

COMMITTEE REPORT

APPLICATION DETAILS

APPLICATION NO:	4/13/00766/FPA
FULL APPLICATION DESCRIPTION:	Erection of 2 No. Dwellings (amended plans received 07th October 2013)
NAME OF APPLICANT:	Mr Ian Eggleston
ADDRESS:	14 Sidegate Durham DH1 5SY
ELECTORAL DIVISION:	Elvet and Gilesgate
CASE OFFICER:	Tim Burnham, Planning Officer, 03000 263963 tim.burnham@durham.gov.uk

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND PROPOSALS

SITE

1. The application site is an area of land which sits between 11 and 14 Sidegate, which is a historic street within the Durham City Centre Conservation Area forming a steep link between Framwelgate Waterside and the A691. The road is not a through road to vehicles under normal use but bollards can be removed to provide occasional access. The area is currently formed of concrete hard standing, a small overgrown grassed area and a conservatory which is attached to the south west facing side elevation of 14 Sidegate. A garden area sits towards the rear of the site.

2. No's 11 and 14 Sidegate contain a window each to their side elevations which overlook the application site. The south west facing ground floor side elevation of 14 Sidegate bears a hallway window while the north east facing elevation of 11 Sidegate exhibits a first floor bathroom window.

3. In a wider context land levels slope downwards from south west to north east. Open ground lies opposite the application site while further terraced dwellings sit along the south east side of Sidegate. Properties on Diamond Terrace sit up the hill separated from the street by front gardens to the north west.

PROPOSAL

4. The application proposes the erection of 2 terraced dwellings which would fill in the gap between the existing terrace in this part of Sidegate. The dwellings would be of two storey construction, with accommodation in the roof space, with the lower property stepped down slightly.

5. In terms of design features, a dormer window would be provided to both the front and rear roof slopes of the properties. Two rear off shots serving each dwelling separated by a

valley gutter would provide additional habitable space at ground floor level. Windows would be centrally aligned above one another to the front elevation.

6. Internally, the ground floors are proposed to be equipped with lounge, bathroom, kitchen and dining area. To the first floor, a bedroom and a bathroom is proposed, with two bedrooms proposed to the second floor.

7. Externally reclaimed blue slate roofs are proposed, with lead cheeks to dormer windows, reclaimed brick to match to front elevations with new brick to match proposed to the rear. UPVC sash windows are proposed.

8. This scheme is being reported to the Planning Committee at the request of County Councillor Richard Ormerod due to concern over anticipated parking problems in association with the new dwellings, due to concerns that the buildings will leave insufficient space for bin storage and because it is considered that the proposed development is not in keeping with the character of Sidegate.

PLANNING HISTORY

9. There is no recent relevant planning history relating to the site.

PLANNING POLICY

NATIONAL POLICY

10. The Government has consolidated all planning policy statements, guidance notes and many circulars into a single policy statement, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), although the majority of supporting Annexes to the planning policy statements are retained. The overriding message is that new development that is sustainable should go ahead without delay. It defines the role of planning in achieving sustainable development under three topic headings – economic, social and environmental, each mutually dependant.

11. The presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in the NPPF requires local planning authorities to approach development management decisions positively, utilising twelve ‘core planning principles’

The following elements are considered relevant to this proposal

12. *NPPF Part 6 - Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes.* To boost significantly the supply of housing, applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

13. *NPPF Part 7 – Requiring Good Design.* The Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment, with good design a key aspect of sustainable development, indivisible from good planning.

14. *NPPF Part 12 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment.* Part 12 sets out the governments aims in relation to the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment and gives guidance in relation to matters concerning heritage assets.

LOCAL PLAN POLICY:

15. Policy E6 (Durham City Centre Conservation Area) states that the special character, appearance and setting of the Durham (City Centre) Conservation Area will be preserved or enhanced as required by section 72 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. The policy specifically requires proposals to use high quality design and materials which are sympathetic to the traditional character of the conservation area.

16. Policy E16 (Nature Conservation – The Natural Environment) This Policy requires that any potential impact upon nature conservation interests should be investigated as part of any planning application.

17. Policy E22 (Conservation Areas) seeks to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of conservation areas, by not permitting development which would detract from its setting, while ensuring that proposals are sensitive in terms of scale, design and materials reflective of existing architectural details.

18. Policy H2 (New Housing in Durham City) requires that new housing is in keeping with the traditional character and setting of the City, preferably on previously developed sites.

19. Policy H13 (Residential Areas – Impact upon Character and Amenity) states that planning permission will not be granted for new development or changes of use which have a significant adverse effect on the character or appearance of residential areas, or the amenities of residents within them.

20. Policy T1 (Traffic – 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

21. 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.

22. Policies Q1 and Q2 (General Principles Designing for People and Accessibility) states that the layout and design of all new development should take into account the requirements of all users.

23. Policy Q8 (Layout and Design – Residential Development) sets out the Council's standards for the layout of new residential development. Amongst other things, new dwellings must be appropriate in scale, form, density and materials to the character of their surroundings. The impact on the occupants of existing nearby properties should be minimised.

24. Policy Q10 (Dormer Windows) This Policy requires that dormer windows should be appropriate in design.

25. Policy U8A (Disposal of Foul and Surface Water) requires that development proposals include satisfactory arrangements for disposing foul and surface water discharges.

26. Policy U11 (Development on Contaminated Land) This Policy requires that any contamination be identified and if necessary addressed prior to development.

27. Policy U13 (Development on Unstable Land) This Policy seeks to ensure that land which could be unstable is made safe and suitable for development.

CONSULTATION AND PUBLICITY RESPONSES

CONSULTEE RESPONSES:

28. Highways Development Management has offered no objections to the application. They have suggested that not providing dedicated parking provision to the dwellings is acceptable as the site is accessible for pedestrians and nearby to local facilities and transport links. It is stated that any residents in the properties could apply for parking permits up to a maximum of two per dwelling for parking at the eastern end of Sidegate or Framwelgate Waterside.

29. The Coal Authority has raised no objections to the application subject to the imposition of a condition relating to intrusive site investigations.

30. Northumbrian Water has raised no objections to the application.

INTERNAL CONSULTEE RESPONSES:

31. Design and Conservation have offered no objection to the application as they suggest it offers the opportunity to enhance the terrace and this part of the Conservation Area.

32. Ecology Officers have offered no objection to the application.

33. Planning Policy has offered no objection to the application.

34. Pollution Control has offered no objections subject to appropriate measures being implemented to manage dust and noise disturbance during any construction activity.

PUBLIC RESPONSES:

35. The City of Durham Trust has commented on the design of the scheme and amendments to the scheme have been incorporated. Sidegate Residents Association has objected to the application. Letters of objection have also been received from 9 local residences.

36. Most objections are put forward on the basis that the properties would be brought into use as Houses of Multiple Occupation. Objections are put forward on the basis of lack of bin storage space provided, while further concerns are put forward that an increase in residents on the street would put further pressure on available parking space in and close to the street. It is suggested that further HMO's would be of detriment to the street and would negatively impact on the surrounding Conservation Area. There are concerns that a current sense of community could be damaged or lost. A request has been made that a covenant be placed restricting the properties to family use only. It is suggested that the application is contrary to Policies H9 and H13 of the City of Durham Local Plan.

APPLICANTS STATEMENT:

37. Mr & Mrs Eggleston have owned 14 Sidegate and the adjacent site for nearly ten years for which they have let the property to students and other private individuals, the site

as it stands is surplus to requirements for the purposes of the people living in the property and they feel that reinstating two houses on the site would greatly improve the area.

38. Due to their long term involvement in the site the applicants are keen to see the site developed without harming the amenity of the existing residents and have gone to great lengths produce a satisfactory design and to consult with the Local Authority and accept their guidance on the design. The applicants have put forward a detailed scheme which is in keeping with the adjacent buildings | the street.

39. There have been several concerns raised by local residents particularly regarding renting the properties to students however it should be pointed out that this is not necessarily the case, the properties will be high quality and be attractive to all manner of prospective tenants. Mr & Mrs Eggleston pride themselves on letting the property to responsible individuals and have not experienced any problems with their tenants, the fact that they own other properties in the street means it is not in their interest to cause disturbance to the detriment of other residents.

40. Mr & Mrs Eggleston feel that the scheme submitted is sensitive to the immediate surroundings, will result in an improvement to the area and provide good quality rental housing which is always required in the City and would respectfully hope that the committee agree and support the application.

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=10/00955/FPA>

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS AND ASSESSMENT

41. Having regard to the requirements of Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 the relevant Development Plan policies, relevant guidance and all other material planning considerations, including representations received, it is considered that the main planning issues in this instance relate to the principle of the development at the site, the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, the layout and design of the proposed development, the impact on the residential area and highways issues.

The Principle of the development of the site

42. Officers consider the site previously developed land. The site appears to have been developed in relatively recent times and it appears that terraced properties stood here, possibly demolished during the 1960's. The side elevations of 11 and 14 Sidegate have a fairly rough and uncompromising appearance, the current structures offering evidence of previous buildings on this site. The site has remained developed through the provision of hard standing and a conservatory, and Officers do not interpret the site as private residential garden.

43. The area is residential in nature and therefore further residential accommodation would be an entirely appropriate use of the land at this site. Policy H2 of the City of Durham Local Plan seeks to direct new residential development to previously developed land and conversions; therefore this application is in accordance with this Policy.

44. Notwithstanding this interpretation, The NPPF puts forward strongly a 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. On this basis even if the land was considered to constitute private garden, and therefore a green field site, Officers consider that the development site would be sustainable due to its proximity to Durham City Centre.

45. The current arrangement and state of the site stands out somewhat, and the filling of this gap would represent a natural continuation of the terrace. Officers do not consider that the principle of the development of this site would represent inappropriate development which would harm the local area in principle.

The character and appearance of the Conservation Area

46. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that Local Planning Authorities shall pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of Conservation Areas. Policy E22 states that proposals should enhance or preserve the character of the Conservation Area. Policy E6 relates directly to the Durham (City Centre) Conservation Area and requires that developments exhibit simple and robust shapes, incorporate traditional roofs, reflect an appropriate quality of design and use appropriate external materials.

47. The National Planning Policy Framework at Part 12 is of relevance. This requires that the impact of any development is considered against the significance of the Heritage Asset, which in this instance is Durham City Centre Conservation Area.

48. The infilling of the site with a development that reflects the style, scale and pattern of development within the surrounding area is considered acceptable.

49. The style and detailing of the proposed development reflects that of the surrounding terraced properties. The nature of this terrace within Sidegate is of stepped properties due to the changing ground level.

50. To the front and rear roof slopes, proposed dormer windows of appropriate design would allow the incorporation of habitable accommodation to the second floor. The dormer windows would be set well down from the ridgeline, would be of appropriate proportion and would not over dominate the roof slope.

51. The materials which are proposed would serve further to make the development appropriate to its Conservation Area setting. Externally reclaimed blue slate roofs are proposed, with lead cheeks to dormer windows, reclaimed brick to match to front elevations with new brick to match proposed to the rear. UPVC sash windows are proposed. These materials are befitting of the sites Conservation Area setting. While the use of UPVC is not ideal, windows in such materials have come on significantly and if good quality sash windows are sourced, it can be very difficult to differentiate them from more traditional materials such as wood. The exact windows to be used can be controlled via condition.

52. Officers consider that the development would rationalise the site and improve the appearance of the Conservation Area between 11 and 14 Sidegate. The current gap site offers very little in terms of visual amenity and has a stark and unfinished appearance that detracts from the character of the Conservation Area.

53. Officers consider that the application would enhance the character of the Conservation Area, while reflecting an appropriate standard of design and materials in accordance with Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act, Part 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies E6 and E22 of the City of Durham Local Plan.

The layout and design of the proposed development

54. Policy Q8 requires that new residential development should be appropriate in scale, form, density and materials to the character of its surroundings. It requires that adequate

amenity space and privacy should be afforded to each dwelling and outlines appropriate separation distances between properties.

55. The two dwellings have been designed to match the scale, form and density of adjoining properties within the terrace and are considered acceptable in this respect. The design of the dwellings would not look out of character with the surroundings.

56. Officers acknowledge that outdoor amenity space at the site would be limited, provided only in the form of a very small yard area to the rear of the single storey off shots to the back of the dwellings. Nevertheless, the space provided would not be significantly out of character to that provided at many terraced residential properties both in the immediate vicinity and within the City centre.

57. The design of the scheme has been amended at the suggestion of Conservation Officers. Through negotiation, improvements have been brought to the scheme including the re positioning of windows to the front elevation and the inclusion of a valley gutter design to the rear off shots to reduce the massing of these elements and to enable them to be read separately from one another.

58. The loss of the hallway window to 14 Sidegate is not considered problematic as the hallway is not considered a habitable room which could reasonably expect an outlook. 14 Sidegate is within the ownership of the applicant. The loss of the first floor bathroom window to 11 Sidegate is also not considered problematic. Officers understand the applicant has agreed a scheme to relocate this bathroom window by providing a velux style window to the roof slope, works which would constitute permitted development. Again, a bathroom window could not be expected to offer significant outlook and the arrangements form a satisfactory solution to the issues for officers. The site overlooks sloping open ground to the front and an area populated by trees with the Raddison hotel beyond to the rear, and no other issues of significance surrounding the layout and design of the proposed development have been identified.

59. On balance, officers consider that the application is appropriate in terms of Policy Q8. The proposed development does not raise significant issues surrounding its relationships to other nearby properties, while the dwellings would be suitable in scale, form, density and materials to their surrounds.

The impact upon the residential area

60. It is important to note that while points of objection have been received in relation to these properties being student lets, this type of tenure is by no means a certainty, although Officers acknowledge that this use is possible. The possibility of utilising an additional room or two for bedrooms within each property is recognised. It would not seem possible however to provide any more than 5 bedrooms per property at the extreme end of the scale through converting part of the dining room and the lounge. Officers consider that the dwellings would likely fall within the C4 use class (House in Multiple Occupation) if utilised by between three and six unrelated individuals, as their only or main residence, although this would very much depend on the exact arrangements at the properties and between the tenants as to whether a C3 (Dwellinghouse) or C4 use was active at the site. It is currently 'permitted development' to change between C3 to C4 use.

61. Policy H13 states that planning permission will not be granted for new development or changes of use which would have a significant adverse effect on the character or appearance of residential areas, or the amenities of residents within them.

62. Officers have been informed that for the records of 2010-2011 only 10 Sidegate is a licensed HMO. Officers understand that student exemptions for council tax purposes were also applied at 14, 16, and 17 Sidegate and North Barn, Crook Hall during that period.

63. The County Durham Plan, currently in draft form, proposes to address the issue of houses in multiple occupation and student accommodation. Policy 32 states that in order to support mixed and balanced communities and maintain an appropriate housing mix, applications for new build houses in multiple occupation will not be permitted if the application site is located in, or within 50m of a postcode area where more than 10% of the total number of properties is already in use as a licensed HMO or student accommodation exempt from council tax charges. Policy officers have opined that if both properties were implemented as small HMO's or converted to small HMO's at a later stage this application or any future change of use may be contrary to this policy in the emerging local plan. However, despite representing the authorities current proposed thinking on issues relating to HMO's, the pre submission draft local plan can currently only be given limited weight in the decision making process, as the draft policy may be subject to change.

64. Concerns over the habitation of the properties by students are noted. It is acknowledged that students may have different lifestyles to many other residents on the street. There is a variety of type and range of housing within Sidegate and Officers consider that the proposed dwellings would not result in a development that would be to the detriment of the range and variety of local housing stock. There are no set thresholds in relation to the acceptability of one type of housing or another, and it is for Officers to make a considered judgement, taking into account all relevant material considerations on the matter. Officers are unable to identify any issues that would cause such significant harm to the locality as to warrant refusal of this planning application.

64. It is important to note that the properties are designed internally as family accommodation.

66. In light of the above considerations and in accordance with Policy H13, officers do not consider that the properties would create a situation where the character or appearance of the area or the amenities of residents within them would be significantly compromised.

67. Officers do not feel that a development at the level of accommodation proposed would contravene the National Planning Policy Framework which aims to create safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion.

Highways Issues

68. Policy T1 requires that new development should not be detrimental to highway safety or generate traffic which would have a significant effect on the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring property. Policy T10 states that vehicle parking off the public highway should be limited in amount so as to promote sustainable transport choices and reduce the land take of development.

69. Highways Development Management has offered no objections to the application. They have suggested that not providing dedicated parking provision to the dwellings is acceptable as the site is accessible for pedestrians and nearby to local facilities and transport links. It is stated that any residents in the properties could apply for parking permits up to a maximum of two per dwelling for parking at the eastern end of Sidegate or Framwelgate Waterside. Officers have been made aware that there is competition for parking spaces in the immediate area, but have visited the site on various occasions and at different times of day including university term time and seen parking available near to the site on most occasions. Officers do not therefore consider that the provision of a maximum

of two parking permits per dwelling would lead to significant highways or parking problems that would warrant refusal of the application.

Other Issues

70. Concern has been expressed over the lack of arrangements for the storage of refuse bins at the site. On visits to Sidegate bins appear to be stored on the terrace adjacent to the north east side elevation of 17 Sidegate or occasionally on the footpath to the front of the terrace. Bins have also been noted stored on the application site. Officers are able to request details of the bin storage arrangements via condition. Officers however are satisfied that suitable arrangements could be agreed which would not compromise highway safety or be harmful to visual amenity to a significant degree. Officers, on balance do not consider this issue so significant as to contribute towards a refusal reason against the application.

71. A bat risk assessment has been undertaken in relation to the application site as a risk to bats was identified due the age of the properties which adjoin the site. The risk assessment concluded that the development site offers no opportunities for bats to roost. The development site has therefore been classed as having a low risk in relation to roosting bats. The Councils senior ecology officer has agreed with this conclusion and has offered no objection.

72. Due to the relatively compact nature of the site in its Conservation Area setting and the limited external space provided, Officers see it appropriate to remove permitted development rights relating to extensions, roof alterations and outbuildings.

CONCLUSION

73. Officers consider that the principle of the development site is acceptable as the site constitutes previously developed land within the City of Durham Settlement boundary and residential use is appropriate in the context of the surrounding area.

74. Officers consider that the application is appropriate in terms of impact upon Durham City Centre Conservation Area as the development is designed in such a manner that it would enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and improve the appearance of a stark site which offers little to the character of the area.

75. Officers consider that the development is acceptable in terms of the scale, layout and design. Two dwellings designed in a manner to match their surroundings are considered appropriate in this location.

76. The development would be acceptable in terms of its impact upon the residential area as Officers consider that the level and density of accommodation proposed would not have a significant adverse impact upon the character of the area to the detriment of community cohesion. In the absence of an evidence based policy that can be given significant weight in the planning process relating to proportions of properties to let in any given area, it is not considered that the introduction of a further two properties of the scale proposed, even if utilised as student accommodation would demonstrably harm the balance of the local community.

77. Officers consider that the application is acceptable in terms of parking and highways issues. Parking is available within nearby streets and Highways development management have confirmed that each dwelling would be eligible to up to two parking permits each.

78. Taking all relevant planning considerations into account, Officers consider the application to meet the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and

RECOMMENDATION

That the application be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions;

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 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.

2. Notwithstanding any details of materials submitted with the application no development shall commence until details of the make, colour and texture of all walling and roofing materials have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local planning authority. The development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of the appearance of the area and to comply with Policies E6 and E22 of the City of Durham Local Plan.

3. Notwithstanding any details of materials submitted with the application no development shall commence until full details of the windows proposed for use have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local planning authority. The development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of the appearance of the area and to comply with Policies E6 and E22 of the City of Durham Local Plan.

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or in any Statutory Instrument revoking or re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no development falling within Classes A, B, C or E of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the said Order shall be carried out without the prior written permission of the Local planning authority on an application submitted to it.

Reason: In the interests of the appearance of the area and to comply with Policies E6 and E22 of the City of Durham Local Plan.

5. Notwithstanding any details of materials submitted with the application no development shall commence until full details of bin storage arrangements have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local planning authority. The development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of the appearance of the area and to comply with Policies E6 and E22 of the City of Durham Local Plan.

6. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved the intrusive investigative works recommended within the Coal Mining Risk Assessment by Dunelm Geotechnical and Environmental received 01st November 2013 must be undertaken. The results of said investigation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development. Should the results of the investigative works confirm the need for remedial works to treat any areas of shallow mine workings and/or any other mitigation measures to ensure the safety and stability of the development, the proposed scheme of remedial/mitigation works must be submitted to and

approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development. Thereafter the development shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed remedial/mitigation scheme.

Reason: In the interests of the stability of the land sought for development having regards to Policy U13 of the City of Durham Local Plan 2004.

7. No development shall take place until a site investigation and desk top study has been carried out in accordance with Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990. The results of the site investigation shall be submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

As a minimum requirement, the desk top study should include the following information in relation to the study site:

- Historical land use
- Former contaminative site uses
- Typical contaminants from former industrial uses
- Watercourses, major underground aquifers, water source protection zones, at or close to the site
- Ground water, perched ground water
- Adjacent land uses and their historical land use, and potential to affect the study site
- All former holes in the ground on or close to the study site

If the desk top study determines there is no historical land use which may cause contamination of the site, no further action is required in relation to the contaminated land risk assessment.

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors in accordance with Policy U11 of the City of Durham Local Plan 2004.

8. If any historical land use which may cause contamination of the site is found from the desk top study site investigation, no development shall take place until an intrusive site investigation (Phase 2) has been carried out. The site investigation methodology shall be agreed in writing with the local planning authority prior to commencement of the site investigation. The results of the site investigation shall be submitted as a report and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

The site investigation report shall take into consideration; the relevant aspects of the desk top study and discuss remediation measures in accordance with appropriate legislative guidance notes.

If, during the course of development, any contamination is found which has not been identified in the site investigation, additional measures for the remediation of this source of contamination, shall be submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

After remediation measures are implemented at the site, a final validation statement shall be submitted in accordance with the remediation recommendations of the above 'Phase 2' report.

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without

unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors in accordance with Policy U11 of the City of Durham Local Plan 2004.

9. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in strict accordance with the following approved plans. Drawing P2013/11/02 rev A, P2013/11/03 rev A received 07th October 2013, Bat Risk Assessment by Barrett Environmental Ltd received 29th August 2013 & Coal Mining Risk Assessment by Dunelm Geotechnical and Environmental received 01st November 2013.

Reason: To define the consent and ensure that a satisfactory form of development is obtained in accordance with Policies E6, E16, E22, H2, H9, T1, T10, Q1, Q2, Q8, Q10, U8A, U11 and U13 of the City of Durham Local Plan 2004.

STATEMENT OF PROACTIVE ENGAGEMENT

In dealing with the application, the Local Planning Authority has worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner based on seeking solutions to problems arising during the application process. The decision has not been made within the 8 week target provided due to the application being called up to committee and due to the need to address coal mining issues, however the application has been reported to members at the first available opportunity.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Submitted Application Forms, Plans and supporting documents
National Planning Policy Framework
City of Durham Local Plan 2004
Response from Councillor Ormerod
Responses from City of Durham Trust
Response from Objectors
External and internal consultation responses



Planning Services

Erection of 2 No. Dwellings (amended plans received 07th October 2013) at 14 Sidegate, Durham, DH1 5SY

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 Licence No. 100022202 2005

Date 10th December 2013