

## DURHAM COUNTY COUNCIL

At a Meeting of **Area Planning Committee (Central and East Durham)** held in Council Chamber, Easington Council Offices on **Tuesday 1 February 2011 at 1.00 pm**

### **Present:**

**Councillor C Walker (Chair)**

### **Members of the Committee:**

Councillors J Bailey, J Blakey, G Bleasdale, M Dixon, S Iveson, R Liddle and M Plews

### **Apologies:**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors A Bell, J Brown, J Moran and K Thompson

### **1 Minutes of the Last Meeting held on 11 January 2011.**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 11 January 2011 were confirmed as a correct record by the committee and signed by the Chair.

### **2 Declarations of Interest (if any).**

Councillor Dixon declared a prejudicial interest in Application 4/10/898/FPA and withdrew from the Meeting during consideration thereof.

### **3 Applications to be determined by the Area Planning Committee (Central & East Durham).**

#### **(a) PL/5/2010/0525 – Walkers Snack Foods (Distribution) Ltd, Stephenson Road, Peterlee, SR8 4AX High Bay Extension to Distribution Centre**

Consideration was given to the report of the Principal Planning Officer (Easington Area Office) which recommended the application for approval. The Principal Planning Officer explained that Members had visited the site that day, and gave a detailed presentation on the main issues outlined in the report.

Councillor Dixon indicated that the development was large which would impact on the landscape and he sought clarification on how far discussions had taken place with the type of materials to be used for the external walls as indicated in condition No. 3.

The Principal Planning Officer advised the Committee that large sample boards would be located on site, so that a decision on the materials to be used could be made.

Councillor Liddle asked if Heavy Good Vehicles could use Thorpe Road and not Lowhills Road.

**Resolved:** That the application be **APPROVED** subject to the conditions contained in the report.

- (b) **PL/5/2010/0530 – Mr and Mrs P Wayman, Tweddle Farm, Fillpoke Lane, Blackhall, TS27 4BT**  
**Additional Facilities to Animal Farm to Include Childrens Amusement Park, Involving Indoor and Outdoor Pedal Go-Kart Tracks, Indoor Play Building, Outdoor Play Equipment and Use of A Former Railway Carriage as Play Area Shelter; Erection of Buildings, Animal Shelters and Pens Associated With the Keeping of Domestic Farm Animals and Non-Exotic Animals and Native Bird Species; Enlargement of Existing Ponds, Provision of Associated Visitor Facilities Including Cafe, Gift Shop and Additional Visitor Car Parking (Retrospective)**

Consideration was given to the report of the Principal Planning Officer (Easington Area Office) which recommended the application for approval. The Principal Planning Officer explained that Members had visited the site that day, and gave a detailed presentation on the main issues outlined in the report.

Mr Robinson an objector indicated that the access road to Tweddle Farm was a shared access and as a result of the volume of traffic compromised it's use. The original application was for 30 – 40 vehicles a week but this has now increased to 100 vehicles a day. Concerns of Health and Safety on the road were raised as the road was not adequate for buses and the volume of traffic. He also raised concerns with the various buildings which did not fit into the rural environment and had been constructed on an ad hoc basis. He referred to the previous permission which stated that no further buildings be placed on site but the applicants had ignored this condition.

Mr Bird an objector who lived in the adjacent farm spoke in addition to the letter he had submitted. He indicated that at the time of the original application he did not object but vehicles to the site were now in excess of 300 a day and that the opening times were now longer and there was extra traffic and noise. He said that the animal shelter looked like a dolls house and the buildings could be seen from the main road and rail line. He raised great concerns with the road in particular that vehicles were unable to pass as the road was narrow. He asked that the council take control or it would end up an amusement park in the countryside.

The Principal Planning Officer indicated that Highways had undertaken an assessment and offered comments on this basis. He indicated that the buildings reflected the different activities and were acceptable and appropriate in scale. This was partly an unauthorised development that the applicants were seeking to address. He asked that the recommendation should be amended to include that a Section 106 agreement as referred to in the report be completed before planning approval was issued.

Mr Scorer speaking on behalf of the applicant indicated that the zoo was not under consideration and that there was no problem with the Section 106 agreement. He advised the Committee that the applicants had financed everything they owned for the development but they admitted that they had made some errors which was why they had submitted the planning application to regulate the position. He thanked Officers for their assistance and professional manner and asked that the application be approved.

The Highways Officer indicated that the road was narrow but was capable of dealing with two cars passing each other. They had asked for three passing spaces and some widening of parts of the road and alligator teeth at the entrance and to limit the number of coaches on the site. He also advised the committee that there had been no recorded accidents on this road and from a Highways point of view the site was acceptable.

Members raised concerns at retrospective applications and enforcement.

Councillor Plews sought clarification on whether the caravan had planning approval. The Principal Planning Officer indicated that the caravan had planning permission but it had now expired.

Councillor Dixon asked how many people were employed and indicated that if the application was approved then it was essential that the car park was moved. The screening put in place and the caravan moved would need also to be enforced.

The Principal Planning Officer advised the Committee that they employed 6 full-time and 30 part-time workers.

**Resolved:** That the application be **APPROVED** subject to the Section 106 agreement referred to and to conditions contained in the report.

**(c) PL/5/2010/0540 – Mr B Armstrong, Land Adjacent the Bungalow, Brackenhill Avenue, Shotton Colliery  
5 No. Dwellings and Associated Works**

Consideration was given to the report of the Principal Planning Officer (Easington Area Office) which recommended the application for approval. The Principal Planning Officer explained that Members had visited the site that day, and gave a detailed presentation on the main issues outlined in the report.

Councillor Blakey asked if a condition could be imposed that the vegetation be removed before works commenced.

The Principal Planning Officer advised the Committee that this would normally be appropriate before occupancy and that site traffic would not warrant removal of the vegetation.

Councillor Dixon raised concerns that distance standards had not been achieved.

The Principal Planning Officer advised the Committee that these were only guidelines, they do try to achieve the standards in all cases but it was difficult to achieve without compromise on this particular site given its size and shape. There were overriding benefits in developing the site. The distances were not significantly sub-standard and would not impact on adjacent residents, it would be properties within the site.

**Resolved:** That the application be **APPROVED** subject to the conditions contained in the report.

- (d) 4/10/00812/VOC – Crosby Homes Yorkshire Ltd, Sheraton House, Sheraton Park, Darlington Road, Nevilles Cross, Durham  
Variation of condition 10 of planning permission 4/10/223 to enable provision of alternative construction site access arrangements**

Consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Durham City Area Office) which recommended the application for approval. The Development Control Manager gave a detailed presentation on the main issues outlined in the report.

**Resolved:** That the application be **APPROVED** subject to the conditions contained in the report.

- (e) 4/10/00845/FPA – Mr S Williams, Land west of 4 South Terrace, Framwellgate Moor, Durham  
Erection of 2 no. dwellings with associated parking together with upgrading of access from Front Street**

Consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Durham City Area Office) which recommended the application for approval. The Development Control Manager gave a detailed presentation on the main issues outlined in the report.

**Resolved:** That the application be **APPROVED** subject to the conditions contained in the report.

- (f) 4/10/00891/FPA and 4/10/00892/LB – St. John's College, Durham University, Land to Rear of 4, 5, 6 and 7 South Bailey, Durham  
Demolition of existing Library Building and Erection of 2 no. Two and a Half Storey Student Accommodation Blocks (66 rooms) to Rear of Existing University Accommodation with Associated Works to Existing Buildings**

Consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Durham City Area Office) which recommended the application for approval. The Development Control Manager explained that Members had visited the site that day, and gave a detailed presentation on the main issues outlined in the report.

Mr Brown the agent indicated that they were aware that the site was sensitive and that they understood concerns. They were grateful of the time given by Officers and the way Officers treated them was exemplary.

Councillor Dixon indicated that this development would help alleviate the problems of students occupying houses in the city centre and as the rooms would be let outside of term time it would contribute to the economy.

Councillor Blakey raised concerns that the development would create a gap in the Grade II listed wall.

The Development Control Manager advised the Committee that the wall was a Grade II\* and that the gap would be created sensitively. English Heritage had not raised any concerns and as it was a listed building it would be extremely precise in the level of detail.

Mr Brown the agent advised the Committee that it was a Grade II not a Grade II\*.

Councillor Plews asked what would happen if something of archaeological interest was found. The Development Control Manager indicated there were clear mechanisms in place for archaeology to be involved.

**Resolved:** (i) That the application for planning permission (4/10/00891) be **APPROVED** subject to the conditions contained in Appendix A to the report.

(ii) The Members be **MINDED TO APPROVE** the application for **listed building consent** (4/10/00892) subject to the conditions contained in Appendix B to the report.

**(g) 4/10/00898/FPA – Mr J Collinson, 3 Smith Close, Sherburn Village, Durham, DH6 1RG  
Erection of Two Storey Pitched Roof Extension to Front of Existing Dwelling (Revised and Resubmitted)**

Consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Durham City Area Office) which recommended the application for approval. The Development Control Manager explained that Members had visited the site that day, and gave a detailed presentation on the main issues outlined in the report.

Mrs Davidson speaking in objection to the proposal indicated that she had concerns with regard to the parking of vehicles on the site in particular the caravan and the impact the extension would have on sunlight to her property. She asked if the Council could impose a condition that the caravan be parked elsewhere as she believed the applicant would continue to park the caravan at his property which would be up against her fence which was next to her conservatory. She went on to say that her neighbouring property had a high apex roof and she felt if this proposal was approved she would be blocked in on both sides.

The Development Control Manager advised the Committee that the proposal would still provide parking for 2 vehicles on site which was the required number. With

regard to the loss of light, while on site this was looked at, and the distances that would be available were such that it was not expected to result in a loss of light to justify refusal of the application. The extension would be set below the ridge line which further helped minimise its visual impact. Planning permission was not normally required to store a caravan in your own curtilage but he could see why this could give rise to concern. The applicant had agreed to store the caravan off site but he suggested that if members approve the application then a further condition be added to limit the period of time the caravan could be stored at the property.

Members agreed that an extra condition limiting the period of time the caravan could be stored be added and asked if the boat could also be included in this condition.

Members were advised that the boat was much smaller than the caravan and it was proposed to store the boat in the garage.

**Resolved:** That the application be **APPROVED** subject to the conditions contained in the report and the inclusion of an extra condition limiting the period the caravan could be stored at the property.

#### **4 Appeal Update.**

##### **Appeals Received**

The Principal Planning Officer (Easington Area Office) gave details in relation to the following appeals which had been lodged with the Planning Inspectorate.

**(i) Appeal by Mr D Middlemiss  
Site at Seaton Nurseries, Seaton Lane, Seaham, Co. Durham,  
SR7 0LT  
Planning Reference – PL/5/2010/0306**

An appeal had been lodged against the Council's refusal of outline planning permission for residential dwellings with all matters reserved at the above site.

Planning permission was refused as it was considered that the proposal would result in residential development outside the established settlement boundaries as identified in the District of Easington Local Plan and had limited access to community facilities, shops and public transport.

The appeal was to be dealt with by means of written representation, and members would be informed of the outcome in due course.

**(ii) Appeal by Mr J Oliver  
Site at Hastings House Farm, Littleton, Durham, DH6 1QB  
Planning Reference – PL/5/2010/0442**

An appeal had been lodged against the Council for the non-determination of an application for the change of use from office accommodation and canteen

building to include agricultural worker's accommodation and associated alterations to elevations at the above site.

The appeal was to be dealt with by means of written representations, and members would be informed of the outcome in due course.