

DURHAM COUNTY COUNCIL
AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE (CENTRAL AND EAST)

At a Meeting of **Area Planning Committee (Central and East)** held in Council Chamber, County Hall, Durham on **Tuesday 13 October 2015 at 1.00 pm**

Present:

Councillor P Taylor (Chairman)

Members of the Committee:

Councillors H Bennett (substituting for Councillor A Laing), G Bleasdale, P Conway, M Davinson, D Freeman, S Iveson, J Lethbridge, C Kay, J Lethbridge, B Moir, R Lumsdon and K Shaw

1 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors J Clark, K Dearden, A Laing and J Robinson.

2 Substitute Members

Councillor H Bennett substituted for Councillor A Laing and Councillor J Maitland substituted for Councillor J Clark.

3 Minutes

The Minutes of the meetings held on 9 June 2015 were confirmed as correct a record and signed by the Chairman.

4 Declarations of Interest

Councillor R Lumsdon declared an interest in agenda item 5a as she knew the applicant personally, Councillor Lumsdon would therefore remove herself from the meeting while the item was being considered.

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

Councillor R Lumsdon left the meeting.

a DM/15/01520/FPA – Land adjacent to Evergreen Park, Crimdon

The Committee considered a report of the Senior Planning Officer regarding the change of use from materials storage area to permit siting of 16 executive holiday lodges at land adjacent to Evergreen Park, Crimdon (for copy see file of Minutes).

The Principal Planning Officer provided the Committee with a detailed presentation which included photographs of the site and a plan of the proposed layout. Members of the Committee had previously visited the existing site and were familiar with the location and setting.

Members were reminded that the application had previously been deferred as there was concern that letters of objection had not been accurately reported and so issues raised in objection might not have been addressed. It was clarified that 25 letters of objection had been received from 22 properties and no new issues had been raised.

Members were advised that should approval be granted, an additional condition would be required to ensure that details of a visitor parking scheme was submitted before the site was occupied.

The Principal Planning Officer advised the Committee that contrary to paragraph 19 of the report, no weight could now be given to the County Durham Plan.

Councillor R Crute, local Member, addressed the Committee. He advised that while he and his colleague, Councillor L Pounder, had no issue with the type of development being proposed, they did not believe the proposals were appropriate for the identified location. Furthermore, they both would have liked to have had some involvement during the pre-application stage however had never been approached by the applicant.

Councillor Crute highlighted that the application site was outside of the settlement boundary which was contrary to saved Local Plan Policy E3. He felt the development would have a significant detrimental impact on local amenity in terms of noise, disturbance and traffic which was contrary to saved Local Plan Policies 35 and 85. Furthermore the application contravened saved Policy 36 in relation to traffic generation and road safety and it was unclear how the application would encourage alternative means of travel to the car. Concerns were also raised relating to flooding.

In relation to the public consultation, Councillor Crute queried where the report stated that there were 9 letters of support from residents. He asked for clarification as to whether they were from residents or businesses and also pointed out that all were just one line letters.

Councillor Crute also highlighted that there was no mention in the previous committee report to a solicitor's letter which had been submitted in objection to the application. The letter had raised land ownership concerns and issues relating to flooding. The letter was now mentioned in the current report however the issues raised had not been addressed by officers. Members were advised that the landowner next to the site kept bulls and had therefore raised safety concerns. Further concerns had also been raised regarding the chemical spread buffer zone and drainage issues.

In relation to highways issues, Councillor Crute advised that the local Fire and Rescue Service suggested that there were 2 accidents per year at or near the access to the site. Councillor Crute believed this was unacceptably high and the influx of additional visitors to the area would result in an increase in accidents.

While the tourism benefits of the application were appreciated, the concerns of local residents were not to be ignored. Councillor Crute believed the relevant policies for consideration were those relating to the right of peace for local residents, free from disturbance.

Councillor L Pounder, local Member, addressed the Committee to read a letter of concern from local residents.

Members were advised that the residents at Evergreen Park lived there on a full time, permanent basis and they felt that the proposed use was not appropriate next to a peaceful residential area which was predominantly occupied by retired or semi-retired residents.

Councillor Pounder advised that the current properties at Evergreen Park were not made of conventional materials and as such were more affected by noise and disturbance. It was felt that the proposed use of the adjacent site would generate significant noise, with visitors to the holiday lodges socialising at all times of the day and night and regularly driving on and off the site as there were no on site facilities. The Committee was advised that the occupier of no.17 Evergreen Park would be particularly affected by noise and disturbance from vehicles as all holiday park traffic would have to pass the gable end of that property. Councillor Pounder advised that the landscape planting scheme would do nothing to screen the noise, furthermore it would cause a loss of natural light. Increased disturbance would also be generated from the waste disposal area.

The residents had advised that when they had bought their properties, the sales brochure had suggested that the location was private, however this was now to be compromised and the residents were facing a permanent loss of privacy.

Councillor Pounder advised that the only access to the site was vehicular as there were no footpaths either on or off the site. As such, concerns had been raised regarding pedestrian safety and there was more potential for road traffic accidents to occur due to the increased traffic entering and leaving the site.

Residents had also expressed concerns regarding the impact of development on the drainage system, as the proposed site location was much more elevated than the existing properties. Assurance was therefore sought that there would be no additional impact on the drains as there was a history of surface water flooding. It was feared that increased run off would exacerbate the drainage system.

It was reiterated that letters of objection had been submitted from 21 of the current properties and while local residents appreciated the economic benefits of the proposals, it would be to the detriment of those currently occupying the site.

Mr A Stephenson addressed the Committee speaking on behalf of the applicant. Members were advised that the operators understood the concerns expressed by their neighbours who were residents of Evergreen Park, however also wished to emphasise that they actually lived closest to the proposed development. It was their property which would overlook the development and so their prime goal was to

maintain the high standards which were already at Evergreen Park. Members were advised that they had no desire or intention to create a Butlins style holiday park, rather that they wanted an area which was peaceful and tranquil. The intention was to develop a small, low key project of executive style high end holiday lodges. With similar age restrictions to what was already at Evergreen Park, the emphasis would be on the more restrained clients seeking a peaceful luxury retreat and careful vetting of proposed clients, together with strict rules and control.

Mr Stephenson highlighted that all current residents had actually chosen to live at Evergreen Park and live there in the full knowledge that they would be separated by a minimum of 6m from their neighbours. Members were assured that the nearest any resident would be to a proposed holiday lodge was 10m, or 66% further away and the farthest would be 16m which was close to 3 times further away. Further mitigation would be offered by way of screening. The Committee was advised that over the past 12 years there had been no complaints about noise from neighbours and the operator did not wish for that record to be blemished.

Mr Stephenson highlighted that the current residents had also chosen to live at Evergreen, fully aware of the traffic noise from the nearby coast road and railway. The occasional vehicle coming into the proposed lodges would, because of the speed restriction, be completely masked by the coast road traffic and would therefore not have any impact.

In relation to traffic on the coast road, Members were advised that former activities at Crimdon Dene such as a beauty pageant and amusements, generated far more traffic than what would ever occur from the minor intensification of traffic on the proposed development. Furthermore, Members were reminded that Evergreen Park had formerly been a caravan park with up to 50 static and touring caravans.

In referring to paragraph 29 of the report, Mr Stephenson highlighted that the Highways Authority confirmed the site location had a good safety record and the access to it was safe.

In relation to water concerns, Mr Stephenson advised that the applicant had submitted photos taken after some 15 hours of continuous rainfall on 13th and 14th August, which demonstrated there were no water issues at all.

The Principal Planning Officer responded to points raised as follows:-

- Drainage – it was accepted that the Drainage Officer had expressed some concerns and had suggested permeation tests. As such, should permission be granted, a further condition would be required for drainage to be dealt with adequately;
- Support – The Committee was advised that all 9 letters of support had been received from local businesses;
- Farmers concerns – many developments took place next to farmers fields, the Planning Authority did not have any control over farming activity;
- Attenuating Noise – the proposed activity of the site would be domestic and on a temporary basis, similar to what was already at Evergreen Park;

- It was felt that the proposed activity of the site could comfortably occur next to the current residents.

The Highways Officer responded to points raised as follows:-

- Traffic flow on the A1086 was approximately 9000 vehicles per day and the proposed development would add less than 1% of that onto the highway;
- The Highways Agency would only comment when there was the potential for a direct impact on the strategic network. The proposed development would have no impact on the A19;
- Accident statistics – The Highways Authority used a Durham Police database known as Stats 19 and the statistics from that database were nationally acceptable by all bodies. Statistical reports from others were considered unreliable. While there may have been accidents away from the site at other parts of the A1086, there was no records of any recorded personal injury accidents in the vicinity of the site access.

Councillor Conway noted that Evergreen Park was a residential area of permanent residence for an essentially retired community. He wondered if in the fullness of time, the proposed holiday park might itself become a place of permanent residence.

Councillor Moir stated that the promotion of economic benefits and tourism was acceptable in principle and the proposed development did seem acceptable, though not in the proposed location. It was noted that over 90% of the objections had come from residents of Evergreen Park and Councillor Moir stated that families visiting the holiday park would inevitably make noise, regularly and quite possibly after hours. He did feel that should the application be approved, local residents would suffer a loss of visual amenity and would suffer a detrimental effect from noise and disturbance.

In response to a query from Councillor Iveson, the Principal Planning Officer clarified that the Planning Authority would have no control over site activity, that would be the responsibility of the operator, though there was a condition proposed regarding the monitoring of the occupiers of the site.

In relation to whether the site could become permanently occupied in time, the Principal Planning Officer advised that the intention was to control the use so that it would always be holiday accommodation.

Councillor Lethbridge had found the site to be peaceful and was concerned about how it would become if the lodges were developed. It was a permanent site of residence and those that lived there wanted a quiet life. He believed the site was inappropriate for the proposed scheme.

Councillor Conway was not comfortable that there was no possibility of the site ever becoming an area of permanent residence and he moved refusal on the grounds that the application contravened saved Local Plan Policies 3 and 36.

Councillor Kay observed that there was no local appetite for the application. The impact of development on residential amenity was extremely important.

The Solicitor stated that the speculation over the precise legal arrangements with the owner for future occupancy of the site, was of no relevance to the Committee. Conditions 5, 6 and 7 related to the nature of occupation and would be binding.

In response to a query from Councillor Davinson, the Principal Planning Officer clarified that the proposed additional condition regarding visitor parking would have to be followed by the applicant.

The Solicitor advised that no weight could be given to saved Local Plan Policy 3 as it was a settlement boundary policy which was no longer considered to be up to date, further to recent barristers advice.

Councillor Conway clarified that the reasons for refusal were as follows:-

That the application contravened saved Local Plan Policy 35 in relation to traffic generation, saved Local Plan Policy 36 in relation to an adverse effect on highway safety and pedestrian safety and NPPF Part 3 in relation to the site not being sustainable.

Councillor Moir seconded the motion for refusal and upon a vote being taken it was;

Resolved: “That the application be **REFUSED** on the grounds that it was contrary to saved Local Plan Policies 35 and 36 and NPPF Part 3”.

Councillor Lumsdon did not return to the meeting.

b DM/15/02021/FPA – 60B & C Claypath, Durham, DH1 1QS

The Committee considered a report of the Planning Officer regarding the demolition of existing two storey end terrace house and construction of two student flats at 60B & C Claypath, Durham, DH1 1QS(for copy see file of Minutes).

The Principal Planning Officer provided the Committee with a detailed presentation which included photographs of the site and a plan of the proposed layout. Members of the Committee had visited the site and were familiar with the location and setting.

Councillor R Ormerod, local Member, addressed the Committee to speak in objection to the application. Members were advised that 60C Claypath had been derelict for many years, while the other properties in the block were generally occupied by students. The amenity of nearby residents of Claypath and Hillcrest Mews, would be detrimentally affected should the application be approved, particularly in terms of loss of sunlight, which was contrary to saved Local Plan Policy H13. In addition, the overbearing nature of the proposed development was also considered unacceptable.

Councillor Ormerod advised that the proposed development was less than 14 metres from 59 Claypath and the bedrooms would look directly into the first floor.

Members were advised that the application contravened saved Policy H9 which stated that the subdivision of an existing property should not have an adverse effect on neighbouring residents.

Councillor Ormerod highlighted that many properties in that area of the city were let to students and with some 3000 student bed applications now approved, this far exceeded the predicted requirement from the University. Councillor Ormerod believed families were being excluded from the area and he feared that such parts of the city would become student dominant. There was a real need to encourage balanced communities.

In relation to bin storage, Councillor Ormerod advised that the proposals would result in a health hazard if unmanaged, as was the case elsewhere in the city.

Mr A Watson, representing the applicant, addressed the Committee. Members were advised that the proposals were the result of extensive consultation dating as far back as 2008. Such consultation had involved the Highways Authority and the Council's Conservation Officers. In presenting the application, Mr Watson advised that all comments relating to the position and appearance of the proposed development, had been accounted for.

Members were advised that student accommodation accounted for 39% of that area of the city and in relation to overlooking, Mr Watson advised that various changes had been made to the scheme to resolve any issues. The current application had only one bathroom window which would be on a level with surrounding properties, which would have obscured glazing.

Councillor D Freeman echoed the comments of Councillor Ormerod. In referring to the officers' assertion that student presence in the city was moderate, he argued that 30% in the Claypath area and 65% in the surrounding area, was much more than moderate. He highlighted that an interim policy regarding student accommodation was currently being considered which spoke of levels of 10% per postcode area. Had the current application come forward at a future date when an interim policy was in place, then it would be refused on the grounds of exceeding the limit for the area. Councillor Freeman believed that the interim policy demonstrated that the current situation was not acceptable.

Members were advised that saved Policy H9 was particularly relevant as 39% and 65% were not acceptable levels and far exceeded what would be acceptable in a balanced community.

In relation to overlooking, Councillor Freeman suggested that the application failed to meet acceptable levels as the distance from the development to both 2 Hillcrest Mews and 59 Claypath, failed the recommended 21 metre separation distance.

The Principal Planning Officer responded to the points raised as follows:-

- Overbearing development / Loss of Amenity – the Planning Authority accepted there were shortcomings in relation to separation distances, as detailed within the officer's report. However Members were reminded that separation distances

were merely guidelines, mainly to be taken into account for the development of schemes such as new estates. The site location was a tight area and so separation distances were less achievable;

- Student Accommodation – The levels in the Claypath area were considered moderate, relative to the surrounding area, as detailed in paragraph 59 of the officer report. The site was an appropriate location for students as it was in close proximity to the city centre;
- Gable End – A separation distance of 13 metres would have been expected, however 2 Hillcrest Mews was currently facing a rear wall with a gable effect. It could therefore be argued that the current situation had a worse impact than what was being proposed.

Councillor Lethbridge had found the current building to be an eyesore compared to the front area of Claypath and he was mindful that the Committee were not in a position to make judgements regarding student numbers. He felt the proposals would improve the building while providing a service, he therefore moved that the application be approved.

Councillor Kay seconded the motion to approve the application. He too had found the building to be untidy and noted that there were already HMO's in the immediate vicinity. The proposals would be a vast improvement to the current building and issues regarding overbearing had been dealt with thoroughly within the officer report.

Resolved: “That the application be approved subject to the conditions detailed within the report”.

c DM/15/02154/FPA – Shoulder of Mutton, Low Row, Easington, Peterlee, SR8 3AU

The Committee considered a report of the Planning Officer regarding the change of use, partial demolition and rebuild/extension of public house to provide 13 residential units at the Shoulder of Mutton, Low Row, Easington, Peterlee, SR8 3AU (for copy see file of Minutes).

The Principal Planning Officer provided the Committee with a detailed presentation which included photographs of the site and a plan of the proposed layout. Members of the Committee had visited the site and were familiar with the location and setting.

In response to a query from Councillor P Conway, the Solicitor clarified that any issues regarding the unadopted access, which was owned by Easington Village Parish Council, would be a private law matter and accordingly, it was not possible to impose a planning condition to address this.

Councillor Davinson was disappointed at the loss of the rear coach house at the premises, though appreciated that it was necessary.

Councillor Kay moved approval of the application as the building was worth saving and it would bring it back into use. The motion to approve was seconded by

Councillor Lethbridge and Councillor Maitland, who was particularly familiar with the area, was pleased to see the building being converted rather than demolished.

Resolved: “That the application be approved subject to the conditions detailed within the report”.

d DM/15/02392/FPA & DM/15/02393/LB – Old Shire Hall, Old Elvet, Durham

The Committee considered a report of the Senior Planning Officer regarding the change of use from office (B1) to 81 bedroom hotel (C1) with fitness suite and spa, restaurant and bar, coffee shop, associated access, car parking and landscaping. Demolition of rear extension and creation of a new lift shaft and kitchen stores. Internal and external alterations to a listed building at the Old Shire Hall, Old Elvet, Durham (for copy see file of Minutes).

The Principal Planning Officer provided the Committee with a detailed presentation which included photographs of the site and a plan of the proposed layout.

Members were advised that should the application be approved, conditions 10, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19 and 20 would need amending. Currently they all made reference to no works commencing until certain requirements had been met. The amendment to all would reflect that such restrictions were only to apply to external works.

Mr T Baker, agent for the applicant, was in attendance to respond to any questions the Committee might have.

In response to queries from Councillor Moir, Mr Baker clarified the car parking plans, access and egress arrangements and the exact location of the extension building which was to be demolished. Members were advised that the extension building was a 1960's brick construction which had been used as a toilet block. Heritage Officers had not raised any concerns in relation to its demolition.

Councillor Davinson moved approval of the application, seconded by Councillor Lethbridge.

Councillors Conway and Freeman also voiced their support for the application and looked forward to the scheme being brought forward.

In response to a query from Councillor Freeman, Mr Baker advised that there had been much discussion on the appropriate access point for the development as there were site constraints. However it was believed that the current proposals presented the most appropriate option which would be safe, alleviate congestion and was also fully supported by the Highways Authority.

Resolved: “That the application be approved subject to the conditions detailed within the report, as amended”.

e DM/15/02602/FPA – Land to the east of Fairfalls Terrace, New Brancepeth

The Committee considered a report of the Senior Planning Officer regarding the construction of 33 houses and associated carriageway, footway and landscaping at land to the east of Fairfalls Terrace, New Brancepeth (for copy see file of Minutes).

The Senior Planning Officer provided the Committee with a detailed presentation which included photographs of the site and a plan of the proposed layout. Members of the Committee had visited the site and were familiar with the location and setting.

Members were advised that should the application be approved, conditions 3, 4 and 5 could all be removed as all requirements had been met in advance by the applicant.

Condition no.2 would need updating to reflect the removal of conditions 3, 4 and 5.

In referring to paragraph 76 of the report, the Senior Planning Officer advised that a condition would no longer be required as a suitable plan had been submitted which the Highways Authority was satisfied with.

Councillor D Bell, local Member, addressed the Committee. He advised that there were issues at the area regarding surface water as there were broken field drains on the site. Due to modifications made by a local farmer, flooding issues had been caused. However Councillor Bell was aware that a drainage plan had been resubmitted by the applicant and to the satisfaction of Northumbrian Water.

Members were advised that new housing was needed in the area and the proposed development would provide an opportunity for rent to buy properties.

Mr Ashcroft, local resident, addressed the Committee. He advised that the main reason he had originally objected to the application was the fear and worry that the developer had not submitted detailed drainage plans which could therefore result in making the flood risk greater for local residents. However Mr Little now acknowledged that the developers had submitted plans which met the approval of Northumbrian Water.

Mr Ashcroft felt the developer should have had the courtesy for the sake of public relation, to have involved the residents in the planning preparation to alleviate their fears about the proposals.

Mr Little, local resident, addressed the Committee. Members were advised that the drainage plans would involve major works, transport disruption, interruption of access and access to private land, however residents had not been afforded the opportunity to raise concerns because the drainage plans had been submitted too late.

Members were advised that the drainage scheme would not cope with surface water and subsequent sewage problems as increased sewerage from the proposed development would potentially cause overflow for manhole 1606.

Mr Little believed that there were specific impacts of the proposed developments which did not appear to have been properly addressed, such as road safety in winter, access and road safety during construction and a lack of sustainability. Mr Ashcroft advised that the removal of the roadside hedge on the west boundary and the construction of stone gabions on the south boundary, would clearly have a negative impact on the visual amenity. Furthermore, Members were advised that the stone gabions were contrary to the recommendations of the Ecology report.

The Senior Planning Officer responded to the points raised as follows:-

Drainage Plans – the developer had provided the drainage plans up front rather than it having to be conditioned as part of a planning permission. Northumbrian Water had confirmed it was satisfied with the plans.

Mr C Smith, applicant, addressed the Committee. While he apologised for the rushed last minute submission of the drainage plans, he too highlighted that the plans were not actually required at the current stage, however the developer felt it prudent to produce the plans up front because of resident concerns.

Members were advised of the technicalities of the drainage scheme and drainage requirements and that the proposals should mitigate all issues of surface water. Only a narrow pipe would need to be installed at a depth of 1 metre, as such the installation would cause minimal disruption.

Mr Smith highlighted that all consultees were satisfied with the proposals and Members were advised that while it was regrettable that a boundary hedge would be removed, that would be mitigated against with new hedges at other boundaries.

In response to a query from Councillor Kay, Mr Smith clarified the location of the combined drain and advised that on site storage was for surface water only.

In response to a query from Councillor Conway, the Senior Planning Officer clarified that there were no contaminates on site.

Councillor Conway was disappointed that no affordable housing was to be provided and requested that more detailed text be provided in officer reports regarding viability and affordability/

Seconded by Councillor Lethbridge, Councillor Kay moved that the application be approved.

Resolved: “That the application be approved subject to the conditions detailed within the report, with condition 2 to be amended to reflect the removal of conditions 3, 4 and 5”.

Councillor M Davinson and Councillor G Bleasdale left the meeting.

f DM/15/01548/FPA – Former Croquet Lawns, Aykley Heads, DH1 5TS

The Committee considered a report of the Principal Planning Officer regarding the erection of two storey office building with associated access, parking and landscaping at the former croquet lawns, Aykley Heads, DH1 5TS (for copy see file of Minutes).

The Principal Planning Officer provided the Committee with a detailed presentation which included photographs of the site and a plan of the proposed layout. Members were advised that a late objection had been received which cited issues such as impact of the development on local residents, impact on roads in the area and issues with the access to the proposed development. All such matters were dealt with within the officer report.

Ms S Ballantyne, local resident, addressed the Committee. It was pleasing news to hear that Atom Bank had been attracted to the city, bringing with it the creation of new employment. However Ms Ballantyne felt it was a shame to develop a new building in a beauty spot such as the former croquet lawns and felt that other sites around the city would have been suitable. It was her understanding that the bank was in its infancy, she therefore questioned the urgency to build premises on greenfield land, when more time could be taken to identify a suitable brownfield site.

In relation to traffic issues, Members were advised that the area had seen a recent increase in traffic due to the merge of Trinity School and other changes in the area. What was once a relatively quiet road was now very busy.

While it was appreciated that staff at the bank would work on a shift system, it was likely they would work similar shifts to the police and so there would still be a lot of traffic on the road when shifts were starting and ending. Members were advised that the road only had one entry and exit point so an increase of even only 10 cars would be disruptive.

Ms Ballantyne advised that when the Trinity School merge was taking place, local residents had requested a specific location for the entrance to the site, though that had been refused. Residents now believed their request had been refused because of the impending application for Atom Bank.

The Principal Planning Officer responded to the points raised as follows:-

- Alternative Sites – this matter was addressed at paragraph 91 of the officer report;
- Traffic – While the concerns from local residents was appreciated, the Highways Authority had considered the impact of development on the highway and was satisfied with the proposals;
- Access – There was already an access point at the development site which would be considered suitable with some modifications.

The Highways Officer advised that staff at Atom Bank would operate on a three shift system and there would be no additional strain at peak hours on the network. It was estimated that some 62 vehicles would leave the bank at 10pm, this number could easily be accommodated on the network.

Councillor Moir welcomed the bank and the employment it would bring to the area. However he acknowledged that the proposed site was a beautiful area and so had sympathy with local residents.

Councillor Kay agreed that the area was one of beauty and he too had sympathy with local residents. However the application needed to be judged against planning considerations and so Councillor moved that the application be approved.

Mr E Twiddy, Atom Bank, addressed the Committee. Members were advised that the bank was very cognisant of the neighbouring area and the place of the site within the city. While the bank was in its infancy, it did employ 140 people and Durham was chosen as the base for a variety of reasons. While other sites had been considered around the area, none were viable options.

Members were advised that the Bank had agreed to allow Trinity School to use the bank carpark at pick up and drop off times to alleviate the strain on the highway.

Councillor Freeman welcomed the application though did have concerns that the traffic on the cul-de-sac would at some point become unsustainable as and when more development occurred in the area.

In response to a query from Councillor Conway, the Principal Planning Officer clarified that the NPPF required consideration of alternative sites and this had been done, as detailed at paragraph 80 of the officer's report.

Councillor Moir seconded the motion to approve the application and upon a vote being taken it was;

Resolved: "That the application be approved subject to the conditions detailed within the report".