

**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 9 October 2012 at 1.00 pm**

**Present:**

**Councillor P Taylor (Chair)**

**Members of the Committee:**

Councillors J Bailey, A Bell, J Blakey, J Brown, P Charlton, E Huntington (substitute for Councillor C Walker), J Moran, A Naylor (substitute for Councillor A Laing) and J Robinson

**Apologies:**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors C Walker, G Bleasdale, S Iveson and A Laing

**Also Present:**

Councillors D J Southwell L Thomson

**1 Minutes**

The Minutes of the meetings held on 11 and 12 September 2012 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair, subject to Councillor A Bell's apologies being recorded for both meetings (for copy see file of Minutes).

**2 Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

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

**3a 4/12/00637/FPA - 3 The Paddock, Gilesgate Moor, Durham**

The Committee considered a report of the Senior Planning Officer regarding the conversion of a garage to living accommodation, side and rear extensions and the erection of a detached garage at 3 The Paddock, Gilesgate Moor (for copy see file of Minutes).

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

The Principal Planning Officer informed the Committee that Northumbrian Water Ltd had confirmed by telephone earlier in the day that the survey works referred to in the report had been carried out and that any drainage issues which may need to be addressed arising from this application could be dealt with by way of condition.

Councillor Southwell, local Member, spoke on the application. He informed the Committee of the planning history of the site and also of the site opposite the application site, for which a planning application had previously been declined. He informed the Committee that the access road to the site was of a gravel construction and the cost for the road was shared between three properties and expressed concern that construction traffic to the site could lead to the road being damaged. He suggested that access problems could be alleviated by using alternative access at the east of the site.

Problems with sewerage at the entrance of the development had been experienced in the past, and Councillor Southwell expressed concern about drainage issues in the area. He requested that the application be deferred until access issues and drainage issues had been investigated further. This was seconded by Councillor L Thomson, local Member.

The Principal Planning Officer informed the Committee that a letter of objection had been received from Mr and Mrs Peeck. The objector was unable to attend the Committee and had requested that the letter be read out. The Principal Planning Officer read the letter to Committee and Members were provided with a copy of the photograph which accompanied the letter (for copy of letter and photograph see file of Minutes).

The Principal Planning Officer replied to the issues raised by advising that both Environmental Health and Northumbrian Water had responded that in their professional opinion, and following further investigation, issues relating to the proposed hydrotherapy pool and drainage/sewerage issues could be dealt with by way of planning conditions. He also advised that the submitted photograph was not considered to provide any significant evidence to suggest that the officer recommendation should be changed.

Mr J McGargill, Highway Development Manager, Regeneration & Economic Development informed the Committee that the suggested alternative access to the site was from Broomside Lane, which was a major distributor road with approximately 6,000 vehicles per day, half of which were light goods vehicles and HGV's. The alternative access did not have dropped kerbs and there was also a grass highway verge, and the use of the access could lead to potential difficulties around damage to drains and other utilities.

Members of the Committee expressed concerns around site access and also sought greater clarification from Northumbrian Water around the issues of drainage and sewerage issues.

**Resolved:**

That the application be deferred to allow further investigations regarding access to the site and also to allow further clarity to be sought from Northumbrian Water around drainage and sewerage issues.

**3b 4/12/00591/VOC - Former Omnibus and Welfare Club, Front Street, Quarrington Hill, Durham. DH6 4QF**

The Committee considered a report of the Senior Planning Officer regarding the variation of condition 2 of planning application 11/00479/FPA to substitute Wren type housing and amended parking provision together with seeking the removal of s106 obligations at the former Omnibus and Welfare Club, Front Street, Quarrington Hill, Durham (for copy see file of Minutes).

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

Ms C Parks addressed the Committee in opposition to the application. The s106 money that was to come from the development was to develop a play area and create public artwork in the Quarrington Hill area, which was in need of such amenities. The residents of Quarrington Hill had faced disruption during the development of the site with temporary traffic lights and parking for site traffic. There may have been stronger objections to the original application if it had been known there were to be no s106 obligations. The developers had commenced construction of the new style of houses before the matter had been brought to Committee, which was unacceptable.

The Principal Planning Office replied that he was aware of the issues in Quarrington Hill, but added that the housing market in the area was difficult and that there was now no profit to be made from the development. The developers had the fallback position to build the houses they already had permission for.

Councillor Blakey expressed concern at the amended parking provision proposed with access onto a fast road and asked whether measures could be introduced to try and slow traffic speeds. She also expressed concern at the proposed removal of s106 obligations as this money was important to the village of Quarrington Hill. Councillor Bailey agreed that the s106 money would be significant to the local community.

Councillor Robinson informed the Committee that while he had some sympathy with the developer, at the same time the problems in the housing market were not the fault of the residents of Quarrington Hill. He moved that the application be approved, but amended so that the removal of s106 obligations was not included. This was seconded by Councillor A Bell.

Mr N Carter, Planning and Development Solicitor, advised the Committee that the existing consent for the site was subject to s106 obligations, and as such, if the

Committee wished to retain the s106 obligations, then the current application should be approved subject to a Section 106 agreement.

**Resolved:**

That the application be approved, subject to the conditions detailed in the recommendations in the report and subject to a Section 106 agreement to provide for Public Art and Public Open Space within Quarrington Hill.

**3c 4/12/00639/FPA - Potterhouse Substation, Front Street, Pity Me, Durham. DH1 5BZ**

The Committee considered a report of the Senior Planning Officer regarding the erection of a telecommunications tower at Potterhouse Substation, Front Street, Pity Me, Durham (for copy see file of Minutes).

The Principal Planning Officer gave a detailed presentation on the application which included photographs of the site.

The Senior Planning Officer informed the Committee that although two further objections to the proposal had been received following the additional public consultation requested by the local Member at the previous Committee meeting, these raised no new considerations.

**Resolved:**

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