



Planning Services

COMMITTEE REPORT

APPLICATION DETAILS

APPLICATION NO:	4/10/00839/FPA
FULL APPLICATION DESCRIPTION:	Use of Unit 9 for A1 retail including sale of cosmetics, pharmaceutical products and ancillary chemists products including food products from 5% of net sales floorspace
NAME OF APPLICANT:	Friends Provident Life and Pensions Limited
SITE ADDRESS:	Unit 9 (Former Allied Carpets) Durham City Retail Park McIntyre Way Durham DH1 2RP
ELECTORAL DIVISION:	Gilesgate
CASE OFFICER:	Andrew Inch, Senior Planning Officer (0191) 31 8745, Andrew.inch@durham.gov.uk

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND PROPOSALS

1. The application site relates to a vacant retail unit of some 650sqm located on a modern out of centre retail development known as Durham City Retail Park. The retail park itself is located two miles to the east of the city centre and is bound on its eastern and southern edges by industrial development, and as such forms part of the Dragonville Industrial Estate, this being reflected in its predominantly industrial use land allocation, along with bulky goods retailing, within the Local Plan. To the west are a number of other commercial uses, including car dealerships, while to the north lies the Belmont Community Centre with its associated facilities. The unit itself is located along the southern part of the retail park and is one of the smaller units within the development. It has been vacant since the beginning of August 2009.

2. Planning permission is sought to occupy the unit as an A1 retail shop including the sale of cosmetics, pharmaceutical products and ancillary chemists products including food products from 5% of the net floorspace. The application has been made in this form for reasons of clarity and to restrict any permission to unit 9 rather than if the application were a further variation to the restrictive goods sales condition to which the original outline planning permission was subject and which has been varied on a number of occasions. The goods which the applicant wishes to retail would not comply with the varied condition restricting the range of goods which can be sold from the retail park. No external alterations are proposed.

3. The application is accompanied by a Design and Access Statement and a Planning and Retail Statement. The Planning and Retail Statement has been supplemented by additional information through the course of the applications' consideration.

4. The application is reported to Committee in view of an objection from Belmont Parish Council.

PLANNING HISTORY

5. Outline planning permission (02/00526/OUT) was granted for the Durham City Retail Park following a call-in inquiry in 2003. Two sites to the south along Dragon Lane were also granted planning permission at the same inquiry but neither has since been developed. The retail park itself has been the subject of a number of applications seeking to vary the conditions to which the outline planning permission was subject. Principally these applications have related to variations to the range of goods to be permitted for sale in any retail unit. Such variations have allowed the now long-term occupation of units by Argos (Unit 6) and Sports Direct (Unit 7), for example.

PLANNING POLICY

6. NATIONAL POLICY:

Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development sets out the overarching planning policies on the delivery of sustainable development through the planning system.

Planning Policy Statement 4: Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth sets out the Government's comprehensive policy framework for planning for sustainable economic development in urban and rural areas.

Planning Policy Guidance note 13: Transport seeks to integrate planning and transport at the national, regional, strategic and local level and to promote more sustainable transport choices both for carrying people and for moving freight.

The above represents a summary of those policies considered most relevant. The full text can be accessed at: <http://www.communities.gov.uk/planningandbuilding/planning/planningpolicyguidance/planningpolicystatements>

7. REGIONAL POLICY:

The North East of England Plan - Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021 (RSS) July 2008, sets out the broad spatial development strategy for the North East region for the period of 2004 to 2021. The RSS sets out the region's housing provision and the priorities in economic development, retail growth, transport investment, the environment, minerals and waste treatment and disposal. Some policies have an end date of 2021 but the overall vision, strategy, and general policies will guide development over a longer timescale.

In July 2010 the Local Government Secretary signalled his intention to revoke Regional Spatial Strategies with immediate effect, and that this was to be treated as a material consideration in subsequent planning decisions. This was successfully challenged in the High Court in November 2010, thus for the moment reinstating the RSS. However, it remains the Government's intention to abolish Regional Spatial Strategies when the forthcoming Local

Government Bill becomes law, and weight can now be attached to this intention. The following policies are considered relevant:

Policy 1, North East Renaissance, seeks to achieve and maintain a high quality of life for all, both now and in the future, requiring a major economic, social and environmental renaissance throughout the Region.

Policy 4 (The Sequential Approach to Development) provides that a sequential approach to the identification of land for development should be adopted to give priority to previously developed land and buildings in the most sustainable locations.

Policy 7 (Connectivity and Accessibility) seeks to promote the need to reduce the impact of travel demand particularly by promoting public transport, travel plans, cycling and walking, as well as the need to reduce long distance travel, particularly by private car, by focusing development in urban areas with good access to public transport.

Policy 8 (Protecting and Enhancing the Environment) seeks to promote measures such as high quality design in all development and promoting development that is sympathetic to its surroundings.

Policy 24 (Delivering Sustainable Communities) refers to the need to concentrate the majority of the Region's new development within the defined urban areas, and the need to utilise previously developed land wherever possible.

Policy 25 (Urban and Rural Centres) identifies key locations for the development of new leisure and retail facilities in the Region. New development should be consistent with the scale of the centre to ensure enhanced vitality and viability.

The above represents a summary of those policies considered most relevant. The full text can be accessed at: <http://www.gos.gov.uk/nestore/docs/planning/rss/rss.pdf>

8. LOCAL PLAN POLICY:

Policy S1A (City Centre) states that the Council will protect and promote the vitality and viability of all centres in the local retail hierarchy consisting of the city centre, the district centres (Dragon Lane and Arnison) followed by the local centres.

Policy S8 (Retail Warehousing Outlets) permits the sale of a range of goods from a designated part of Dragonville Industrial Estate, provided the use cannot be accommodated in the nearby district centre, would not adversely affect the vitality and viability of any other centre and would not include the sale of goods including food and drink, clothing, sports goods or equipment, shoes, toys and games and toiletries, for example.

Policy T1 (Traffic Generation – General) states that the Council will not grant planning permission for development that would generate traffic likely to be detrimental to highway safety and / or have a significant effect on the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring property.

Policy T10 (Parking – General Provision) states that vehicle parking should be limited in amount, so as to promote sustainable transport choices and reduce the land-take of development.

The above represents a summary of those policies considered most relevant in the Development Plan the full text, criteria, and justifications of each may be accessed at (<http://www.cartoplus.co.uk/durham/text/00cont.htm>)

CONSULTATION AND PUBLICITY RESPONSES

9. STATUTORY RESPONSES:

There have been no statutory responses.

10. INTERNAL CONSULTEE RESPONSES:

The Planning Policy Section recommended the refusal of the application since it is contrary to Policy S8 of the Local Plan and failed to meet requirements of the sequential test set out in PPS4. Since the submission of additional information they consider the requirements of PPS4 to have now been satisfied and that sufficient material considerations exist which would justify a minor departure from Policy S8 of the Local Plan.

11. PUBLIC RESPONSES:

In response to the application in its submitted form there have been five letters of objection, including one from the Parish Council.

GVA Grimley on behalf of ING Real Estate Investment Management Ltd, owners of The Gates shopping centre in Durham City Centre, has objected to the application in its originally submitted form. They are concerned that a further relaxation of the range of goods which can be retailed on the retail park will set a precedent for further high street retailers to locate on the retail park and one which would compete with rather than complement the city centre offer. They note that a sequential assessment of all in-centre options was not carried out and conflicts with Policy S8 of the Local Plan and Policy EC15 of PPS4. In addition, they note that the applicants have not carried out a full impact assessment which they advise is required for retail development under 2,500sqm which are in an existing centre and not in accordance with an up to date development plan as required at Policy EC16 of PPS4.

Leak Chemist of Belmont object to the application finding that the proposed use would undermine the protection given to the city centre and other retailers when the retail park was given planning permission. Attention is drawn to a number of chemists within 1 mile of the application site and that no further pharmacy provision is needed, and while there is an exemption from the pharmacy licensing regime for pharmacies on retail parks of 15,000sqm or more, there would be undoubted harm to existing pharmaceutical provision.

Additional correspondence was also received from Leak Chemist which drew attention to the County Durham Pharmaceutical Needs Assessment 2010-11 which identified that, 'there is currently enough access to pharmaceutical services within existing provision across County Durham' and further that, 'County Durham has a greater than national average number of community pharmacies per head of population'. They consider this supports their view that existing pharmacy provision will be detrimentally affected.

The occupier of 84 Grange Road, Carrville has objected to the application on the grounds that it would have an adverse effect on local businesses which are already struggling.

Belmont Parish Council object to the application on the grounds that there are already four pharmacies within the neighbourhood and that the relaxation of the range of goods which can be retailed from the unit will have a detrimental effect on existing businesses.

Since the submission of additional information relating to an extended sequential assessment and an impact assessment, a further consultation exercise has been carried out. One letter of response has been received.

Leak Chemist of Belmont further object to the application, noting that there is no need for a further pharmacy, and that although easy to access by car the retail park is not easy to access on foot by the elderly and mothers of young children who statistically require pharmaceutical services more than others. They consider it would inappropriate to risk harming the excellent local pharmacy provision in order to suit Boots' own business model. They disagree with the findings of the revised sequential assessment and note a number of empty properties in surrounding local centres. They dispute the applicant's assertion that a £0.3million trade diversion is insignificant and advise that any reduction in income from trade diversion is likely to seriously threaten the viability of local pharmacies.

They also advise that while trade from prescriptions is a significant part of their businesses, they derive most of their income from the sale of health and beauty products, and that the opening of Tesco, followed by a pharmacy within Tesco has hit local businesses hard and that this proposal would again affect local businesses detrimentally.

12. APPLICANTS STATEMENT:

The application site comprises the former Allied Carpets unit at Durham City Retail Park. The unit comprises 650 sqm (7,000 sq ft) on ground floor. It has been vacant since August 2009.

The planning application proposes the continued use of an existing retail unit for A1 retail purposes but subject to a variation in the range of goods permitted to be sold to allow for Boots to trade from the unit. The planning application does not involve any net additional retail floorspace.

Boots have entered into an agreement with the owners of the Retail Park to occupy the unit subject only to the grant of planning permission. The intention is to commence the fit out of the store in June 2011 and to trade from August 2011.

Boots are already represented in Durham City Centre and other centres within the wider area. The proposed store would be in addition/complimentary to these stores and seeks to respond to, inter alia, the identification of Durham City Retail Park on the NHS (Pharmaceutical Services) Regulations 2005 List of Approved Retail Areas 2010. Boots have confirmed in writing that the proposed store will be in addition to its existing representation and it has no intention of closing any town centre stores. The applicants have gone further and are prepared to enter into a legally binding agreement under S106 to support the Council's Heart of the City Shop front initiatives underlining a commitment to the City Centre as a whole-not just Boots own stores.

The planning application is supported by a Planning and Retail Statement which addressed all PPS4 and other issues as agreed in pre-application discussions. This information was supplemented with further information under cover of our letter dated 6th January and 8th March. These submissions address all matters raised by the Council. The evidence most clearly demonstrates that the proposed Boots store:

- 1) Will not give rise to any material impact on defined centres including on existing pharmacies within defined centres. Moreover, there is clearly no evidence that the proposal is likely to lead to significant adverse impacts in terms of any one of impacts set out in PPS4.
-

- 2) Following a comprehensive review of opportunities in Durham City Centre and all other centres in the former Durham City area, we have demonstrated that there are no sequentially preferable sites that would be suitable, viable and available to accommodate Boots' retail requirements.

In such circumstances, government guidance is clear that planning applications should be determined by taking account of the positive and negative impacts of the proposal and any other material considerations. Accordingly, we would reiterate the other positive impacts which should be afforded significant weight including:

- 1) The proposals will deliver circa 8 full time and 15 part time jobs in an existing retail unit which has not contributed to employment opportunities within the area for coming up for 2 years.
- 2) The proposals will contribute to meeting the Government's health objectives of enhancing access to pharmacy provision generally and in this location specifically as evidenced by the inclusion of Durham City Retail Park on the latest Approved List of Site for Pharmaceutical Services and most recently the grant by the NHS (North East Primary Care Services Agency) of Boots application to provide pharmaceutical services from the application site.
- 3) The proposals will offer a number of other benefits to shoppers in Durham by increasing choice and access to pharmacy, health and beauty products, etc.

We therefore conclude that the application proposals accords with PPS4 and saved Local Plan Policy. Accordingly, we remain of the view that planning permission should be granted for the proposed development.

The above represents a summary of the comments received on this application. The full written text is available for inspection on the application file which can be viewed at <http://82.113.161.89/WAM/showCaseFile.do?action=show&appType=planning&appNumber=10/00839/FPA>. Officer analysis of the issues raised and discussion as to their relevance to the proposal and recommendation made is contained below

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS AND ASSESSMENT

13. The main issue is whether the proposed relaxation in the range of goods which can be retailed from Unit 9 would significantly adversely affect the vitality and viability of the retail centres identified in the retail hierarchy set out at Policy S1 of the Local Plan.

Background

14. By way of background, this application seeks to fulfil an identified exemption to the pharmacy licensing regime which exempts pharmacies located on out of town retail parks of over 15000sqm, as is the case here. The exemption is contained in the National Health Service (Pharmaceutical services) Regulations 2005. The Health Select Committee Report which informed the regulations advised that the Government wanted pharmaceutical services to improve further their accessibility and convenience to customers by locating pharmacies in areas where consumers already go, namely large shopping developments, so as to not undermine the market available to smaller community pharmacies. Furthermore, they must provide the range of services specified by the local Primary Care Trust (County Durham PCT), enabling the PCT to prescribe the type of services it wishes to see provided, for example, in a specific area of pharmacy where provision may be deficient in a locality. It is on this basis that the applicants are applying for Boots the Chemist to occupy unit 9.

Sequential Assessment

15. In support of the proposal, a detailed Planning and Retail Statement has been provided, which, following the identification of flaws in its approach by objectors, has been updated to provide an extensive sequential assessment of all in-centre options (as identified at Policy S1A of the Local Plan) and an assessment of retail impact in accordance with the requirements of Policy EC14 of PPS4. Turning firstly to the sequential assessment, Policy EC15 states that such assessments should ensure that sites are assessed for their availability, suitability and viability, and that all in centre options have been thoroughly assessed. Flexibility in terms of format or disaggregation of parts of the use need only be demonstrated as part of sequential assessment in considering sites in or on the edge of existing centres. The application site is neither in nor on the edge of an existing centre (in retail hierarchy terms), being some distance from and segregated by a busy main road from the Dragon Lane District Centre. The findings of the sequential assessment insofar as the city centre is concerned is that there are three vacant units at the time of the assessment, the first being the former Palladium Cinema building on Claypath, which although vacant is deemed unsuitable by way of its narrow frontage, and its inclusion within a wholesale redevelopment site is such that it would not offer any long-term suitability. A second vacant unit within the Gates Shopping Centre at some 265sqm is significantly below the level of floorspace required by Boots, and is not therefore suitable. At the time of the assessment the third vacant unit was the former Waitrose in the Gates Shopping Centre. However, since the submission of the application this large anchor store of some 2850sqm has been occupied in full by Wilkinson's. There are therefore no suitable, available or viable units within the city centre.

16. In terms of district centres, Boots are already represented at the Arnison Centre, with a pharmacy therein as well as within Sainsbury's, and moreover, there are no vacant units. At Dragon Lane Retail Park there are, similarly, no vacant units available. A full assessment of local centres within the former City of Durham Council area from Esh Winning in the west to Coxhoe in the south east and has identified a number of vacant units ranging from 20 to 80sqm which is significantly below the level of floorspace required by Boots. These units whilst available are certainly not suitable or viable. It is therefore considered that in light of the sequential assessment undertaken, it satisfies the requirements of Policies EC14 and EC15 of PPS4 and Policy S8 of the Local Plan in this particular regard, and addresses the inadequacies of the initial assessment as identified by a number of the objectors.

Impact Assessment

17. Turning now to retail impact, the applicants contend that the requirement for an impact assessment is on proposals over 2500sqm floorspace as set out at Policy EC16 of PPS4. However, notwithstanding this position, they have sought to address the issue of impact, looking at the impact upon existing Boots store, other chemist's stores and other retailers. In terms of the impact upon existing Boots stores, Boots have indicated that the opening of an out of town store has had little or no impact on trade in its town centre stores, and has provided a study from October 2010 which considers a number towns/cities nationwide with dual representation in terms of out of and in town centre locations. The evidence provided indicates that no Boots town centre stores have closed as a result of an out-of-town store opening and indeed, in most cases, the town centre stores have benefited from significant investment. Boots currently operates in 135 towns/cities with dual representation. At a more local level, the impact of the Boots store opening at the Arnison Centre was shown to have had no material effect on trade at either the Market Place or North Road stores, with trade having increased at the latter.

18. In terms of the likely impact of the proposed store on the existing city centre stores, there is unlikely to be a significant impact having regard to the above evidence, however, in order to demonstrate its commitment to the Boots city centre store in the Market Place, for example, it has recently been the subject of significant financial investment of around £280,000 involving works to the store internally and to its shopfront. In order to further demonstrate Boots commitment to ensuring the vitality and viability of the city centre and to meet the aspirations of Policy S8 in terms of promoting and protecting the city centre, they have offered by way of a unilateral undertaking under s106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, to provide a financial contribution of some £20,000 to the Shopfront Improvement Scheme which forms part of the ongoing Heart of the City regeneration project. The match funded scheme will enable funding to be directed towards city centre retail units which would benefit from an enhanced shopfront, and would, in particular, assist such works to shopfronts in the control of charitable or voluntary organisations, of which there are a number, including, for example, the Salvation Army on Saddler Street.

19. The aspect of impact which has given rise to significant objections is upon local pharmaceutical operators, on the grounds that the relaxation of the goods restriction at the retail park would remove the protection afforded to small retailers and the city centre which was a condition of the original planning permission and that there is no need for any further pharmaceutical provision in the area. On the first issue, there is undoubted conflict, acknowledged by the applicants, with the requirements of Policy S8 of the Local Plan in terms of the range of goods which the policy permits. The sale of food and toiletries, for example, are not permitted, but would form part of the proposed use, although the former would be form a very small proportion of the net sales floorspace. The range of goods which can be retailed from the retail park has been varied on two previous occasions, and as a variation of condition, the relaxation applies across the retail park. This application differs insofar as it is an application for planning permission specifically for Unit 9, and any relaxation in retailed goods would apply only to that unit. It would not therefore open the flood gates for other high street retailers to occupy other units in this way.

20. In terms of the impact of a further pharmacy in the local area, objectors consider there to be little need for a further pharmacy, and it would be likely to have a significant impact on three small independent pharmacies. Objectors point to a recent publication by NHS County Durham and Darlington, *County Durham Pharmaceutical Needs Assessment 2010-11*, which identifies that 'there is currently enough access to pharmaceutical services within existing provision across County Durham' and further that, 'County Durham has a greater than national average number of community pharmacies per head of population'. On this issue it is important to consider the distinction between a community pharmacy and the type proposed here. The proposed pharmacy would not be in a community unlike Leak Chemist in Belmont or Clarks Chemist in Cheveley Park which are well-related to a surrounding community and doctors surgeries including Belmont Surgery on Broomside Lane and Cheveley Park Medical Centre on The Links, respectively. The proposed pharmacy is there to provide increased access to pharmacies in areas where consumers already go, like large shopping centres. Moreover, a pharmacy in this location will be accessible to staff from across the retail park as well from the various industrial and commercial uses adjacent. In addition, while the assessment may have concluded that there is sufficient provision, the NHS (North East Primary Care Services Agency) have recently approved Boots application to provide pharmaceutical services from the application site. On this issue, two points arise, in that firstly, the NHS in the North East is not opposed to further pharmaceutical provision, and secondly, that there is a clear distinction between the proposed store and those existing independent retailers.

21. Further evidence on the issue of impact of Boots stores in large shopping centres has been provided with the application. Where any pharmacies have closed, submitted evidence suggests that this was not as a result of the opening of a Boots store; rather it was through retirement or takeovers of chains and subsequent store rationalisation. Therefore, while recognising that local independent stores are fearful for the viability of their stores if the Boots store was to open, there is little evidence to suggest that a material impact on trade will occur. The proposals would not therefore result in demonstrable harm to either the city centre, district centres or local centres, or indeed those independent pharmacies located in an out of centre location and afforded the same policy status and limited protection as the application site.

Other Material Planning Considerations

22. The Government has recently written to all local planning authorities advising of a Written Ministerial Statement by the Minister for Decentralisation, the contents of which should be regarded as being a material planning consideration. Amongst other things, the statement advises local authorities to consider the range of likely economic, environmental and social benefits of proposals; including long-term or indirect benefits such as increased consumer choice, more viable communities and more robust local economies (which may, where relevant, include matters such as job creation and business productivity). In this case, the proposals seek to bring about the occupation of a retail unit which has been vacant for some 21 months, whilst creating employment opportunities for 8 full-time staff and 15 part-time staff. At a time when the latest unemployment statistics show a fall in unemployment nationally, there has been a considerable rise in unemployment in the North East (quarter to end February 2011 compared to previous quarter). Furthermore, there has been a rise nationally in unemployment among women who typically account for the greater proportion of part-time workers, noting that the proposed use by Boots would generate some 15 part-time jobs. It is therefore considered to be material that the proposals will bring about job creation at a time of economic depression. This is considered consistent with the approach set out at Policy EC10 of PPS4 which states that local planning authorities should adopt a positive and constructive approach towards planning application for economic development.

CONCLUSION

23. In conclusion, the applicants have demonstrated that there are no sequentially preferable sites available within or on the edge of the identified retail hierarchy, in terms of impact that Boots are committed to their existing provision in the City and have demonstrated commitment to the city centre generally through a financial contribution to shopfront improvements, and that the scale of the business and through evidenced experience of dual representation and impact on local pharmacies that the proposed use would not be to the detriment of the vitality and viability of existing centres. The conflict with Policy S8 of the Local Plan, and the departure that the approval of the application would represent, in terms of the range of goods permitted to be sold from the retail park, is considered to be outweighed by the Governments policy of seeking to ensure greater access to pharmaceutical services in accessible locations like large shopping centres where people already travel to, the need for job creation at a time of economic depression and the opportunity to bring a vacant retail unit back into use. Approval of the application is therefore recommended, subject to conditions to control the goods and services retailed from the premises and that the unit be occupied for the sole benefit of Boots the Chemist, these conditions being considered appropriate to the particular merits of the case made as part of the application, rather than the relaxation of goods able to be retailed being acceptable on the basis of any other pharmaceutical retailer.

RECOMMENDATION

1. That the application be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions and completion of s106 legal agreement:
2. The development to which this permission relates shall be begun not later than 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.
3. The premises shall be for the sole occupation of Boots the Chemist and shall not be occupied by any other retailer. Reason: In order to ensure the retail impacts and justification for the permitted use are retained in perpetuity and to ensure accordance otherwise with Policy S8 of the City of Durham local Plan 2004.
4. The use hereby approved shall not commence until a comprehensive schedule of products and services to be offered/provided at the premises has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The use shall be operated in full accordance thereafter with the agreed schedule. Reason: In order to ensure the range of goods and services offered at the premises is entirely reflective of the justification for the permitted use and to ensure accordance otherwise with Policy S8 of the City of Durham local Plan 2004.

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDATION

1. The proposed retail use would bring about the occupation of a prominent vacant retail unit, and where the applicants have demonstrated that there are no sequentially preferable sites available and where the degree of impact that a store of the size and in the location proposed would have limited material impact on the operators existing stores or other local pharmacies. The range of goods to be retailed including pharmaceutical, chemists products and small amount of food goods is however, contrary to Policy S8 of the City of Durham Local Plan 2004. Material considerations outweighing this minor departure and to enable the occupation of single unit, are considered to relate to the re-use of a vacant retail unit, the Government's drive to increase access to pharmaceutical services at large retail centre's like Durham City Retail Park where people already go, and the creation of a number of jobs at a time of continued economic depression.
 2. In particular the development was considered acceptable having regard to the specific nature of the intended operations business and their ongoing commitment to their stores in the city centre and the city centre generally.
 3. Whilst it is acknowledged that there is local opposition to proposed use on the basis that there will be a significant impact on local pharmacies that will affect their viability, there is little evidence to suggest that this would be the case, and as such, these concerns are considered to be of insufficient weight to outweigh the otherwise acceptable nature of the particular scheme proposed.
-

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Submitted Application Forms and Plans

Submitted Planning and Retail Statement

Supplementary information received 6 January 2011, 8 March 2011 and 20 April 2011

Design and Access Statement

North East of England Plan Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021 (RSS) July 2008

City of Durham Local Plan 2004

Planning Policy Statements 1 and 4, and Planning Policy Guidance note 13

County Durham Pharmaceutical Needs Assessment 2010-11

Responses from Planning Policy Section

Response from Belmont Parish Council

Public Consultation Responses

For reference purposes only. No further copies may be made



Planning Services

4/10/839/FPA

Unit 9 (Former Allied Carpets), Durham City Retail Park

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 (Durham City Area Office) Licence No. 100022202 2005.

Comments

Date

21 April 2011

Scale

1:1250