

DURHAM COUNTY COUNCIL
AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE (NORTH)

At a Meeting of the **Area Planning Committee (North)** held in the Council Chamber, County Hall, Durham on **Thursday 29 June 2017 at 2.00 pm**

Present:

Councillor I Jewell (Chairman)

Members of the Committee:

Councillors A Bainbridge, D Bell, A Hopgood, O Milburn, A Shield, L Taylor, S Zair, C Kay (substitute for M McKeon), A Simpson (substitute for M McGaun) and T Smith

1 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors H Bennett, L Boyd, M McGaun, M McKeon and J Robinson.

2 Substitute Members

Councillor C Kay substitute for Councillor M McKeon.
Councillor A Simpson substitute for Councillor M McGaun.

3 Minutes of the Meeting held on 27 April 2017

Resolved: That the minutes of the meeting held on 27 April 2017 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

4 Declarations of Interest (if any)

Councillor O Milburn declared an interest in application DM/17/00935/FPA as previous non-executive board member of Derwentside Homes (Karbon Homes).

Councillor A Shield declared a personal interest in application DM/17/00692/FPA as the local member.

Councillor I Jewell declared a personal interest in DM/17/00097/FPA and DM/17/00479/OUT as the local member.

5 Applications to be determined by the Area Planning Committee (North Durham)

a DM/17/00097/FPA - Land To The West Of Syke Road, Burnopfield

The Committee considered a report of the Senior Planning Officer regarding proposed erection of 75 houses, including associated access, infrastructure and open space (for copy see file of Minutes).

The Senior Planning Officer provided a detailed presentation which included photographs of the site and plans of the proposed layout. Members had also visited the site the previous day and were familiar with the setting and surroundings.

Members were advised that proposals indicated that there would be two sites sharing the access created from this development, the second of which was to be considered as the next agenda item and would only be deemed acceptable if this application were to be granted.

Further details were reported by the Senior Planning Officer in respect of affordable housing and the proposed contribution of £333,868 to address demand on the education system.

Councillor Shield raised a query regarding the shared access and allocated parking. He asked for further clarification on the highways assessment and number of allocated parking bays provided per dwelling. The Highways Officer advised that an assessment had been carried out on 90 dwellings including trip generation analysis, which had identified 46, 2 way movements during AM peak hour and 45, 2 way movements during PM peak time. In addition other factors had been taken into consideration when assessing the access and egress and officers were satisfied with the proposed scheme.

Councillor Shield further commented that he would have considered it more appropriate to have more than one access and egress to make the site more accessible. He did note that although he had some general concerns regarding the application he did acknowledge highways comments. He further noted that although the land was classed as green field it could be more attributed to shrub land. Taking into account that there had been no statutory objections he therefore **MOVED** that the application be approved subject to the conditions listed in the report.

Regarding education provision, Councillor Hopgood asked whether any consultation had been undertaken with the local schools. The Senior Planning Officer advised that education provision was assessed at a strategic level by determining future demand and capacity. It was further noted that the site would be expected to take 2/3 years to develop and details were provided regarding the timing in which the school would receive funding.

Councillor Jewell added that it was interesting to note that the school had objected to development on a previous site, but had not objected on this occasion.

Councillor Kay queried whether the education contribution would be spent in a capital way or to provide revenue support for employing a teacher. In response the Senior Planning Officer advised that the contribution would be allocated for capital works only. Funds for teaching staff could be obtained from other sources however

noted that the increase in council tax base and wider economic impact would outweigh those costs.

Councillor O Milburn **SECONDED** the proposal.

Following a vote being taken it was:-

Resolved: That the application be approved subject to the conditions listed in the report.

b DM/17/00479/OUT - Land To The West Of Syke Road, Burnopfield

The Committee considered a report of the Senior Planning Officer regarding proposed erection of 14 self-build plots, with all other matters (except access) reserved (for copy see file of Minutes).

The Senior Planning Officer provided a detailed presentation which included photographs of the site and plans of the proposed layout. Members had also visited the site the previous day and were familiar with the setting and surroundings.

It was reported that the applicants proposed to offer to Design and Build each house from the starting point of a range of indicative house types. Buyers would also be permitted to build their own homes under a Design Code which would be required to be submitted and agreed with the Planning Authority under reserved matters.

Councillor Milburn added that she was aware that some smaller estates were failing with many plots remaining unsold. This was resulting in roads being un- adopted and in some cases sights becoming blights on the landscape. She therefore asked whether there was any assurances or compensation which could be put in place to cover the council for this eventuality. The Senior Planning Officer advised that there was always potential for slow development on self-build sites however conditions attached to the application would ensure that all road ways etc. were built to an adoptable standard prior to the development on an individual plot.

Councillor Shield queried whether there was to be any play provision provided at the northern end of the site. The Senior Planning officer advised that there was no provision for play however on planning balance it was concluded that this did not outweigh the benefit of the proposals.

Councillor Kay added that he was disappointed to learn that no 106 agreement for a contribution towards education provision was to be put in place. The Senior Planning Officer advised that the issues had been discussed in depth with the School Places and Admissions Manager and it was acknowledged that once the contribution had been received from Barratt Homes in respect of the previous application, this would be sufficient to cover demand and meet the needs identified by the assessment.

Councillor Kay further added that he agreed that some play provision should be provided. The Senior Planning Officer reiterated that this was not significant or adverse enough to outweigh the benefits of the application.

Councillor C Kay **MOVED** that the application be approved subject to the conditions as listed in the report.

Councillor A Bainbridge **SECONDED** the proposal.

Following a vote being taken it was:-

Resolved: That the application be approved subject to the conditions as listed within the report.

Councillor O Milburn declared an interest in the following Item, left the meeting and took no part in the discussion or voting thereon.

c DM/17/00935/FPA - Wood View Community Centre, Wood View, Langley Park

The Committee considered a report of the Senior Planning Officer regarding the proposed demolition of existing former community centre and construction of 14 new build houses and associated footway and landscaping (for copy see file of Minutes).

The Senior Planning Officer provided a detailed presentation which included photographs of the site and plans of the proposed layout. Members had also visited the site the previous day and were familiar with the setting and surroundings.

It was reported that should the committee be minded to approve the application, condition 6 as listed within the report would no longer be required.

Councillor Simpson, local member, addressed the committee to put forward the views of residents. He advised that there were concerns amongst residents of Wood View that the development would lead to the displacement of cars and many residents would not be able to park outside their own properties. He therefore requested that consideration be given to turning the bungalows around and creating access points via Pine Street.

Councillor Hopgood added that it was clear that parking was the main issue with this development and queried the situation with resident and visitor parking bays. The Highways Officer provided clarification regarding the number of allocated and visitor parking bays highlighting that the proposed arrangements were the best fit for the site. It was acknowledged that although the provision was slightly under the recommended guidelines, it was not significant enough to refuse the application.

Further debate took place regarding the number of spaces to be provided and the potential displacement of existing resident parking. Councillor Kay added that he agreed with Councillor Hopgood and felt that the development could be of detriment to existing residents however noted that this was not a material planning

consideration and with such **MOVED** that the application be approved subject to the conditions as listed within the report.

Councillor Hopgood also acknowledged that the issues outlined were not significant enough to refuse the application and with such **SECONDED** the proposal.

Councillor Shield added that he felt that further discussions could be undertaken with the developers to resolve the issue of car parking and accommodate those foreseen problems. He did however note that the development could be classed as brownfield infill and was happy to see low cost housing to be provided.

Following a vote being taken it was:-

Resolved: That the application be approved subject to the conditions as listed in the report.

d DM/16/02732/FPA - Site Of Former South Moor Hospital, Middles Road, The Middles, Stanley

The Committee considered a report of the Senior Planning regarding the proposed erection of 65 no. 2, 3 and 4 bedroom two-storey dwellings with associated works (for copy see file of Minutes).

The Senior Planning Officer provided a detailed presentation which included photographs of the site and plans of the proposed layout.

Councillor Hopgood in reference to affordable housing, asked what the price range of these properties were expected to be.

In response C Dodds, Gleeson Homes advised that the homes were targeted at first-time buyers, with a 2 bed property expected to cost around £80,000. Councillor Hopgood queried whether this was expensive for the area of South Moor / Craghead. In addition she highlighted that the single wire back garden fence or the non-sealed gravel drives did not represent quality or value for money for homebuyers. She further added that the £10,000 contribution did not seem adequate enough for the improvement of biodiversity in the immediate area.

In response the Senior Planning Officer advised that to ask for more money towards biodiversity improvements would make the scheme unviable.

Councillor Shield commented that in his opinion some of the conditions required tightening up as he did not consider the scheme to be fully fit for purpose or fully compliant. The Senior Planning officer advised that officers did share some of the concerns raised however previous decisions made by this committee made it difficult to request anything further from the developer. It was noted however that the development would bring a different dimension to the housing stock in the area.

Further discussion took place regarding the lack of play provision and Councillor Hopgood **MOVED** that the application be refused on the grounds that it contravened the following NPPF policies:

Part 8 - by not providing play and open space for families and young people.
Part 6 – by not providing a wide choice of high quality homes, which were sustainable for the future.
Part 7 – by not providing good design, despite attempts by planners to rectify.

Councillor A Shield **SECONDED** the proposal.

Following a vote being taken the motion was lost.

Resolved: That the application be approved subject to the conditions listed in the report.

e DM/17/00692/FPA - Lintzford Bridge Garden Centre, Lintzford Road, Hamsterley Mill

The Committee considered a report of the Planning Officer regarding the change of use from car park to carwash (retrospective) (resubmission) (for copy see file minutes).

The Team Leader North provided a detailed presentation which included photographs of the site and plans of the proposed layout. Copies of the layout which had been submitted by the applicant were also circulated for members' information.

Councillor Shield noted that the car wash had been in operation for some time and made reference to the previous refusal and appeal. He advised that his main concerns related to contamination of the wider natural environment from inadequate wastewater drainage. In addition he advised that although the site was well screened this was only evident during spring / summer. He also found the use of floodlights and the impact on the busy arterial road to be of concern.

He therefore **MOVED** that the application should be refused on the grounds that it contravened NPPF, Part 11, Part 14 and Policy EN1 of the Derwentside District Local Plan.

Councillor Zair **SECONDED** the proposal.

The Team Leader North advised that unfortunately planners did have concerns regarding the quality of the resubmission and the capability of the applicant to provide what was required of them to provide sustainable drainage, disposal and hardstanding.

Councillor Jewell asked whether the recommended water waste equipment was 100% certain to remove any pollutants. The Team Leader North advised that this guarantee could not fully be given and advised that sustained use over a number of years could have an adverse impact on the natural environment.

Following a vote being taken it was:-

Resolved: that the application be refused on the grounds that the waste water management measures currently in operation together with those measures submitted with the application are not considered to be capable of preventing significant harm to the natural environment contrary to Part 11 of the NPPF (Conserving & Enhancing the Natural Environment) and Policy EN1 of the Derwentside District Local Plan.

Reason - The proposal fails to satisfy the environment role of sustainable development and any benefits resulting from the development would not outweigh the adverse impacts of the proposal on the natural environment contrary to Paragraph 14 of the NPPF.

f DM/17/01667/FPA - 11 Park View, South Pelaw, Chester-le-Street

The Committee considered a report of the Planning Officer regarding the proposed erection of a porch to front and two storey rear extension (for copy see file of minutes).

The Team Leader North provided a detailed presentation which included photographs of the site and plans of the proposed layout. Members had also visited the site the previous day and were familiar with the setting and surroundings.

It was noted that the application submitted was identical to that which had been previously refused and confirmed at appeal by the Planning Inspectorate.

Councillor T Smith, local member, addressed the committee to speak in support of the application. She advised members that along this stretch of terraced homes a number of which had two storey extensions which set a precedent for others in the area. Due to the pitch of the roof on these properties the upstairs space was unsuitable for family living and with such had led to a host of properties being bought to let, causing in itself tenant problems for existing residents and local members.

In addition to the above, the owner's adult son had additional needs and with such required additional space and room for his own independence. In addition the bathroom was currently located on the ground floor which also caused problems.

In conclusion she advised that neighbours had not objected to the application as many of them also wanted to extend their properties to allow for better family living. She considered the extension to be sustainable and would in addition promote healthy communities.

The Team Leader North referred to the decision of the Planning Inspector who had found that that the depth of the extension would have an overbearing and significant impact on neighbouring residents.

Discussion ensued regarding the size of the extension and it was noted that a reduced size extension without overbearing impact on residents may be deemed acceptable. Councillor Milburn asked what size extension would be deemed

acceptable as she did agree that these dwellings were no longer suitable for families.

Councillor Hopgood in sympathising with the applicants personal circumstances suggested that the application be deferred in order for the applicant to work with planners to reach a suitable compromise. The Team Leader North added that although deferment was frustrating for the applicant, it would be considered appropriate under the circumstances.

Councillor Hopgood **MOVED** that the application be deferred.

Councillor Bell **SECONDED** the motion.

Following a vote being taken it was:-

Resolved: That the application be deferred to allow further discussions with the planners and applicant in order to submit a revised application which would be deemed acceptable.