

The City of Durham Trust
(Registered charity number 502132)

SUMMARY DATA: 19 June to 16 July 2024

PLANNING APPLICATIONS considered	OBJECTIONS submitted	SUPPORT submitted	COMMENTS/CONCERNS submitted
19	7	-	-

PLANNING APPLICATIONS RESPONDED TO: 19 June to 16 July 2024

Ref.	Location	Work	Date	Officer	Response
<i>From DCC weekly list 28/5:</i>					
24/01274/FPA	38 Highgate	Garage conversion to accommodation	20/6	Woodruff	Objection
<i>Amendments:</i>					
24/00149/FPA	Land NW of Melbury Ct, Old Dryburn Way	Construction of a PBSA (Sui Generis) + assoc. parking, landscaping	20/6	France	Further objection
24/01161/FPA	35 Hallgarth Street	Rear extension, loft conversion, etc	28/6	Sandford	Further objection
23/02504/FPA	45A Sunderland Road, Gilesgate	Alterations/extensions + CoU to 4 x small HMOs (C4) (one existing)	2/7	Penman	Further objection
<i>From DCC weekly list 10/6:</i>					
24/01474/FPA 24/01475/LB	43-44 Saddler Street	Replacement ground floor front window	1/7	Hurton	Objection
24/01150/FPA	The Kiosk, Freeman's Reach, Riverside Place	Retention of timber decking and steel balustrade (<i>retrosp.</i>)	22/7	Scott	Objection
<i>From DCC weekly list 21/6:</i>					
24/00770/FPA	2 Palmer's Close, Church Street Head	Ext'n to create a 2-bed dwelling + new access	11/7	Richards	Objection

PLANNING APPLICATIONS NOTED: 19 June to 16 July 2024

Ref.	Location	Work	Date	Officer
<i>From DCC weekly list 1/7:</i>				
24/01114/FPA	47 South Street	Ext'l decor works, gutter renewal, greenhouse/summerhouse to rear	15/7	White
24/01612/FPA	14 Nevilledale Terrace	Replacement windows	15/7	Walton
24/01647/FPA	58 Frank Street, Gilesgate Moor	Dwellinghouse (C3) to HMO (C4) incl. ext'n and car parking area	15/7	Hurton
24/01273/LB	Haughton House, St John's College, 1-7 South Bailey	Replacement wall lamps to front entrance	17/7	Woodruff

PLANNING APPLICATIONS NOTED AT THE MEETING (16 July 2024)

Ref.	Location	Work	Date	Officer
<i>From DCC weekly list 8/7:</i>				
24/01712/PN56	University Library Stockton Rd	Replacement entrance doors	17/7	Richards
24/01623/LB	56 South Street	Chimney repairs, repointing etc	22/7	Walton
24/01693/FPA	6 Fowler Wynd	Front porch, rear extension etc	22/7	Beveridge
24/01715/FPA	Ogden Centre, Science Site, South Road	Replacement telescope housing to Rochester Building roof	25/7	Sandford

24/01581/FPA	41 Oak Avenue, Sherburn Road Estate	Dwellinghouse (C3) to self-contained HMO (C4)	26/7	Hurton
24/01750/FPA	5 Albert Street	Repl. dormer window frame	29/7	Richards
<i>From DCC weekly list 15/7:</i>				
24/01814/FPA	Hillcrest, Springfield Park	First floor side extension	1/8	Richards

OUTCOMES TO PREVIOUS RESPONSES (*decided since 18 June 2024*)

Ref.	Location	Work	Trust's response	Decision/Date
23/02118/FPA (APP/X1355/W/ 24/3337793)	12 The Hallgarth	Dwellinghouse (C3) to HMO (C4)	OBJECT	ALLOWED 25/6
Reason(s):	<i>Having regard to the submitted evidence of the main parties and interested parties, the main issue is the effect of the proposal on housing mix. [For the reasons given above,] the proposed addition of a further HMO in the area would not further unbalance the community and its effect on housing mix would be acceptable. It would therefore accord with CDP Policy 16, the aims of which have previously been set out. Because the proposal would involve very limited external changes to the property, it would not adversely affect the significance of the CA and would preserve its character/appearance. Appeal allowed subject to the conditions listed (including soundproofing and restriction to 4 bedrooms).</i>			
23/01996/VOC (APP/X1355/W/ 24/3339581)	17 Hallgarth Street	VOC 4 (opening hours)	OBJECT	DISMISSED 26/6
Reason(s):	<i>[For the reasons given above,] I do not find the proposed variation of Condition No 4 would suitably protect nearby occupiers from additional noise and disturbance, and it would lead to harm to their living conditions. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy E4 of the DCNP and CDP Policies 29 & 31, the aims of which have previously been set out. It would also conflict with the relevant provisions of the NPPF, which have similar aims. I note the appellant's statement that the current restrictions on trading hours are limiting for the business, and this may place challenges on its continued operation. However, the location of the site in a highly residential area requires a balanced approach to such uses. Although I recognise the commercial and economic benefits the extended hours would deliver, such benefits would not overcome the harm I have identified in respect of the main issue.</i>			
24/00040/AD	Land to the south of Pimlico	Freestanding directional sign	OBJECT	WITHDRAWN 26/6
24/00876/TPO	East Durham/Houghall Community College	Removal of 5 trees and pruning of 4 trees/shrubs	OBJECT	APPROVED 26/6
Reason(s):	<i>A pruning plan was submitted which further outlined the extent of the works, the officer was satisfied with this info. and recommends the works for approval. The proposed works are not considered to negatively impact the trees' form, appearance, or long-term health. These works will ensure that the trees remain in good health and will continue to make a positive contribution to visual amenity and the character of the area and comply with CDP Policy 40 and guidance contained within NPPF Policy 15. The application is therefore recommended for approval subject to the inclusion of British Standard 3998:2010 condition.</i>			
23/02672/FPA	Land south of South College, The Drive	Access road to serve commercial area	COMMENT	APPROVED 27/6
Reason(s):	<i>The updated scheme can reasonably be concluded to meet the requirements of CDP Policies 21, 24 & 40, and Policy T1 (Sustainable Transport Accessibility & Design) of the NP, along with the relevant requirements of NPPF Parts 9 & 15. The scheme is not considered to result in 'unacceptable harm' to the landscape or surrounding historic environment. The nature of the works proposed is such that there is negligible effect and no identifiable harm on the heritage assets, built and natural, and the req'ts of CDP Policies 24 & 44 and NPPF Part 16 are met. The drainage scheme as assessed has been confirmed as meeting the req'ts of CDP Policy 35 and Policy S1.j & k of the NP. The applicant's offer of a 1% [BNG] gain, with a payment of £1394 is concluded acceptable by the County Ecologist. Approved subject to S106.</i>			
24/00812/FPA	42 Bradford Cres., Gilesgate	Dwellinghouse (C3) to HMO (C4) including rear extension	OBJECT	APPROVED 1/7
Reason(s):	<i>It is considered that the principle of dev't is acceptable and would accord with the req'ts of CDP Policy 16(3). When assessed against other criteria contained within Policy 16 and the remaining policies of the CDP, relevant to the application, the dev't would not imbalance the existing community, result in any unacceptable cumulative impact upon the amenity of existing or future residents, have any detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area, or have an unacceptable impact on highway safety. The dev't therefore accords with CDP Policies 16, 21, 29 & 31, NPPF Parts 9, 12 & 15 and the SPD.</i>			

23/02439/FPA	28 Albert Street	Conservatory to rear extension etc	OBJECT	APPROVED 3/7
Reason(s):	<p><i>The dev't is considered acceptable in principle and by reason of its size, scale, layout and materials could be satisfactorily accommodated without adverse impact upon the appearance, character, design and scale of the existing dwelling or surrounding area, and would not have a significant detrimental impact upon the level of amenity enjoyed by neighbouring occupiers. It is further considered the dev't would preserve the character and appearance of the surrounding CA. In addition, the dev't is not considered to result in any unacceptable highway safety impacts and is therefore considered acceptable in this regard. Furthermore, the dev't is not considered to have a detrimental impact to protected species, (in this case bats) and is therefore acceptable in this instance. Consequently, the proposal would accord with the req'ts of Sect. 72 of the Planning (LB & CA) Act 1990, Policy H2 of the Durham City NP, NPPF Sections 2, 4, 9, 12, 15 & 16, CDP Policies 21, 29, 31, 43 & 44 and guidance contained in the Council's Residential Amenity Design Guide SPD.</i></p>			
24/00705/FPA	Prince Bishops Shopping Centre, High Street	Redev't comprising partial demolition above mall level and erection of new commercial units (E) hotel (C1), PBSA (sui gen.) and new public square	OBJECT	APPROVED 3/7
Reason(s):	<p><i>Informal: Approved at County Planning Committee. Committee Report: The benefits of the scheme are considered to outweigh the identified harms. The proposals are considered generally compliant with the policies of the CDP, the Durham City NP and the NPPF. There are minor conflicts in terms of a lack of restriction to occupation of the hotel, the standard of amenity for some of the student rooms and in terms of cycle provision. Addressing these conflicts, regard must be had to the city centre location and the wider strategic context of delivering economic growth through the regeneration of a key City Centre with much needed employment and economic benefits in a highly sustainable location. This overarching strategic aim needs to be considered in the overall planning balance and weighed against the failure of the dev't to fully achieve sustainable transport and quality of life objectives particularly when the site constraints in this unique World Heritage setting would prevent significant changes to the design. Concerns raised have been taken into account and addressed within the report with suitable conditions proposed to mitigate concerns where possible. The objections raised would not outweigh the above conclusions, and on this basis the application is recommended for approval, subject to S106 and appropriate conditions.</i></p>			
24/00973/LB	Palace Green Library	Refurbishment of roofs	SUPPORT	APPROVED 4/7
Reason(s):	<p><i>The works would preserve the historic fabric of the Grade II LB and it is considered the proposals are an acceptable form of development and accords with NPPF Parts 15 & 16, Sect. 66 of the Planning (LBs & CAs) Act 1990 and CDP Policies 43 & 44.</i></p>			
24/01241/PN56	Bridge House, North Road	Prior approval CoU from Class E to residential dwellings (C3)	OBJECT	PRIOR APPROVAL REQUIRED AND REFUSED 5/7
Reason(s):	<p><i>On the basis of the submitted info., it is considered that prior notification is required and refused, as the proposal would have an unacceptable detrimental impact on Local Healthcare Provision contrary to Part 3 Class MA2 (2)(h)(ii) of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015.</i></p>			