

The City of Durham Trust
(Registered charity number 502132)

SUMMARY DATA: 22 May to 18 June 2024

PLANNING APPLICATIONS considered	OBJECTIONS submitted	SUPPORT submitted	COMMENTS/CONCERNS submitted
21	6	-	-

PLANNING APPLICATIONS RESPONDED TO: 22 May to 18 June 2024

Ref.	Location	Work	Date	Officer	Response
<i>From DCC weekly list 13/5:</i>					
24/00040/AD	Land to the south of Pimlico	Freestanding directional sign	29/5	Fenwick	Objection
24/01173/FPA	St Leonard's Catholic School, North End	Demolition for a replacement building; works to retained Springwell Hall, car parking, landscaping etc	26/6	France	Objection
<i>From DCC weekly list 20/5:</i>					
24/01222/FPA	5 Hawthorn Terrace	Replacement dormer roof extension	5/6	Woodruff	Objection
24/01161/FPA	35 Hallgarth Street	Rear extension, loft conversion, etc	10/6	Sandford	Objection
24/01241/PN56	Bridge House, North Road	Prior approval CoU from Class E to residential dwellings (C3)	14/6	Richards	Objection
<i>Appeal:</i>					
23/03752/FPA (APP/X1355/W/24/3344526)	Cross View House, Neville's Cross	Dwellinghouse (C3) to large HMO (sui generis)	27/6	Morina	Further objection

PLANNING APPLICATIONS NOTED: 22 May to 18 June 2024

Ref.	Location	Work	Date	Officer
<i>From DCC weekly list 13/5:</i>				
24/01143/FPA	29 Hawthorn Crescent, Gilesgate Moor	Dwelling (C3) to HMO (C4) incl. alterations to roof, parking, etc	29/5	Spurgeon
<i>Amendments:</i>				
23/02236/FPA	1 Beech Crest	Sub-divide dwelling (C3) into 3 flats (<i>part retrospective</i>)	7/6	Hurton
<i>From DCC weekly list 28/5:</i>				
24/01213/FPA	Telephone Exchange, Providence Row	Installation of antennae, boxes, etc and replacement cabinet	10/6	Sandford
24/01209/FPA	33 Maddison Ct, Aykley Heads	First floor front extension	12/6	Fenwick
24/01334/VOC (20/01286/LB)	Mount Oswald Golf Club, South Road	VOC 2 (approved plans)	12/6	France
24/00592/CEU	6 Ravensworth Terrace	Lawful dev't certificate for existing use as 7-bed HMO	14/6	Fenwick
24/01188/FPA	32 Goodyear Crescent, Sherburn Road Estate	Dwellinghouse (C3) to HMO (C4) incl. rear ext'n, parking, etc	14/6	Penman
24/01303/FPA	County Hall, Framwelgate Peth	Temporary CoU of car park for use by a school (Class F.1(a))	14/6	Hopper

<i>From DCC weekly list 31/5:</i>				
24/01097/AD	10-11 Silver Street	3 fascia signs + 1 hanging sign	19/6	Richards
24/01365/FPA	1 Princes' Street	Carport structure	20/6	Scott

PLANNING APPLICATIONS NOTED AT THE MEETING (18 June 2024)

Ref.	Location	Work	Date	Officer
<i>From DCC weekly list 10/6:</i>				
24/01199/AD	The Waterside Building, Riverside Place	1 non-illuminated totem sign	24/6	Fenwick
24/01395/LB	St Chad's College, 16-22 North Bailey	Replacement of 85 internal fire doors	25/6	Woodruff
24/01439/CEU	19A North Road	Certificate of existing lawful use for restaurant (Class E)	N/A	Richards
<i>From DCC weekly list 14/6:</i>				
24/01413/FPA	10 Chipchase Grove	Rear extension	2/7	Beveridge
24/01469/FPA	26 North Crescent	First floor extension on existing garage	2/7	White

OUTCOMES TO PREVIOUS RESPONSES (decided since 21 May 2024)

Ref.	Location	Work	Trust's response	Decision/Date
23/02622/FPA (APP/X1355/W/ 24/3339936)	Land south of South College, The Drive	74-bed care home facility (C2) with associated works	SUPPORT	ALLOWED 22/5
Reason(s):	<i>The principle of specialist housing for older people at the appeal site would accord with the relevant dev't plan policies. In addition, a range of other policy requirements other than those matters outlined [above] were identified and considered within the Council's officer report which concluded that the proposal was in accordance with the related policies. I have been provided with no substantive evidence which would prompt me to disagree with the Council's conclusions in these respects, subject to the imposition of planning conditions as discussed and the contributions secured through the Unilateral Undertaking. The proposal accords with the dev't plan, read as a whole. There are no material considerations, including the NPPF, that indicate that I should take a decision otherwise than in accordance with it.</i>			
24/00447/FPA	Durham Dramatic Society Fowlers Yard	Replacement works for 10 existing timber sash windows	SUPPORT	APPROVED 22/5
Reason(s):	<i>It is therefore considered the proposals are an acceptable form of dev't and accord with NPPF Parts 12, 15 & 16, Sect. 72 of the Planning (LB & CAs) Act 1990 plus CDP Policies 29, 31, 44 & 45 and Policies DCH1, DCH2 and DCS1 of the Durham City Neighbourhood Plan.</i>			
24/00830/PN56	The Rectory, The Village, Brancepeth	Prior notification for installation of 10 x solar panels on tilt racks	OBJECT	PRIOR APPROVAL NOT REQ'D 23/5
Reason(s):	<i>On balance, it is considered that the proposed solar panels are permitted development subject to the conditions set out within Part 14, Class A of the GDPO 2015. As such, prior approval is not considered to be required.</i>			
24/00969/TCA	St Leonard's Catholic School, North End	Proposed felling of 21 trees within the Conservation Area	OBJECT	RAISE NO OBJECTION 23/5
Reason(s):	<i>The works are not considered exempt from the requirement for a Section 211 notice. The [above] report sets out a reasoned/systematic approach to assessing the relative value of the 21 trees subject to the Sect. 211 notice both using the most up-to-date TEMPO process and a detailed assessment based on public realm and private amenity concerns. The application has been considered in its own right and in relation to the proposals to demolish and rebuild the school. For the latter, the implications of the currently submitted layout have been considered, along with the fact that at this stage of the democratic process the proposed layout could be subject to amendment. There are some trees that scored higher than others but neither the trees visible from the school gates, as public realm, nor those to the rear of Springwell Hall Cottage are considered to warrant the serving of Orders. This assessment has quantified the relative harms to the designated heritage assets and non-designated heritage assets, concluding that there is less than significant harm, and that the effects on the assets and their settings does not justify the serving of TPOs. It is noted that residents consider the Sect. 211 procedure in advance of consideration of the application premature and request</i>			

	emergency TPOs be served on this basis to defer ass't. The Sect. 211 notice allows the LPA to make a TPO if justified in the interests of amenity. Officers consider there is info. to hand to allow a considered/informed ass't of both amenity and effect on the CA. An 'emergency' TPO to temporarily protect the trees as suggested to defer a decision for further ass't is not considered defensible. The survey of trees along the drive identified two trees - T3 and T5 - that are currently not subject to preservation orders, but that do potentially justify such in their own right. These are not subject to the Section 211 notice, but have been identified as part of the Section 211 assessment in a wider assessment of trees of value. A detailed investigation of die-back in one is being investigated, following which there is an intention to serve orders to protect the trees during demolition/ construction works and thereafter. Further, the age and nature of the existing TPO for the overall campus is not of some age and would benefit from reserving. This action too is proposed in the immediate future.			
24/00526/FPA	19 North Road	Reconfig. of 1 st & 2 nd fl. to retain 2 x 6-bed HMOs and create 2 x 2-bed wheelchair accessible flats	SUPPORT	APPROVED 30/5
Reason(s):	The proposed dev't would not have an adverse impact on the character or appearance of the area (and would preserve the special character/appearance of the CA), and would not be harmful to the residential amenity of neighbouring properties or highway safety and would be considered to be in a sustainable location. It would therefore be in accordance with the NPPF Parts 12 & 15, CDP Policies 6, 21, 29, 31 & 44, DCNP Policies S1, H2, D4, T1 & T3 and S72 of the Town and Country Planning (LB & CAs) Act 1990.			
24/00821/FPA	Harrison House, 1 Hawthorn Terrace	6 x conservation Velux windows in existing roof space (front)	OBJECT	APPROVED 30/5
Reason(s):	It is considered that the proposals conform with the relevant policies, as the character and appearance of the surrounding CA would be preserved and there would not be any adverse impact to residential amenity in accordance with CDP Policies 29, 31 & 44, NPPF Parts 12, 15 & 16, DCNP Policy H2 and Sect. 72 of the Town and Country Planning (LB & CAs) Act 1990.			
23/02312/FPA	29 Silver Street	Lower floors to 2-bed duplex (C3)	COMMENT	APPROVED 31/5
Reason(s):	It is considered that the principle of dev't is acceptable and would accord with the aims of CDP Policies 6 & 16 in this regard. In addition, the proposed dev't would have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and heritage assets in accordance with Sect. 72 of the Town & Country Planning (LB & CAs) Act 1990 and, subject to conditions, would have no detrimental impacts on residential amenity or ecology. There would be no concerns with regards to highway safety and the proposals are considered to comply with the aims of other relevant policies with the Plan. The dev't is therefore considered to accord with NPPF Parts 9, 12, 15 & 16, CDP Policies 6, 16, 21, 27, 29, 31, 32, 35, 36, 41 & 44, and Policies S1, T2, T3, H1 & H2 of the Durham City Neighbourhood Plan.			
24/00883/FPA	St Leonard's Catholic School, North End	Demolition of existing disused school buildings	OBJECT	APPROVED 4/6
Reason(s):	If the response to the public consultation reflects the level and focus of the proposals, the principle of the removal of the buildings is relatively uncontentious, with the main concern directed towards the tree loss proposed. Formal review and challenge of DCC's assessments and processes and the potential for Judicial Review were raised on an objector's behalf very early in the process, with frustration at the overlapping and disjointed processes a more common theme. The tree element of the proposals is largely now superseded by the parallel s.211 process, with the trees not considered to justify the serving of Preservation Orders, being of very limited public amenity value, and providing minimal contribution to the setting of the CA. The potentially negative weight this aspect could bring has effectively been superseded. They are being removed as this report is written. The demolition, whether considered in isolation in this application, or in the context of the replacement school buildings proposed in a parallel application is considered to the betterment of the Hall and Gatehouse, the principal non-designated heritage assets on site. This is of positive material weight. Matters of highway safety are resolved to the satisfaction of Highways Officers. This issue is of neutral weight. Likewise, the essential and significant aspect of public amenity from dust and noise has been assessed in detail and upon revision considered acceptable and is of neutral weight in the planning balance. In concluding the assessment of the planning balance, and with any negative weight from the tree loss argued as now redundant, the proposals accrue positive material weight from the improvement to the heritage assets, with other aspects neutral from achieving Policy compliance.			
24/00198/DRC (22/03232/FPA)	4-6 Silver Street (STACK)	Discharge of Conditions 3 (CMP) and 4 (Materials)	COMMENT	APPROVED 5/6
24/00894/LB	12 Church Street	Installation of a blue plaque	SUPPORT	APPROVED 5/6
Reason(s):	The proposed plaque would not cause any adverse impact on the character, appearance or significance of the Grade II LB, but would support a greater understanding of the historic significance of the site. As such the application is considered to comply with the provisions of the NPPF Part 16, CDP Policy 44 and Sect. 66 of the Planning (LB & CAs) Act 1990.			

24/00948/LB	Aykley Heads Gate Piers and Walls	Restoration of Grade II listed asset	SUPPORT	APPROVED 5/6
Reason(s):	<i>The proposed works would sustain and conserve the character, appearance and significance of the LB and as such the proposal is in accordance with NPPF Sect. 16, CDP Policy 44 and Sect. 66 of the Planning (LB & CA) Act 1990.</i>			
24/00586/VOC (20/01107/FPA)	Saffron Ho. Newcastle Road, Crossgate Moor	VOC 10 for an opening restrictor on 1 st floor ensuite window (north)	OBJECT	APPROVED 12/6
Reason(s):	<i>It is concluded that the installation of a metal restraining horizontally across the outside of the obscure glazed N facing en suite window would prevent any loss of privacy, or perception of overlooking, for the adjacent neighbouring dwelling to this side (Langdale). The obscure glazed S facing en suite window is openable, however following the completion of the dev't it is clear that due to the position of Saffron House relative to that of the rear garden of the adjacent neighbouring property to the S (Fairway), the occupants of this neighbouring property would not suffer from overlooking or loss of privacy from the position of this window. Therefore, it is concluded that the proposed alteration to the wording of Cond. 10 to remove the reference to 'non-opening' of the first-floor windows within the gable elevations would not have a detrimental impact upon residential amenity from overlooking and loss of privacy, according with CDP Policies 29 & 31 and NPPF Part 12. However, it is considered necessary and appropriate to require the retention of the restraining bar to the N facing en suite window in perpetuity. Overall, the proposed alteration to the wording of Cond. 10 would achieve the same outcome as its original wording.</i>			