly have an appreciable impact on a building or on their surroundings should be subject to the local planning authority's detailed assessment. Advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts.

LOCAL PLAN POLICY

12. Policy Q16 (Adverts) seeks to ensure that advertisements are suitably designed and do not have an adverse impact on visual amenity or highway safety. Particular attention will be paid to the impact they may have upon the character and setting of listed buildings and the character and appearance of conservation areas.

RELEVANT EMERGING POLICY

13. The County Durham Plan

Paragraph 216 of the NPPF says that decision-takers may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to: the stage of the emerging plan; the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies; and, the degree of consistency of the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the NPPF. The County Durham Plan was submitted for Examination in Public and a stage 1 Examination concluded. An Interim Report was issued by an Inspector dated 15 February 2015, however that report was quashed by the High Court following a successful Judicial Review challenge by the Council. As part of the High Court Order, the Council has withdrawn the CDP from examination. In the light of this, policies of the CDP can no longer carry any weight at the present time.

CONSULTATION AND PUBLICITY RESPONSES

STATUTORY RESPONSES:

14. Highway Officer – Has raised no objection to the proposal.

INTERNAL CONSULTEE RESPONSES:

15. None

PUBLIC RESPONSES:

16. Framwellgate Moor Parish Council object to the application as they consider the application along with other previous ones all contribute to the ongoing and still unresolved parking issues in this vicinity which have been highlighted with Durham County Council on many previous occasions.

APPLICANTS STATEMENT

17. The application for advertisement is to obtain consent to display signs on the Vauxhall garage site. The proposed signs are part of a national image update for the Vauxhall Company; replacing existing signs with their new image signs to incorporate a more unified display of Vauxhall garages. The proposed signs will continue to inform potential customers of the location of the site without it being unappealing to the surrounding area. The proposed advertisements would not have an effect on the on-going parking disputes.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS AND ASSESSMENT

18. As identified in Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 the key consideration in the determination of a planning application is the development plan. Applications should be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The NPPF stipulates that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety. In addition the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 requires Local Planning Authorities to determine applications for advertisement consent in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking into account the provisions of the development plan where material, and any other relevant factors.

Public Safety

19. In relation to public safety, the Highways Authority has been consulted as part of the application and raises no objections. The signs are positioned in order to attract the attention of customers and to inform people of the different operations within the garage site. However the signs are not considered to have an adverse effect as they are satisfactorily positioned on the garage buildings and entrance to the site so that they are not considered to cause a distraction to motorists that would prejudice highway safety.

Amenity

20. The signs are largely replacements of the existing signs on the building. The fascia signs are an appropriate size and design on the building. The totem sign replaces an existing totem sign at the entrance to the site and the amended design, colour and logo is considered appropriate. The amended directional sign is also considered appropriate and replaces an existing directional sign. Therefore, the cumulative effect of the advertisements upon the character and appearance of the area is considered acceptable. These are

established business premises in an existing employment area, and the advertising proposed is considered to be entirely appropriate.

Other Considerations

21. The objection raised by Framwellgate Moor Parish Council relates to their concern that this application along with other previous ones all contribute to the ongoing and still unresolved parking issues in this vicinity. The application submitted is an advertisement application only and the County Highway Officer has clarified that it raises no parking or highway issues. The outstanding concern of the Parish Council with regard to parking is a separate issue to this advertisement application and one that the County Council's Enforcement Officers are currently investigating.

CONCLUSION

22. The proposed signs in the various locations identified are considered to be acceptable in terms of their siting, scale and design. They would not be unduly prominent and are therefore considered to have an acceptable impact on visual amenity of the area and public safety, and the cumulative impact of the signage will not lead to an unacceptable level of clutter on the building.

23. Taking all relevant planning matters into account it is considered that the proposal is acceptable given that it accords with both national and local policy with regard to consideration of proposed advertisements.

RECOMMENDATION

That the application be APPROVED subject to the following conditions;

1. This consent to display the advertisement(s) is for a period of five years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007, and saved policy Q16 of the City of Durham Local Plan.

2. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in strict accordance with the following approved plans. Plan References; 1:1250 Site layout plan, Elevation Plan 1, Elevation Plan 2, Totem Sign and Entrance sign, Sign C and D, Directional Sign, Service icon fascia sign. All signs validated on the 9th October 2015.

Reason: To define the consent and ensure that a satisfactory form of development is obtained in accordance with saved policy Q16 of the City of Durham Local Plan.

3. No advertisement is to be displayed without the permission of the owner of the site or any other person with an interest in the site entitled to grant permission.

4. No advertisement shall be sited or displayed so as to —

(a) endanger persons using any highway, railway, waterway, dock, harbour or aerodrome (civil or military);

(b) obscure, or hinder the ready interpretation of, any traffic sign, railway signal or aid to navigation by water or air; or

(c) hinder the operation of any device for the purpose of security or surveillance or for measuring the speed of any vehicle.

5. Any advertisement displayed, and any site used for the display of advertisements, shall be maintained in a condition that does not impair visual amenity.

6. Any structure or hoarding erected or used principally for the purpose of displaying advertisements shall be maintained in a condition that does not endanger the public.

7. Where any advertisement is required under these Regulations to be removed, its removal shall be carried out to the reasonable satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason for conditions 3 - 7: To comply with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007, Part 7 of the NPPF and saved Policy Q16 of the City of Durham Local Plan 2004

STATEMENT OF PROACTIVE ENGAGEMENT

The Local Planning Authority in arriving at its decision to approve the application has, without prejudice to a fair and objective assessment of the proposals, issues raised and representations received, sought to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner with the objective of delivering high quality sustainable development to improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area in accordance with the NPPF. (Statement in accordance with Article 35(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.)

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Submitted application form, plans, supporting documents and subsequent information provided by the applicant.

The National Planning Policy Framework

National Planning Practice Guidance Notes

City of Durham Local Plan 2004

Statutory, internal and public consultation responses

Emerging County Durham Plan

