

**The City of Durham Trust**  
(Registered charity number 502132)

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS RESPONDED TO: 16 February to 15 March 2022**

Ref.	Location	Work	Date	Officer	Response
<i>Amendments:</i>					
21/03443/FPA	2 The Grey House, Princes Street	Replacement ground floor windows (uPVC)	16/2	Hurton	Sustained objection
21/01611/FPA	Apollo Bingo, Front Street, Gilesgate Moor	Demolition for 4-storey PBSA + assoc. facilities	24/2	Dalby	Restated objection
21/01789/FPA	Land at St John's Road, Neville's Cross	12 townhouse dwellings with associated works	1/3	Morina	Restated objection
21/04118/FPA	Stonebridge Service Station	Replacement shop and EV charging facility	2/3	Russell	Comment
21/00431/FPA	Carter House, Pelaw Leazes Lane	Rooftop extension	8/3	Morina	Objection
22/00139/FPA	The Beauty Spot, Saddlers Yard	4-bed HMO + linked loft spaces (communal areas)	14/3	Russell	Objection maintained
<i>From DCC weekly list 14/2:</i>					
21/02984/FPA	Low Burn Hall Farm	2 x rear dormer windows	28/2	Penman	Objection
21/04262/FPA	Mount Oswald South Rd	12 dwellings and access alterations	4/3	Harding	Objection
22/00379/LB	Indoor Market (entrance)	Installation of Parish blue plaque	4/3	Russell	Support
22/00382/LB	142 Gilesgate	Installation of Parish blue plaque	4/3	Russell	Support
<i>From DCC weekly list 21/2:</i>					
22/00157/LB	Durham Cathedral, The College	Remedial works	7/3	Fenwick	Support
22/00369/FPA	24 Nevilledale Terrace	C3 to C4	9/3	Jennings	Objection

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS NOTED: 16 February to 15 March 2022**

Ref.	Location	Work	Date	Officer
<i>From DCC weekly list 7/2:</i>				
22/00123/FPA	24 Churchill Ave., Gilesgate	C3 to small HMO (C4)	21/2	Penman
22/00245/FPA (withdrawn)	10 Rowan Tree Avenue, Gilesgate Moor	C3 to small HMO incl. garage conversion + window changes	21/2	Penman
<i>From DCC weekly list 14/2:</i>				
22/00211/LB (withdrawn)	Finchale Abbey Farm	2 x 2m posts on existing barrier plinth	N/A	Morina
<i>From DCC weekly list 28/2:</i>				
22/00459/FPA	102 Hastings Avenue	Additional front extension	15/3	Russell

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS NOTED AT THE MEETING (15 March 2022)**

Ref.	Location	Work	Date	Officer
<i>From DCC weekly list 7/3:</i>				
22/00507/FPA	Harcourt 10 Quarryheads La.	Side roof + rear extension	23/3	Ackerman
22/00155/FPA	26 The Riverwalk	Class (E) to hot food takeaway	24/3	Hurton
22/00210/FPA	Finchale Abbey Farm	2 x 2m posts - existing plinth	24/3	Morina
22/00625/FPA	The Cathedrals, Court Lane	First floor apartment into 3 x 2-bed apartments	25/3	Morina
<i>From DCC weekly list 14/3:</i>				
22/00711/FPA	16 Laburnum Avenue	Erection of porch (retrospective)	1/4	Ackermann

**OUTCOMES TO PREVIOUS RESPONSES (decided since 15 February 2022)**

Ref.	Location	Work	Trust's response	Decision/Date
22/00041/FPA	8 Ravensworth Tce	New windows, stairwell, roof light	COMMENT	APPROVED 16/2
Reason(s):	<i>It is considered that the proposal would have an acceptable impact on the host property and the street scene including the Conservation Area (CA) in which the property is located as well as having an acceptable impact on neighbouring properties and as such is considered acceptable in respect of planning policies as outlined in the CDP and NPPF.</i>			
APP/X1355/W/21/3284723	8 Laburnum Ave	C3 to either C3 or C4	OBJECT	ALLOWED 21/2
Reason(s):	<i>In coming to my decision, I have had full regard to the conflict of the proposal with Part 3 of CDP Policy 16. This conflict carries considerable weight in the determination of the appeal. However, the evidence put forward by the appellant with regard to his severe personal hardship due to the concentration of existing HMOs indicates that a decision otherwise in accordance with the development plan should be made in this instance. Although the proposal would conflict with the development plan there are material considerations that justify a departure from it and lead me to conclude that the appeal should be allowed.</i>			
APP/X1355/W/21/3275009, X1355/Y/20/3265941	21 Market Place	Rear extension - HMO and retail	OBJECT	ALLOWED 1/3
Reason(s):	<i>On balance, the proposal would preserve the special historic interest of the Grade II LB, the setting of adjoining LBs, and the character/appearance of the Durham City CA. This would satisfy the requirements of the Act, para 197 of the Framework, and would not conflict with CDP Policies 44 &amp; 45 and Policies H1 &amp; H2 of the NP. When read together, these policies seek, among other things, to ensure that developments sustain the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets including any contribution made by their setting. As a result, the proposal would be in accordance with the development plan. The proposed development would not be harmful to creating, or maintaining, a mixed and balanced community having regard to the policies in the development plan. Proposal would comply with the relevant requirements of Part 3 of CDP Policy C16 and the Framework.</i>			
21/03620/FPA	5 Palatine View	Chimney pots removed (retrospective)	OBJECT	REFUSED 3/3
Reason(s):	<i>Proposed removal of the chimney pots, capping off the chimney and air bricks would be discordant with the historic character of the terrace and be harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene. Works are considered to have a detrimental impact on the character/appearance of the CA, a designated heritage asset. The level of harm to this asset is less than substantial but there are no public benefits to outweigh this harm. Therefore, the works are considered to be unacceptable and in conflict with Policies 44 of the CDP, Policy H2 of the NP, Part 16 of the NPPF and Section 72 of the Planning LB &amp; CAs Act of 1990.</i>			
21/01611/FPA	Apollo Bingo, Front St, Gilesgate Moor	Demolition of existing bingo hall for 4-storey PBSA + assoc facilities	OBJECT	APPROVED 8/3
Reason(s):	<i>Informal: Planning Committee members voted 9:6 to approve. Committee Report: it would accord with the broad aims of CDP Policies 6 &amp; 16 subject to a S106 agreement and appropriate planning conditions. On balance the dev't is acceptable in terms of the loss of a non-designated heritage asset, provides acceptable levels of amenity space for residents of the proposed development, protects the privacy, and amenity of the existing residents whilst also being acceptable in terms of highways, drainage and ecology in accordance with Policies 1, 6, 16, 21, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36 &amp; 44 of the CDP and NPPF Parts 2, 4, 8, 9, 11, 12 &amp; 16. [As this document was drafted the formal decision had still not appeared].</i>			
21/03117/FPA	Units 9 and 22-24 The Riverwalk	E(a) retail to E(b) restaurant; new shopfronts	OBJECT	APPROVED 9/3
Reason(s):	<i>Units are currently vacant therefore in this regard the proposal would improve the vitality of the centre and support a prosperous economy in accordance with CDP Policy 9, NP Policies S1 &amp; E3 and Parts 6 &amp; 7 of the NPPF. Application is considered to be compliant with relevant advice within CDP Policies 29 &amp; 31, Parts 8, 12 &amp; 15 of the NPPF and the NP where relevant. The amended shop front respects the scale, proportion, materials and character of the building and location therefore is considered to be in compliance with CDP Policy 29. The character and appearance of the CA is preserved having regards to CDP Policy 44. This application relates solely to the partial CoU of the premise and new shop fronts. Many concerns raised by objectors, including loss of circulation space, relate to matters outside the scope of this application and were fully addressed as part of application 21/03052/FPA. It is considered that the plans submitted are clear and a compliance condition has been imposed. Officers consider that the development does accord with the development plan.</i>			
21/03682/FPA	St Cuthbert's House, Diamond Terrace	Replacement 2-4 storey workplace building	OBJECT	APPROVED 9/3

Reason(s):	<i>Development is considered to be in general compliance with the Development Plan, adhering to the content of the majority of policies of the CDP and NP. However, some conflict with CDP Policy T21 and NP Policies S1 &amp; T1 has been identified due to DCC's adopted parking standards not being met, particularly the absence of 2 dedicated accessible parking spaces designed to necessary standards. However, this can be mitigated to an extent through a condition to ensure a scheme which prioritises parking spaces being provided for the use of a disabled member of staff/visitor. On balance, taking into account the merits of the scheme in representing an efficient use of brownfield land and delivering employment opportunities in a development of appropriate design and character, the scheme is considered to remain acceptable despite the degree of aforementioned conflict with specific CDP and NP policies.</i>			
<b>22/00052/FPA</b>	<b>Freemans Quay Leisure Centre</b>	Solar panels on roof	SUPPORT	APPROVED 10/3
Reason(s):	<i>Development is not considered to harm the surrounding CA or setting of the WHS and would have no significant adverse impacts on the amenity of adjacent land users in this instance. Development will help to protect and conserve the environment by reducing the building's carbon footprint and help to contribute to wider measures being implemented by DCC to reduce their environmental impact. Proposals are considered to accord with Parts 2, 12 &amp; 16 of the NPPF, Policies 29, 31, 44 &amp; 45 of the CDP and Policies S1, H1 &amp; H2 of the NP.</i>			
<b>21/04085/FPA</b>	<b>37-38 Silver Street</b>	Upper floors 5-bed HMO, lower ground floor 2-bed flat	OBJECT	APPROVED 11/3
Reason(s):	<i>[As this document was drafted the delegated report had still not appeared].</i>			
<b>21/03362/FPA</b>	<b>Croxdale Hall</b>	Outbuilding/greenhouse to holiday let	OBJECT	APPROVED 14/3
Reason(s):	<i>The development is considered to conserve and enhance the significance of the registered park and garden and the Sunderland Bridge CA, along with the special landscape qualities of the AHLV. Proposed use as a holiday let is not considered to generate a significant increase in traffic and an extensive PRow network is within close proximity to the site. In addition, the development is not considered to have an adverse impact upon residential amenity. Conditions are imposed to secure further details of noise management, joinery details, surface finishes, drainage, household waste collection and broadband connection. With these conditions the proposal accords with CDP Policies 8, 10, 20, 21, 26, 29, 31, 32, 35, 36, 39, 41 &amp; 44 and Parts 2, 4, 6, 9, 12, 13, 15 &amp; 16 of the NPPF.</i>			