

## **DURHAM COUNTY COUNCIL**

At a Meeting of **County Planning Committee** held in **Council Chamber, County Hall, Durham** on **Tuesday 6 June 2023** at **9.30 am**

**Present:**

**Councillor G Richardson (Chair)**

**Members of the Committee:**

Councillors A Bell (Vice-Chair), D Boyes, J Higgins, P Jopling, C Marshall, C Martin, M McKeon, I Roberts, K Shaw, A Simpson, S Wilson, S Zair, M Currah and J Elmer

**Also Present:**

Councillor P Heaviside

**1 Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor A Savory.

**2 Substitute Members**

There were no substitute Members in attendance.

**3 Declarations of Interest**

Councillor C Marshall declared that he knew both developers having served time as a Cabinet member.

**4 Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 2 May 2023 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

**5 DM/22/00584/FPA - Land to the North of George Pit Lane, Great Lumley**

The Committee considered a report of the Senior Planning Officer regarding an application for the erection of 148 dwellings with associated access, infrastructure and landscaping on Land to the North of George Pit Lane, Great Lumley (for copy see file of Minutes).

L Ollivere, Senior Planning Officer updated the Committee in respect of refusal reason no. 4 to read the following;

- The application fails to demonstrate that the development would have good access by sustainable modes of transport to services and facilities in Great Lumley contrary to criteria f of policy 6 of the County Durham Plan and Paragraphs 105 and 110 of the NPPF.

The Senior Planning Officer gave a detailed presentation of the application which included a site location plan, aerial photograph, site layout, elevations and photographs of the site. Members had attended a site visit the previous day.

Councillor Heaviside, addressed the Committee as Local Member and also as Chair of Lumley Parish Council. He confirmed that residents had been outraged on social media when the application was first submitted, feelings which remained and were reflected in the number of objections received. A public drop-in session had been arranged with Planning Officers and was attended by 200 residents, most of whom were opposed to the scheme.

The Parish Council had received regular representations from residents relating to the site and had submitted an objection to the application. There were several reasons for refusal which related to policies 6 and 10 of the County Durham Plan (CDP). Councillor Heaviside suggested that Policy 6 had been quoted out of context by the Applicant, which was an excuse to land grab a greenfield site for development. The site in question was used for food production and he questioned whether it could afford to be lost.

Another issue was the footpath provision on Cocken Lane and the S bend into the village to the East. The developer had made assurances that the footpath would be widened, however at Stainmore Drive the property boundaries would not allow this and neither would the narrow road. Further down Cocken Lane the school were already subject to parking issues which would be exacerbated if the school expanded and additional children accommodated. Members who had attended the site the previous day, had observed a near miss incident with a vehicle.

Councillor Heaviside referred the Section 106 contributions which equated to £470k for primary school accommodation for 45 pupils and suggested that this was not enough as a similar building in the village had been erected at a cost of over £2m. Park View Academy had been allocated similar contributions but had been unable to make a single extra classroom place. Due to other large developments in Chester le Street and bordering areas of Sunderland, children from the area were being taken to out of area schools by bus, passing Park View to attend North Durham Academy in Stanley.

There were two bus operators that were running services in the area and the report suggested that a bus could reroute, however Councillor Heaviside suggested that it would be unlikely for operators to drop services to accommodate a bus stop outside of this development.

Councillor Heaviside confirmed that the report was extensive and contained a fair appraisal of the application. Having considered local objections and the content of the report, he supported the recommendation to refuse the application.

Ms M Juniper addressed the Committee on behalf of a group of 60 householders from Great Lumley, who objected to the proposal. The scheme conflicted with CDP Policies 6 and 10. Specific concerns were in relation to the position and density of the development – it was disproportionate and would result in a significant population increase, impacting on already limited services in Great Lumley.

The site encroached into open countryside and would result in loss of agricultural land as well as footpaths and Public Rights of Way that were used for amenity but were also an important habitat for wildlife. With regards to the removal of hedgerows, Ms Juniper considered that the mitigation offered would take years to regenerate.

With regards to the highway safety concerns, Ms Juniper reiterated the dangers on the S bend which often met cars on the wrong side of road and suggested that the scheme would exacerbate existing transport and parking issues.

Mr L Marlow, addressed the Committee in objection to the proposal. The site was not sustainable, there was little employment in the village and a strong reliance on transport to get to work. The site was also situated on top of a hill with four main roads, two of which were inaccessible on foot. The roads were too dangerous for cyclists and there were very little passing places. The suggestion from the developer that they would give all house buyers a £100 voucher towards a bicycle was ludicrous due to location. Mr Marlow supported the comments from Ms Juniper and asked the Committee to reject the application.

N Westwick spoke on behalf of the Applicant and confirmed that over the course of the application, they had worked proactively with the Council and listened and responded positively to feedback. The original application had been for 157 dwellings, since reduced to 148. This was a high-quality mixed development which was policy compliant, with only two outstanding red

scores relating to walking routes. The Applicant had worked to address this by creating improvements such as new bus stops at the site entrance and a commitment to extend or divert the footpath which would be fully funded by the Applicant. There were no outstanding objections from the Highways Authority and the scheme had not yet been back to the design review panel. He considered there to be some inaccuracies in the report and disagreed that the walking distance exceeded acceptable limits as the measure did not account for the shortest walking distance through Millennium Park. With regards to the HSE point about the treatment works, the historic Hazardous Substances Consent was a historic matter and the site fell below the 10% threshold which was an acceptable limit. Mr Westwick highlighted the contributions the scheme would provide for schools and other improvements and it accorded with policies.

The Senior Planning Officer responded to confirm that the land was considered grade 3b which was moderate agricultural land and not the best or most versatile. The loss was not considered to be a significant enough reason to refuse the application so had not been included as a reason for refusal.

In response to concerns raised about the S bend, the Senior Planning Officer confirmed that a new crossing had been proposed as part of the application as well as new footways which were accepted by Highways Officers. Regarding the contributions to education, money was subject to a clause to ensure it was invested in nearest schools if it could not be invested in the schools named. There was new bus provision and it was possible to reroute the bus route, however there was no guarantee that the service would continue after five years when the subsidy provided by the Applicant ended.

With regards to comments raised regarding the lack of employment in the area, the Senior Planning Officer accepted this point, but the issue regarding sustainability was with regards to the lack of services in close proximity to the development.

In response to the comments from Mr Westwick regarding the walking distances, the authority considered the most logical and direct routes in terms of distances and the route through Millennium Park had been discounted.

As an experienced farmer the Chair disagreed with the conclusion that this would not result in the loss of agricultural land. This was a 20 acre site which was suitable for growing forty tonnes of grain in a country that needed food.

Councillor Bell complimented the Officer for the standard of the report. He agreed the development would result in the loss of agricultural land and the assessed walking route was not the best route, however he understood the rationale behind using it. Extending the narrow footpaths to a width of 1.5 m would still fail to comply with national guidance of 1.8m and he highlighted road safety issues on Cocken Lane which had been reported by the school in recent years and prevented continued use of nearby allotments that were frequented. It was not safe to expect children to walk to school, on a route that was dangerous.

Councillor Bell referred to the presentation slide which showed the village boundary and to a recent site that had squared off the village and been fully supported. This extension was unsuitable and would create an unusual boundary, potentially resulting in more development. The site had been assessed in the SHLAA and was not accepted. The Officer's opinion was consistent and confirmed that this was an unsustainable site for housing.

The development would exacerbate issues accessing the nearest secondary school, Park View which was consistently oversubscribed. Recently, 18 children from Lumley had been refused a place and were expected to go much further afield. Park View had been unable to spend contributions previously allocated.

With regards to the rerouting of the bus provision, Councillor Bell considered this an attempt at making the site sustainable. He could not support the application as the site was unsustainable, poorly linked and local residents and Members did not support it. He moved the recommendation to refuse the application for the reasons in the Officer's Report as amended.

Councillor Marshall queried the issues raised by the applicant regarding the statutory responses and the possible changes alluded to which had the potential to sway the decision. He advised that he supported sustainable development, but a lot of time had been spent on the CDP to ensure that the correct development was forthcoming in places where it was needed. This site extended the settlement in the direction of open countryside that didn't fit in with policy 6 and he wanted clarification as to whether there had been any update from consultees.

The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that the response from Landscape was the most up to date position. They had not objected but given several views throughout the application, but whilst it had been confirmed that the application had positively evolved, they had confirmed an incursion into the

countryside to a localised level, and left Planning Officer's to make a judgment.

Referring to the HSE, the Senior Planning Officer confirmed that there had been no further response however they did have concerns regarding substances at Lumley water treatment works and following independent advice from Northumbrian Water, it had been confirmed to relate to historic records. Chlorine was no longer stored on site, however as it was yet to be taken off the register and if the Committee were minded to approve the application, provision would have to be made to notify the HSE so they could consider referral to the Secretary of State.

S Reed, Planning Development Manager gave a detailed explanation regarding how the landscape impact had been assessed by Planning Officers and Policy 6 which included criteria on settlement boundaries and the presentation included a site boundary plan with the existing built area of Great Lumley and its defined settlement. The application clearly sat outside of the settlement boundary and therefore failed to comply with Policy 6. The Officer's had worked positively and proactively with Developers and there were a number of sites which had been assessed under Policy 6 with a more positive outcome however those sites were better related and also in terms of scale and form.

Councillor Marshall seconded the proposal to refuse the application.

Councillor Jopling had concerns about the density of the site, the loss of agricultural land and also the site was outside of the built settlement. She agreed with the Officer's assessment, it was contrary to the CDP and it would impact on wildlife with loss of hedgerows. It was important to listen to Parish Councils, Local Members and residents as they knew their area. Councillor Jopling supported the recommendation.

Councillor Boyes highlighted the necessity of the CDP in order to protect sites which did not accord to the policies within. This site may have been approved without it, similar to a couple of sites in East Durham before it was adopted. He agreed that it did not accord to CDP policies and he thanked locals for the input. When weighing up whether the housing supply outweighed the impacts of the development, this scheme did not.

Councillor Wilson acknowledged the positive aspects of the scheme from the developer, however there were a significant number of issues, the lack of sustainability was a huge issue and he supported the recommendation.

Councillor Higgins had attended the site visit and confirmed that there was an incident with a vehicle. He agreed with the concerns raised, one of the major concerns for him was that of the access which although would be altered, would continue to be hazardous. The site was not accessible for someone without transport, especially those with disabilities who would find it difficult to walk into village to use facilities. He supported the recommendation.

Councillor McKeon advised that she supported the recommendation and referred to the suggestion that an alternative walking route should have been used. She would not walk through a park after dark no matter how well-lit it was and she wanted to highlight the need to consider young women when considering sustainable walking routes.

With regards to the comments from other Members regarding the loss of arable land, she highlighted the difficulties for younger generations to get on the property ladder and that at some point in the future, agricultural land was going to have to be used for development. On this occasion the site that was being considered was not sustainable. She also thanked the residents for attending the Committee and expressing their views.

Councillor Bell referred to the nearby housing estate referred to locally as Stainmore which would be significantly impacted by this development. He thanked Officers for the way that they had dealt with the application and for the drop-in session which had been provided outside of office hours.

Councillor Elmer advised that with regards to basic sustainability, the site was quite a distance and the arrangements of the bus provision depended on subsidy, which raised a question of how it could be sustained. The Council wanted to encourage people to use other methods of transport but this development would force car dependency in order to access services. The incursion into countryside was a clear policy breach and it was important with large applications that the Council did not set a precedent and allow something that was not in accordance with policy. He agreed with the recommendations.

## **Resolved**

That the application be **REFUSED** for the reasons outlined in the report and as amended by the Senior Planning Officer.

**7 DM/22/01981/RM - Land To The East Of Regents Court, Sherburn Road, Durham**

The Committee considered a report of the Principal Planning Officer regarding a reserved matters application for 470 dwellings (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) pursuant to DM/20/03558/OUT at Land to the East Of Regents Court, Sherburn Road (for copy see file of Minutes).

G Blakey, Principal Planning Officer gave a detailed presentation of the application which included a site location plan, aerial photograph, site layout, elevations and photographs of the site. Members had attended a site visit the previous day.

The Committee received details of a late representation received from a resident from Bent House Farm in objection to the proposals.

A statement was read out from Local Members Councillors E and L Mavin as they had been unable to attend. They were not opposed to housing development on the site, but objected on behalf of residents who would be affected by the development. They complimented the engagement between the Council, both developers and Local Members and residents of the Bent House Farm development. They also welcomed the inclusion of the much needed bungalows. They acknowledged that some improvements had been made to the green buffer but it was still too thin in places at 7 metres. If the number of dwellings was reduced, a 20-metre buffer could have been provided the full length. The CDP provision was for 390 houses on this part of Site but the current application was for 470 dwellings. Planting of a 20m buffer should be in place from construction with mature specimens used to alleviate concerns that the Bent House Farm properties would be overlooked.

The plan showed possible pathways at the southern boundary, leading to the bottom of the gardens of two properties and residents were concerned that this would provide an avenue for anti-social behaviour. The pathway proposed did not link to any current viable path and they requested it be removed from the plans. They also requested that the footpath/cycleway access at the south west of the site be moved further away from the entry lane to the Bent House Farm properties. There was a safety concern as the exit from Bent House Farm was up an incline and visibility was poor in both directions.

As well as the policy failings, there were sustainability and design issues and the reserved matters application was deficient in meaningful net zero design. The City of Durham Trust had set out detailed arguments and proposed



amendments to mitigate these inadequacies and both Councillors E and L Mavin supported these proposals.

A statement had been received from Local Member C Fletcher who had also been unable to attend. She thanked Officers and Developers who had been able to have discussion and community input into the development.

Councillor Fletcher was in overall support of the development, but had some outstanding concerns. Whilst she was pleased to see a wider mix of homes including bungalows, she remained concerned that there were too many properties proposed. The outline planning permission stated a defined maximum number of properties on the site of 400 houses with 20 houses adjacent to Benthouse Lane. The proposed number of houses was too high and had resulted in minimum sized properties and lack of space to allow wider multi-use footways.

Councillor Fletcher also remained concerned about the buffer zones as the report stated that there should be 20m buffer zone between the residents in Benthouse Lane Farm house and Barns yet it was only 7-10m in places.

With regards to crime and community safety, Councillor Fletcher had some concerns with the access points that offered no protection, such as a chicane, kissing gate, or cycle gate. These were needed to prevent quadbikes or other such vehicles from entering and exiting the site.

Councillor Fletcher was optimistic that all the properties on the site would be constructed in line with the revised "Part L" regulations for energy efficiency, however she had not been able to find out how this obligation would be met. She considered it would be negligent of the Committee to approve the application if the details were not made available for consideration.

Ms C Lattin addressed the Committee in objection to the proposal. The number of houses proposed had not been agreed in the CDP. The scheme had been described as providing a gateway for Durham City, however there was no evidence that this would be achieved.

The report stated that all new development should comply with Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS) but this was not applied to this development. The scheme consisted of basic house types which were too small and ranked low on the building for life system. The provision of bungalows were welcome but they included small internal spaces which could have been increased by providing less garden space.

There was no bus service into estate so residents would rely heavily on cars which would impact on the highway. It lacked in energy efficiency details with regards to EPC ratings, insulation and vehicle charge points. There was no confirmation as to whether it would be connected to the gas network or provision of ground source heat pumps.

Mr P Conway, addressed the Committee on behalf of Belmont Parish Council. The Parish Council recognised the constructive discussion that had taken place between the Applicants and local people and acknowledged that many outstanding issues had been resolved, however there were still a number of points that had not been settled, which had been raised in the ongoing Belmont and Gilesgate Neighbourhood Plan discussions.

The CDP site allocation for this area was for 420 units, further noting that the original application site had been allocated for 390 units with another 30 on the adjacent western site. The application should be for 390 units and if it was, the Parish Council believed that the outstanding issues could be satisfied with further discussions and additional conditions.

Mr Conway confirmed that reducing the scheme to 390 units would alleviate many concerns with regards to proximity, area, roads and footpaths and also design and appearance. Due to sequencing this application was exempt from NDSS which was unfortunate as between 30-35% of properties did not meet that standard. In addition further discussions between developers and local people on making this development compliant with carbon free and energy efficiency would be welcomed. Belmont Parish Council requested additional conditions relating scale, design, and energy efficiency, which the Parish Council considered would result in a housing development that was a credit to Durham City and the Developers.

Mr B Evans objected to the proposal on behalf of Bent House Farm residents. The CDP included a requirement that development should respect and protect the character and integrity of Bent House Farm and its rural setting. The proposals put forward did not meet the requirement as it was intended by the policy, or residents' expectations.

In the outline application, the Applicant had provided data suggesting a dense 20m buffer to the edge of Bent House Farm, reducing towards Bent House Lane. Residents had suggested the 20m buffer be extended to cover Bent House Farm in its entirety, but this had been described as something for developers to fully detail prior to the submission of the reserved matters application. In October 2021 residents were advised that the nominated

builder would consult with interested parties prior to reserved matters application however this did not happen.

In July 2022 residents approached the Developers and secured a site meeting. After subsequent email exchanges and site meetings up to March 2023, minor amendments were made to the border treatment. The latest structure planting described was 6-7 metres in critical spots and only 3-4 metres at east end of farmhouse properties. He referred to one inadequate space with wildflower planting, that he considered would potentially be utilised as a play area. Residents had asked for a continuous hedge buffer.

Mr J Ashby, City of Durham Trust, had submitted a document in May which had not been uploaded to the Planning Portal. The Trust and Gilesgate Residents Association objected on similar grounds explained by other speakers. The root cause of the issues with the application was the attempt at trying to cram too many houses on the site. It was clear that 470 dwellings was far too many and had resulted in various policy failures. The site was demonstrably out of scale, which should have been a reason for refusal, along with failure to meet NDSS. If the application was not refused, then further conditions were essential to require all houses met the NDSS, that the properties complied with the Council's declared intentions for net-zero, that the estate paths were genuinely multi-use, and that the paths adjacent to Bent House Farm were relocated and protected as specified in the representation from the Gilesgate Residents Association and by local residents.

Mr P Arkle, Managing Director of Miller Homes, addressed the Committee on behalf of Miller and Barratt Homes. Miller Homes had built great developments over the years, most recently at Lambton park and Seaham Garden Village. There had been a lot of engagement throughout the process and despite receiving criticism, Developers contributed hugely to the wider economy and heritage, and this site was a good example.

Mr Arkle thanked everyone who had contributed in the planning process and acknowledged the contentious issues, however this was an indication of how much people cared and reinforced the necessity of this dialogue for effective collaboration. The process had resulted in a scheme that exceeded expectations, accepting that this was not a view shared by everyone. There had been many meetings with the local authority and other interested parties and due to the design and review process, the developers were presenting a scheme that they were proud of and hoped would be supported by Members.

He continued that outline approval was for up to 500 units with a final scheme presented to Members of 470 units. It was an opportunity to create a sustainable community. The scheme exceeded sustainability

requirements, complying with the provision of affordable housing, accessible and adaptable housing and also included provision for bungalows, creating a multi-generational housing scheme.

Due to the interaction with local stakeholders, the Developer had tried to alleviate concerns by amending footpath connections and strengthening the landscape buffer, and would continue to work with residents if the scheme was approved. The new homes proposed were designed to reflect the recent changes in building regulations and as such were more energy efficient. The scheme benefited from many technologies in construction to ensure energy compliance and sustainability. Development of site would create investment in the area, with £70m being spent on the development and £40m would be going into the supply chain and labour force. There would be 80 workers on site at any time.

Due to policy changes, Mr Arkle confirmed that times were difficult for Developers, but collaboration and early engagement was key. He thanked Council Officers for the ongoing effort to engage with major housebuilders and advised that Miller Homes and Barrett Homes were keen to continue to invest in Durham, a place where people aspired to live.

The Chair confirmed that he had attended the site visit the previous day and made an observation with regards to weed management. There was an issue with Thistles that would shortly distribute seeds and potentially contaminate land for miles.

Councillor McKeon referred to the bus routes and sustainable transport during the Committee which granted outline planning permission. She understood that there were current revenue and staffing issues but did not anticipate that would be permanent. The Applicant had stated during the meeting that there was merit in having bus infrastructure on the site which could include laybys that could be converted. The Principal Planning Officer advised that none were proposed as part of the reserved matters application.

In response to a question from Councillor Currah regarding HMO's which residents often strongly objected to, the Principal Planning Officer confirmed that a condition was attached to prevent any change of use.

Councillor Martin asked for an explanation for the number of houses proposed and why it differed from the number allocated in the CDP. The Principal Planning Officer gave the background to assessments of sites and confirmed that the standard calculation was 30 dwellings per hectare. During the process and as applications developed, they were reassessed and transitioned into final detailed plans.

The Principal Planning Officer addressed the issue raised regarding the NDSS which the CDP required all houses to meet. The requirement for implementation was on schemes that were approved 12 months after the CDP had been adopted. Outline planning permission for this site had been approved within the first 12 months of adoption and therefore this application had no requirement to comply with the NDSS.

The Principal Planning Officer apologised that the comments from the City of Durham Trust was not available on the website. He confirmed in response to a query raised by Mr Ashby, that despite the decision notice being issued in March 2022, the resolution had been granted in October 2021 and discussions that followed were with regards to Section 106 agreements. Admittedly, the failure to meet NDSS was disappointing, but he assured Members that this would apply to very few schemes.

Councillor Elmer suggested that the issues were all caused by overstocking and if there had not been such an effort to build as many houses as possible on the site, the Developer could have increased the size of the properties and create better garden spaces, better footpaths and provision for transport. The report made no reference to cycle provision, the scheme lacked public transport and buffer zones were only 6m wide in places despite their importance. Issues with the site were due to having as many properties on site as possible and as a result the scheme had to make sacrifices in other areas. There was a lack of detail with regards to low carbon aspirations and other critical aspects of the site. Whilst he did not have an issue with the location, he did not support the scale of the scheme.

N Carter, Planning and Highways Lawyer, stressed to the Committee that the maximum dwelling numbers for the site had been established at outline consent, for up to 500 dwellings.

Councillor McKeon noted the scale of the development, which was bigger than some of the villages within her ward, which included bus routes. Sustainable development should include provision for public transport and if possible, should include provision for buses. There was already a regular service through Gilesgate Moor Estate and if the ability to provide a loop through this development, was there, it should be included. She suggested that if this couldn't be approved, the application should be deferred to include public transport infrastructure.

The Planning Development Manager reminded Members that the reserved matters application related to landscaping, design and layout and whilst provision of a bus service was a valid planning issue it had not been

considered appropriate to condition at the outline stage and was outside of the scope of this RM application. The was scheme focused on improvements to pedestrian and cycle routes, and providing footpath connectivity to the Sherburn Road Estate.

In response to further queries from Councillor McKeon as to whether there was a legal way of including public transport infrastructure, the Planning and Highways Lawyer reiterated that the application was for reserved matters only, relating to appearance, landscaping, layout and scale. Matters which had been considered as part of the outline application could not be reconsidered.

P Harrison, Highway Development Manager advised that as a low traffic residential estate, there would be no requirement to install a layby for bus stops and instead would consider lane markings on the carriage way.

The Planning Development Manager suggested that a meeting be facilitated with Integrated Passenger Transport following the meeting, in order to discuss the potential of a bus route.

Councillor Wilson stated that the site did meet necessary requirements and whilst he understood concerns regarding the density, there was a lot of green space including a focal point in the centre of the scheme, which would improve the landscape. He moved the recommendation to approve the application.

Councillor Boyes had been a Member of the Committee that approved the outline application and acknowledged the debate which had taken place regarding bus provision. He referred Members to the visualisation contained in the presentation slides, which identified an attractive feature in the centre of the site. He complimented the Managing Director of Miller Homes for attending the Committee and seconded the motion to approve the application.

In response to further queries from Councillor Bell, the Principal Planning Officer advised that detailed discussions had taken place between the Developer and residents regarding the landscape buffer and its dual purpose of which was to provide a screen from the world heritage site but also to achieve a transitional landscape from the road so that residents of Bent House Farm felt they had separation. The Officers felt that they had reached a point where the buffer was acceptable and it had been approved by the Landscape Officer.

With regards to the SUDs basin, the Principal Planning Officer confirmed that one of the detailed conditions for discharge was the final scheme which needed to make sure that the design accounted for any climate change events to ensure that no nearby properties would be affected.

Councillor Marshall noted the long history of a site which had been allocated in both previous local plans. He reminded Members that it was subject to full outline permission and in his opinion, no material planning reasons for refusal. He also thanked the Managing Director of Miller Homes for attending the meeting and engaging with residents. Despite reaching a point where they continued to disagree, there had been meaningful engagement as confirmed by Local Members. This was a well-designed estate, there would always be objectors to a proposal to delete green belt land, but it was time to move on and allow developers to deliver much needed housing.

### **Resolved**

That the application be APPROVED subject to the conditions outlined in the report.