

DURHAM COUNTY COUNCIL

AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE (CENTRAL AND EAST DURHAM)

At a Meeting of **Area Planning Committee (Central and East Durham)** held in Council Chamber, County Hall, Durham on **Tuesday 10 January 2012 at 1.00 pm**

Present:

Councillor P Taylor

Members of the Committee:

Councillors J Blakey, G Bleasdale, J Brown, P Charlton, R Liddle, A Naylor (substitute for A Laing) and J Robinson

Apologies:

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors C Walker, J Bailey, A Bell, S Iveson, A Laing, J Moran, K Thompson and B Wilson

Also Present:

J Taylor – Principal Planning Officer (Durham Area)
A Dobie – Principal Planning Officer (Easington Area)
N Carter – Solicitor
A Glenwright – Highways Officer

1 Minutes of the Last Meeting held on 13 December 2011

The minutes of the meeting held on 13 December 2011 were confirmed as a correct record by the committee and signed by the Chair.

2 Declarations of Interest, if any

There were no declarations of interest received.

With the agreement of the Committee, the order of business was amended to allow item numbered 3 (f) on the Agenda PL/5/2011/401 and PL/5/2011/402 – Hardwicke Hall Manor Hotel, Hesleden Road, Hesleden to be considered first.

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

4

- 4a PL/5/2011/401 and PL/5/2011/402 - Hardwicke Hall Manor Hotel, Hesleden Road, Hesleden
PL/5/2011 – Four Detached Residential Properties Including Private Vehicular Access Road
PL/5/2011/402 – Partial Demolition of Grade II Listed Garden Wall and Proposed Repair of Remainder, Partial Demolition of Boundary Wall and Complete Demolition of Existing Brick Shed within Curtilage of Grade II Listed Hardwicke Hall Manor Hotel in Association with Residential Development of Four Dwellings**

Consideration was given to the report of the Principal Planning Officer (Durham Area) which recommended refusal of the application for the reasons given.

The Principal Planning Officer gave a detailed presentation on the main issues outlined in the report, which included photographs of the site. Members had visited the site that day and were familiar with the location and setting.

The Officer advised that since the report had been circulated notification had been received that the Parish Council had no views in relation to the application.

B Scorer, the applicant's agent addressed the Committee and stated that there were issues that he wished to discuss with Officers further and had asked for consideration of the application to be deferred to allow discussions to take place.

In considering the application Members considered that the request for a deferral was reasonable to allow further discussions between the applicant and Planning Officers.

RESOLVED

That the application be deferred.

- 4b 4/11/00599/OUT - Land at Langley Hall Farm, Brandon Lane, Durham
Outline Application Proposing Residential Development of up to 70 Dwellings Seeking Detailed Approval of Means of Access Only**

Consideration was given to the report of the Principal Planning Officer (Durham Area) which recommended approval of the application.

The Principal Planning Officer advised Members that there was an error in the recommendation section of the report which should read 'the application be approved subject to the following conditions and subject to the completion of a Section 106 Obligation to secure the payment of £40,000 for public art/environmental improvements in the locality, £70,000 for the provision of recreation/play space or £1000 per unit and 23% on site affordable housing'. The Officer went on to give a detailed presentation on the main issues outlined in the

report, which included photographs of the site. Members had visited the site that day and were familiar with the location and setting.

In discussing the application some Members were of the view that the proposal was clearly outside the settlement boundary and constituted development in the open countryside. A comment was also made that there were existing sites in other locations that had been identified for housing which should be examined prior to agreeing to developments on sites such as Langley Hall Farm. Other concerns included the increased demand on local services, increased traffic congestion on the A690 into Durham, and the single access which seemed inadequate for the number of properties proposed.

Other Members expressed their support for the application. The development offered 23% affordable housing which would help to address housing problems in the City and would bring about community benefits, including a financial contribution by the developer towards recreational facilities and public art.

Officers responded to the comments raised. The Highways Officer advised that in accordance with national guidelines issued in 2007, the access was deemed to be acceptable for the number of properties it would serve. With regard to traffic congestion the application was supported by a traffic assessment and whilst it was accepted that there would be additional vehicles on the network, the number was deemed to be relatively modest.

The Principal Planning Officer appreciated that there were undeveloped sites in other settlements, however it was unlikely that these would be delivered in the current housing market. As part of the emerging NPPF there were the beginnings of more emphasis being placed on sustainability and in certain cases a presumption in favour of sustainable development. In the opinion of Officers the site at Langley Hall Farm met this criteria as well as delivering community benefits such as affordable housing and public art.

RESOLVED

That the application be approved subject to the conditions outlined in the report and to the applicant entering into a Section 106 Agreement to secure the following:-

- (i) The payment of £40,000 for the provision of public art/environmental improvements in the locality
- (ii) The payment of £70,000 (or £1,000 per unit) for the provision of recreation/play space
- (iii) The provision of 23% on site affordable housing.

4c 4/11/00930/FPA - Gordon Mount, 19 Crossgate Peth, Durham Resubmission of Planning Application 11/00072/FPA for the Erection of a Detached Garage and Store to Rear of the Property

Consideration was given to the report of the Principal Planning Officer (Durham Area) which recommended approval of the application.

The Principal Planning Officer gave a detailed presentation on the main issues outlined in the report, which included photographs of the site. Members had visited the site that day and were familiar with the location and setting.

Members were advised that the consultation period for the application expired on 29 December 2011 and since the report had been circulated 3 additional letters of objection had been received, together with one letter commenting on the application. The additional representations had been considered by Officers but did not raise any new material issues. Had it been the case and the objections raised new matters which would change the Officer assessment, then the report would have been withdrawn from the Agenda.

The Officer also advised that the wording of condition 3 regarding materials was to be amended with a new condition regarding incidental use to be added.

R Cornwell, an objector addressed the Committee on behalf of six residents. He submitted 3 photographs and took Members through each. Residents considered that if approved the development would contravene saved policies E6 and E22, which sought to preserve the setting, character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The series of photographs showed the greenery and the relatively modest size of the former garage, the existing condition of the site, and how the proposed workshop would dominate the street scene.

The report made reference to a mitigating landscape scheme but residents considered that there would be little available room for planting. A trellis had been suggested to add height to the boundary wall but Officers had advised against this. The door and windows of the workshop would only be three metres from the garden of number 20 The Avenue which would affect their privacy.

Councillor N Martin spoke in support of the residents and considered that the proposed workshop would be a 'monstrous carbuncle' in an important part of the Conservation Area of Durham City. Many of the gardens further down The Avenue had trellis fencing, the design drawings did not reflect the size of the workshop, and a landscaping scheme was not feasible.

D Carter, the applicant gave a presentation to Members which included photographs. The typical streetscape of The Avenue was a combination of walls and fences of differing heights. The drawings submitted did accurately reflect the scale of the workshop, and had been designed by a professional architect, in accordance with the views of local residents and Planning Officers. The proposal was to provide parking and storage to meet the needs of his family and to ensure the security and safety of the rear of his premises.

In determining the application Members sought clarification of the materials to be used and considered that the proposed timber appearance of the garage and access gates would be acceptable and would be in character with the surrounding area.

RESOLVED

That the application be approved in accordance with the conditions outlined in the report subject to a change to condition 3 and to a new condition being added as follows:-

3. Notwithstanding any details of materials submitted with the application no development shall commence until samples of the boundary wall, hardstanding, access gates, store/workshop wall and roofing materials have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be constructed in accordance with the approved details.

New Condition: The store/workshop hereby approved shall be used for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling house only, and shall not be used for any trade or business purposes.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity in accordance with Policy Q9 of the City of Durham Local Plan.

4d 4/11/00897/FPA - 165 Gilesgate, Durham Proposed Demolition of Existing Single Storey Flat Roof Area to Rear and Erection of Single Storey Pitched Roof Extension to Rear of Existing Dwelling

Consideration was given to the report of the Principal Planning Officer (Durham Area) which recommended approval of the application.

The Principal Planning Officer gave a detailed presentation on the main issues outlined in the report which included photographs of the site.

RESOLVED

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

4e 4/11/00774/FPA - Land at Woodland Terrace and College View, Esh Winning, Durham Erection of 30 No. Dwellinghouses with Formation of New Access and Closure of Existing Access (resubmission)

Consideration was given to the report of the Principal Planning Officer (Durham Area) which recommended approval of the application.

The Principal Planning Officer gave a detailed presentation, which included photographs of the site. Members had visited the site that day and were familiar with the location and setting.

Mrs Hennigan, an objector addressed the Committee. Her main concerns were for the safety of local children who had played on the site but who now had to play in the streets. The site had been identified in the Esh Winning Masterplan to re-house

residents from The Oaks but was now surplus to requirements. There were other areas of land in Esh Winning which could be developed including a site opposite which would be available once the new school was completed.

Councillor J Wilkinson spoke at length in support of the application. In the Esh Winning Masterplan undertaken in 2007 this site was the catalyst for regeneration of the whole village. The site would benefit from HCA Funding to provide affordable homes for rent, which was much-needed. The development was adjacent to the new school and would benefit from recreational facilities such as a MUGA, library and sports hall. The site was well-situated for the village amenities and was on the main bus route into Durham City.

In considering the application Members were advised that the site formed a crucial part of Esh Winning Masterplan and would provide considerable community benefit, particularly with the provision of affordable housing. As the site had been fenced off for some time, Members acknowledged that its current amenity value was limited and that there were other open space areas near to the site. Members felt that the proposed development would enhance a barren area of land.

RESOLVED

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

4f PL/5/2011/0443 - Seaton Nurseries, Seaton Lane, Seaton Residential Development (outline) (resubmission)

Consideration was given to the report of the Principal Planning Officer (Durham Area) which recommended approval of the application.

The Principal Planning Officer gave a detailed presentation on the main issues outlined in the report, which included photographs of the site.

Mr Brooker, the applicant's agent stated that whilst outside the settlement boundary the site constituted previously developed land, having a garden centre, caravan/container storage, and car repair facilities located there. The buildings were failing and it would be financially unviable to carry out improvements. The location was sustainable, being similarly situated to other developments on greenfield sites on the edge of Seaham. There were facilities in Seaton that had not been referred to in the report and the site was on a bus route. Highways Officers had not offered any objections and whilst the ecology report had not yet been received, it was expected to confirm the findings from the previous planning application.

In deliberating the application Members were advised by the Principal Planning Officer that it was accepted that this was a long-established, previously developed site, however the current uses were appropriate to the location and were unobtrusive. There was no natural boundary to this site and if approved Officers were concerned that applications from other developers may come forward in the future, extending further into the open countryside.

Following discussion it was **RESOLVED**

That

- (i) The application be approved subject to the receipt of a satisfactory ecology report
- (ii) Officers be authorised to formulate appropriate conditions and report them back to the Committee.

The reasons for conditional approval were expressed to be that the site was not considered to be significantly separated from Seaton, was in a sustainable location and was already developed.