

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 10 April 2018** at **1.00 pm**

Present:

Councillor P Taylor (Chairman)

Members of the Committee:

Councillors D Brown, J Clark, K Corrigan, D Freeman, K Hawley, S Iveson, I Jewell (substitute for M Davinson), P Jopling, R Manchester, J Maitland (substitute for A Laing) and O Temple

Also Present: Councillors K Shaw and F Tinsley

1 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors G Bleasdale, I Cochrane and N Grayson and A Laing.

2 Substitute Members

Councillor I Jewell substituted for Councillor M Davinson and Councillor J Maitland substituted for Councillor A Laing.

3 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 13 March 2018 were confirmed as a correct record by the Committee and signed by the Chairman.

4 Declarations of Interest

Councillor J Clark declared an interest in Item 5a as a member of the Durham City Housing Group (CDHG) Operations Board. It was noted that she would leave the Chamber and take no part in the discussion or voting thereon.

Councillor J Clark left the meeting at 1.05pm

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

a DM/17/03975/FPA - Land At Matterdale Road, Peterlee

The Principal Planning Officer, Chris Baxter gave a detailed presentation on the report relating to the abovementioned planning application, a copy of which had been circulated (for copy see file of minutes). Members noted that the written report was supplemented by a visual presentation which included photographs of the site. The application was for 12 dwellings with associated landscaping and parking and was recommended for approval, subject to conditions and a Section 106 Legal Agreement.

The Principal Planning Officer noted a correction to report, the contribution set out at Paragraph 67 of the report stating £23,310, which should have read the same as set out in the recommendations at page 24, £24,310.

The Committee were informed there had been no objections to the application from statutory or internal consultees, with the Ecology Team being satisfied with the inclusion of a s106 Agreement in relation to reducing the number of access points to Special Protection Areas as identified within the Durham Heritage Coast Partnership's Business Plan 2014/15. The Principal Planning Officer noted there had been no objections from members of the public and that Planning Officers felt the application was acceptable in principle and was in a sustainable location. Members were informed that the area was not allocated as open space via policy. The Principal Planning Officer noted that it was felt that the application would not impact adversely on visual and residential amenity and the Highways Section noted the application was acceptable.

The Chairman noted the Committee Services Officer would read out a statement from the Local Member, Councillor A Laing, as she was unable to attend the meeting.

"I am fully in support of the application. It involves the redevelopment of a former housing site that is near to the town centre and a good range of facilities and services for the residents. It is a good quality scheme providing some welcome affordable housing, and will be of benefit to the area".

The Chairman asked Mr P Glover, Agent for the applicant to speak in support of the application.

Mr P Glover noted the site had previously been a residential site and was in a very sustainable location. He added that there was much need for family and affordable homes in this area. Mr P Glover noted the contemporary and sympathetic design followed the topography of the site and was in the vernacular of the area. He asked Members of the Committee to follow the Planning Officer's recommendation and approve the application.

The Chairman asked Members of the Committee for their comments and questions on the application.

Councillor I Jewell noted that the scheme seemed to be very straightforward, with no objections from the statutory or internal bodies, with no objections from members of the public, and with the Local Member being in support of the application. Accordingly, Councillor I Jewell moved that the application be approved as per the Officer's report.

Councillor O Temple asked as regards parking allowance per dwelling and the density of properties on the site.

Councillor J Maitland echoed the comments made in Councillor A Laing's statement and noted the development would much improve the area. Councillor J Maitland seconded the proposal made by Councillor I Jewell.

The Principal Planning Officer explained there were 2 car parking spaces per property and 6 visitor car parking spaces in addition. He noted he did not have the density figure to hand and suggested the Agent for the Applicant may have the figure. Mr P Glover noted the density was approximately 30 properties per hectare.

RESOLVED

That the application be **APPROVED** subject to the completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement and the conditions detailed in the Officer's report to the Committee.

Councillor J Clark entered the meeting at 1.20pm

b DM/17/03834/FPA - 16 Tempest Road, Seaham, SR7 7AY

The Planning Officer, Susan Hyde, gave a detailed presentation on the report relating to the abovementioned planning application, a copy of which had been circulated (for copy see file of minutes). Members noted that the written report was supplemented by a visual presentation which included photographs of the site. The Planning Officer advised that Members of the Committee had visited the site and were familiar with the location and setting. The application was for conversion of C3 4 bed dwelling to C1 seven bedroom aparthotel including demolition of porch and alteration of windows and was recommended for approval, subject to conditions and the completion of a s106 legal agreement, as set out within the report.

The Planning Officer noted the application site was approximately 100 metres from the coast and explained that the application site was next to Londonderry Court, a Grade II* Listed Building and was within the Seaham Conservation Area. Members noted there was a range of shops and facilities located nearby, within walking distance. Councillors were asked to note the building was attached to a neighbouring property, and that the old brown uPVC windows as shown in the presentation were in the process of being replaced with new white sash style windows with Georgian features, in keeping with the windows in the area.

The Planning Officer referred to elevations for the property, noting no alterations to the rear of the property and no extensions. Members noted the internal layout and the proposed changes as set out on the presentation slides. It was highlighted that the stairwell ran along the boundary with the attached property.

In terms of representations, it was noted that initial concerns from the Highways Section had been resolved, with a supporting statement having been supplied by the applicant in terms of parking. Members noted Environmental Health had commented in terms of impact on residential amenity for the attached building and Londonderry Court. It was explained this was resolved through a management plan and sound insulation. The Planning Officer noted that Ecology colleagues had noted a requirement in terms of a financial contribution towards the management of the coast in accordance with National Habitat Regulations.

The Planning Officer explained that there had been 10 letters of objection from members of the public and a petition, with a summary of the reasons being set out in the report, including: impact on residential amenity; car parking within the curtilage of the application site; house prices; and works had commenced prior to permission being granted. The Planning Officer noted that the applicant had been advised not to commence any works prior to the application being determined by Committee.

The Planning Officer added that there had been 19 letters of support for the application, noting that the proposal was for much needed accommodation of this type; that there was adequate parking in the nearby surrounding area; and that the works would help to improve the building.

Councillor F Tinsley entered the meeting at 1.25pm

Members were referred to Condition 3 within the report recommendation, noting a Management Plan in terms of the building and providing contact details for local residents should they be an issue at the property.

The Planning Officer concluded by noting that the application was recommended for approval, subject to a s106 Agreement and conditions.

The Chairman thanked the Officer for her report and noted Councillor K Shaw, a Local Member wished to speak in relation to the application.

Councillor K Shaw noted he had been asked to raise concerns on behalf of local residents. He explained that Seaham was a town that was growing and thriving, a place people wanted to visit and agreed there was a need for places for visitors to stay overnight. He added that residents did not think this application was the solution, with concerns from residents in terms of impact upon residential amenity. Councillor K Shaw noted Paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) stated a presumption for sustainable development unless there were material considerations why development should not take place.

Councillor K Shaw noted residents' concerns included: overlooking from the property; the adequacy of the parking; noise disturbance; that Londonderry Court, sheltered accommodation, was within touching distance of the proposed development.

Councillor K Shaw noted residents' concerns in terms of the building being adjacent to elderly residents, noting guests to enter the property by 11.00pm. He added there did not appear to be regard in terms of the impact on the adjoining neighbouring property, with that property being part of the original building. Councillor K Shaw added that there would be noise during development, impacting on the neighbouring property and, once complete, the neighbouring property would effectively be permanently living in the wing of a guest house. He added that Environmental Health had not objected, however, he was not aware on any surveys having been conducted.

Councillor K Shaw explained residents felt there would be a loss of privacy to adjacent properties and that there were also issues in terms of parking capacity and noise levels. He added that it had been suggested that there was nearby parking available 24 hours, and that traffic surveys would have had a better understanding if they had been carried out on a pleasant day at the weekend in terms of the parking available and traffic levels. He noted that a conservative estimate of the parking required was around 8 spaces, and that paragraph 57 of the Officer's report noted in relation to car parking: "Nevertheless there remains a residual adverse amenity impact in this regard".

The Chairman thanked Councillor K Shaw and asked Mr D Irwing, Applicant to speak in support of the application.

Mr D Irwing noted he would address points raised by the Local Member, who had been invited on several occasions to discuss issues raised by residents. Mr D Irwing noted that parking was available 24 hours and that the development addressed a call from the Seaham Destination Plan in terms of this type of accommodation. Mr D Irwing explained the background in terms of his links to the property and the town and noted upon staying in the area the only accommodation was at the nearby Seaham Hall or Seaton Lane Inn, a distance away.

Mr D Irwing added that the parking survey had been moved to early morning, and late afternoon times and of the 50 spaces available nearby the most that had been occupied was 5. He noted that the street was a wider than average road and that while some residents had noted concerns relating to the development, there was also support from other local residents and businesses. He added there was also further support for this type of accommodation via local social media pages, citing 91% support.

Mr D Irwing noted that the development of this type of accommodation would mean there would be a little more coming and going to the property, however, if the town was to grow it would need this type of accommodation.

The Chairman asked the Planning Officer to respond to the points raised.

The Planning Officer referred to site plan to highlight the distance between the development and Londonderry Court, and also showed proposed internal layouts, to demonstrate that in terms of overlooking, the situation would be similar to that existing currently. She highlighted that there were no proposed extensions, the works to be within the current building.

In relation to noise and additional comings and goings, the Planning Officer noted that the change of use meant there was potential for more, with the entrance to the property being along the side of the property. She reiterated that the management plan would ensure entry to the property by 11.00pm and there would be contact details should residents have any concerns. The Planning Officer added that there would be sound insulation internally and the layout had been designed to try to reduce the amount of the rooms adjacent to the neighbouring property, with a corridor offering additional protection.

The Planning Officer noted in relation to car parking that the Highways Section had initially raised concerns, however, after consideration of the information submitted had noted no objections. The Highways Development Manager, John McGargill noted that Tempest Road was 9 metres wide and if vehicles were parked both sides vehicles could still pass. He added that the survey carried out had shown that there was spaces available along Tempest Road and at nearby public car parks. The Highways Development Manager explained that similar applications for Durham City had been approved. He added that in the case of 7 vehicles being associated with the development, this would equate to 5 vehicles in competition with others for spaces and that this would not be sufficient to sustain a reason for refusal.

The Chairman thanked the Officer and asked Members of the Committee for their comments and questions.

Councillor J Clark noted the background information in relation to the development, and wondered if there had been a period of tranquillity prior to development with the property being empty and asked, if the application was approved, would guests be directed to where the car parking would be provided or available. The Chairman asked if the applicant could provide any further information. Mr D Irwing replied that the property had been empty for 12 months and confirmed that guests would be e-mailed with instructions in relation to gaining entry and times, as well as parking information and a polite notice as regards respecting other nearby residents.

Councillor J Maitland asked whether the aparthotel would be for holiday seasons or all year round. The Planning Officer noted it was all year round.

Councillor I Jewell asked as regards a live-in receptionist or whether keys would be collected. He noted that if the property was not successful as a hotel it would likely become a bedsit or similar. The Planning Officer noted the application proposed that there would be no one on site, keys would be collected and that the management plan would apply, with a contact being available to guests and neighbouring residents. She added that any move to a different type of accommodation would need to be via a separate planning application.

Councillor O Temple noted he understood the need for accommodation within the destination plan, and added that with no management on site, the management plan itself would be very important. He asked whether it was possible to have a time limit on an occupancy, if there were prolonged periods without lets, for example in winter, and then longer terms lets were then made, he felt this would not be the same purpose as enabling tourism.

The Solicitor – Planning and Development, Neil Carter spoke to the Planning Officer and advised that the Local Planning Authority could not reasonably impose restrictions in terms of the length of occupancy. He added that this could be included within the management plan, should the applicant volunteer to do so, however the LPA could not insist upon its inclusion.

Councillor P Jopling noted that while visiting the site, it was clear some works were underway on site. The Chairman noted applicants were always informed that they carried out any works prior to permission at their own risk.

Councillor J Clark moved that the application be approved; she was seconded by Councillor I Jewell.

RESOLVED

That the application be **APPROVED** subject to the completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement and the conditions detailed in the Officer's report to the Committee.

c DM/18/00328/FPA - 36 The Hallgarth, Durham, DH1 3BJ

The Solicitor – Planning and Development noted that at the start of the meeting, the Applicant's Agent, Mr D Leybourne had been given sight of e-mails in objection that had already been circulated to Committee Members so that he may comment when addressing the Committee. Mr Legbourne confirmed that he had read them and did want to comment.

The Planning Officer, Jennifer Jennings, gave a detailed presentation on the report relating to the abovementioned planning application, a copy of which had been circulated (for copy see file of minutes). Members noted that the written report was supplemented by a visual presentation which included photographs of the site. The Planning Officer advised that Members of the Committee had visited the site and were familiar with the location and setting. The application was for a new house in the garden of 36 The Hallgarth and was recommended for approval, subject to conditions as set out within the report.

The Planning Officer noted that the application site was within the Durham City Conservation Area, had a number of listed buildings nearby and was 450 metres east of the Durham Cathedral and Castle World Heritage Site (WHS).

The Committee were informed that the proposed property would be set back 1.5 metres from the line of houses and Members noted proposed elevations. The Planning Officer noted the design was in keeping with the properties in the area in terms of material and scale. It was added that the upstairs bathroom window would be required to be obscured glazing in perpetuity.

The Planning Officer noted no concerns from Northumbrian Water Limited and no objections from the Highways Section, highlighting no parking permits would be provided for the new property.

It was noted that the Design and Conservation Section had noted that the application would have a neutral impact in relation to heritage.

The Committee were informed that the Tree Section had noted none of the trees warranted a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) and Ecology and Contamination Land Officers had noted no objections. The Planning Officer noted the Archaeology Section had noted a conditions in terms of a watching brief and investigation works as set out in the report.

The Planning Officer noted a number of public responses had been received, with the main concerns raised being: development would constitute overdevelopment, leading to problems with waste disposal, noise and parking; be detrimental to the amenity and area; and concerns the property would ultimately be converted to a House of Multiple Occupation (HMO).

The Planning Officer noted that the proposal were acceptable in policy terms and was in a sustainable location within the City. It was reiterated that the application had been deemed neutral in terms of impact upon the Conservation Area and heritage assets. The Planning Officer noted that the application was not deemed to have significant detrimental impact upon residential amenity and was recommended for approval.

The Chairman thanked the Planning Officer and asked the Local Member, and Committee Member, Councillor D Freeman speak in relation to the application.

Councillor D Freeman noted Members would have had sight of e-mails from members of the public in objection to the application, sent to Councillor D Freeman. He added that this had not compromised his decision making, he had not yet made up his mind in terms of the application. He explained that he had asked that the application be brought to Committee as he had concerns in terms of the impact of development within a garden and a fear of the property becoming a HMO, notwithstanding paragraph 74 of the report which stated a change of use application would be required. Councillor D Freeman asked how the property would be monitored in terms of HMO status and some residents had noted their doubts in terms of the merits of the property as a family home, having a reduced garden area and no parking. Councillor D Freeman noted the report had stated no requirement for parking spaces, however, asked the Committee to think of a family home without any parking provision, and no parking permits being available.

Councillor D Freeman noted that he felt that building a property within an existing garden seemed to be contrary to Policy H2 of the saved City of Durham (COD) Local Plan. He noted that the Officer had spoken to the fact the COD Local Plan was out-of-date, however, he noted that some references to saved plans were made in support of a recommendation when it suited. He noted that the distances between properties were nearer than permitted and therefore the application was contrary to Policy Q8. He added an issue relating to a covenant had been raised, though he understood this matter fell outside of the remit of the Committee, he asked for clarification as to the Committee's position if the covenant had been put in place by the former City of Durham Council.

Councillor D Freeman concluded by noting that Paragraph 77 of the report noted there was a need for family homes, however, there had not been any mention within the report of the large development at the former school site within 100 metres and therefore he felt that a single property in the context of the larger development was not a strong argument.

The Chairman thanked Councillor D Freeman and noted that Local Plans were used where not in conflict with the NPPF. He asked Ms D Jones to speak in objection to the application.

Ms D Jones noted she was speaking in objection on behalf of at least 8 neighbours that had been unable to attend the Committee meeting. She added the local community wanted 36 The Hallgarth to remain as a family home, only viable if the large garden was retained, and that the proposals represented overdevelopment. Ms D Jones noted Policy H13 protected against significant adverse effect on the character or appearance, or the amenities of residents within an area. She referred to Paragraph 80 of the report that accepted that there would be some adverse impact on neighbouring residents, however, set out that Officer did not feel this outweighed the benefits of the proposal. Ms D Jones noted that there was significant and demonstrable impact on neighbours in terms of loss of privacy, loss of green space and the impact upon parking.

Ms D Jones noted that the Authority could demonstrate a 5 year housing supply and 75 properties were being built on the former Whinney Hill School site nearby. She added that the Officer's report noted that separation distances were less than policy and that there would be some overlooking by the proposed development. Ms D Jones noted that the loss of green space would have an impact on local wildlife.

Ms D Jones explained that parking was a huge issue in the area, noting no permits would be issued for the new property and that the garages nearby had been transferred to the County Durham Housing Group and there was a waiting list. She noted given all of those facts it would be difficult for the property to be used as a family home and the fear of residents was that the new property and 36 The Hallgarth would become HMOs with there being around 10 HMO properties already in the area.

Ms D Jones concluded by noting that Paragraph 74 of the report did not convince residents that there would be enforcement taken in terms of a HMO and therefore she asked that Members would consider the objections raised by residents and refuse the application.

The Chairman thanked Ms D Jones and asked Mr D Leybourne to speak in support of the application.

Mr D Leybourne noted that pre-application enquiries in relation to the development had been made with the Planning Department and initial objections in relation to the impact on the view of the Cathedral had been taken on board with the position of the new property being set back 1.5 metres. He added that, as the Planning Officer had explained, any use as a HMO would require a separate change of use application and would not be supported with an Article 4 Direction in place. Mr D Leybourne noted that the proposed property's bedroom would not overlook Hallgarth Farm. He added that the location was sustainable, being within the City and the Highways Section had not objected to the application. He noted an application to rent one of the garages had been submitted with many of the garages in the area being used for storage rather than for vehicles. He added the Officer's recommendation was for approval, considering the objections raised, with the issues having been addressed. He noted in terms of overdevelopment, Officers felt this was not the case. He added in terms of overlooking, the gable window had been relocated. Mr D Leybourne added that in terms of garden space and the Cathedral view, this had been addressed by the setting back of the property. He noted that there had been no Highways objections and that any use as HMO would require a change of use application.

In response to the e-mails that had been circulated, Mr D Leybourne noted that it had been widely assumed the application was for 2 HMOs, and that was not the case and clearly that would be subject to applications in terms of change of use.

The Chairman thanked Mr Leybourne and asked the Principal Planning Officer, to comment on the issues raised. The Principal Planning Officer noted that the application before Members at Committee was for C3 residential use, not for a HMO. He added that should the property be used as an HMO, then if residents were to alert Planning, there would be grounds for enforcement action. The Principal Planning Officer noted that there would clearly be a reduction in garden space, however, it was felt the remaining garden space would be sufficient for the properties. In reference to the application being contrary to Policy H2, the Principal Planning Officer noted that the policy did direct to brownfield sites, however, the site was in a highly sustainable location and therefore acceptable in planning terms.

The Principal Planning Officer noted in respect of privacy concerns that the separation distance in question, being less than the policy, was to Hallgarth Farm House and was 14 metres, less than the 21 metres per policy. He explained that it met distances in terms of habitable windows, and the only one being the first floor bathroom, which would have obscure glazing fitted. He added that at the ground floor trees and the boundary treatment would break up the views. He noted that all the separation distances to Hallgarth Street were over 21 metres except one which was 20.5 metres.

The Principal Planning Officer noted that given the angle and level differences, it was not sufficient to justify a refusal reason over 0.5 metres. In relation to loss of important green space in the area, the land was currently private garden and therefore could not be classified as public green space that would be lost to the general public.

The Highways Services Manager noted that the application site was in a very sustainable location in terms of bus and rail travel, with a range of amenities within walking distance. He noted there was a car share scheme, "Co-wheels", operating in the City. He concluded by noting the application was NPPF Part 4 compliant and that he could not recommend refusal on the grounds of parking.

The Solicitor – Planning and Development noted that the outstanding issue of a covenant was not a material planning consideration, even if it had been imposed by the former City of Durham Council.

The Chairman thanked the Officers for their responses and asked Members of the Committee for their comments and questions.

Councillor O Temple noted that on the site visit he had been struck by how difficult it had been for the bus driver to get out having driven down the cul-de-sac. He added that even for a time during the day, there was a large number of cars parked along the road leading to the application site. In terms of overdevelopment, he noted a lack of parking, the site being within an existing garden, and the separation distances being less than the policy requirement, as stated by the Officer. He added he was minded not to vote in favour, in terms of the impact on residential amenity. Councillor O Temple noted the site was close to the Cathedral and policies H2 and H13 had already been quoted previously as those the application would be in breach of. He noted that Design and Conservation had noted a neutral impact from the application, adding this was close to being adverse. Councillor O Temple noted he felt it was a cumulative impact of a number of small details, and that if someone more experienced in policy were to recommend refusal he would support their motion.

Councillor D Brown noted two omissions from the site plan, that 31 The Hallgarth has an extension right up to a garage, and there was a new build property opposite to the site, compounding car parking and access issues.

The Principal Planning Officer noted that the separation distance would be 20.5 metres between the extension and Hallgath Street and Planners felt that in this case it was acceptable. He reiterated that the 14m to Hallgarth Farm House was acceptable given the obscure glazing to be used.

Councillor I Jewell explained that he was struggling to see some of the points raised in objection, noting the only loss of green space was to 36 The Hallgarth, and this was not public space, rather a private garden. He added that it was likely any person purchasing the property would be aware of the garden size and understand the situation in terms of car parking, with some people not owning a car. He noted he was not fully convinced the objections were valid.

Councillor I Jewell moved that the application be approved; he was seconded by Councillor J Maitland.

RESOLVED

That the application be **APPROVED** subject to the conditions detailed in the Officer's report to the Committee.

d DM/18/00362/FPA - 1 Witton Grove, Framwellgate Moor, Durham, DH1 5AB

The Planning Officer, Lisa Morina, gave a detailed presentation on the report relating to the abovementioned planning application, a copy of which had been circulated (for copy see file of minutes). Members noted that the written report was supplemented by a visual presentation which included photographs of the site. The Planning Officer advised that Members of the Committee had visited the site and were familiar with the location and setting. The application was for change of use of land to side of dwelling to private garden area including erection of single-storey extension to side and rear of dwelling and detached garage and shed within extended garden area and was recommended for approval, subject to conditions as set out within the report.

The Planning Officer noted the application site itself was not an area of high landscape value or greenbelt land, though there was such an area opposite the site. Members noted that the proposals were for a wraparound extension and a rear garage with driveway. It was added the extended garden area was set back from the boundary as the area adjacent to the road was adopted highways.

The Planning Officer noted no objections from the statutory or internal consultees, with one objection from the neighbouring property being in relation to fencing being placed on top of an existing wall, though it was explained that this would not be the case. She added the Local Member had been in objection when initially it was thought the application encroached into the greenbelt, however, it was reiterated the application was not within the greenbelt area.

The Planning Officer noted the application was recommended for approval, subject to an update to Condition 2 within the report to reflect and amended plan containing detail as regards the garage door and updates in terms of a raft being upgraded to piles and an amended Condition 4 having been agreed with the applicant.

The Chairman thanked the Planning Officer and asked the Solicitor – Planning and Development to provide an update to the Committee.

The Solicitor – Planning and Development noted that initially the application had been referred to Committee by a Local Member, Councillor M Wilkes. He added that he had been in correspondence with Councillor M Wilkes late yesterday and prior to the Committee meeting today in terms of the Local Member feeling the reasons for calling the application in to Committee were no longer sufficient to sustain a refusal reason.

The Solicitor – Planning and Development noted that his advice had been that Officers had correctly accepted referral to Committee and once accepted it was not possible for the matter to be considered under delegated authority. He added there was no mechanism for withdrawal of a referral once accepted and therefore the application was properly before Members for consideration.

The Chairman asked Members of the Committee for their comments and questions.

Councillor J Clark noted there was no mention of a Construction Management Plan (CMP) within the report, with the close proximity to the roundabout and the need for construction vehicles to turn. The Principal Planning Officer noted that for household scale development a CMP would not normally be requested, though if Members were minded and felt it would be useful the points raised could be included. Councillor J Clark noted she felt that this would be useful for to allay neighbours' concerns.

Councillor P Jopling moved the recommendation, subject to the inclusion of a condition relating to a CMP as mentioned by Councillor J Clark. Councillor O Temple seconded the proposal.

RESOLVED

That the application be **APPROVED** subject to the conditions detailed in the Officer's report to the Committee and an additional condition relating to a Construction Management Plan.