



**CITY OF DURHAM  
PARISH COUNCIL**

Learning from the past.  
Building for the future.

Ms Lisa Morina  
Planning Development Central/East  
Room 4/86-102  
County Hall  
Durham  
DH1 5UL

City of Durham Parish Council  
Office 3 D4.01d  
Clayport Library  
8 Millennium Place  
Durham City  
DH1 1WA

9<sup>th</sup> July 2021

Dear Ms Morina,

**DM/21/02263/FPA | Demolition of existing timber garage and erection of new stone garage. | The Cottage Quarryheads Lane Durham DH1 3DY**

The City of Durham Parish Council Planning Committee considered this application at its meeting on the 9<sup>th</sup> July 2021 and resolved to object to this application.

Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires applications for planning permission to be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) operates under a presumption in favour of sustainable development. It states that development proposals, which accord with the development plan, should be approved without delay. The adopted Development Plan where the site is located comprises the planning policies of the County Durham Plan (CDP) and the Durham City Neighbourhood Plan, which was formally adopted by the County Council on 23rd June 2021.

Firstly, it should be noted that the applicant's submitted Design and Access Statement advises that "*we are seeking planning approval for the demolition of existing Garage & erection of proposed Garage, Hall, Utility, Lounge & Bedroom*". The Parish Council sees no reference to any of these rooms within the proposed plans and elevations document submitted with this application and would ask that the applicant clarifies the position on this matter. Clearly if such rooms are proposed, new plans will need to be submitted in support of this application so that the Parish Council may fully assess the merits of this development against relevant local Plan Policies, the NPPF and the Nationally Described Space Standards.

Furthermore, the application site is located to the southern edge of the Durham City Conservation Area (designated 1968). This proposal should therefore be assessed against CDP Policy 44 (Historic Environment) which is clear that development proposals will be expected to show "*respect for, and reinforcement of, the established, positive characteristics of the area in terms of appropriate design (including pattern, layout, density, massing, features, height, form, materials and detailing).*"

This approach is entirely consistent with Neighbourhood Plan Policy H2, which is equally clear that development proposals within and affecting the Durham City Conservation Area should *“have materials, detailing and lighting appropriate to the vernacular, context and setting”*.

Whilst the Parish Council welcomes this proposal as replacing a timber building, which at present is in a poor condition, the Parish Council objects to the use of uPVC as a material for both the windows and the door. This element of this proposed clearly fails the test set by CDP Policy 44 and DCNP Policy H2.

It should also be noted that the application site is covered by an Article 4 (2) Direction. It is understood the Direction resulted from the evidence-base as part of the Durham City Centre Conservation Character Appraisal. Accordingly, the Direction was served to restrict Permitted Development Rights in order to control minor forms of development that could otherwise have an adverse impact and further erode the character and appearance of the historic area through loss of traditional features, details and materials and also offering a means of potentially reversing past unsympathetic alterations. Therefore, the proposal by virtue its proposed UPVC alternatives would be considered in conflict with these aims.

It is acknowledged that the specified replacement UPVC windows and door are a good quality product at the higher end of the market. That said, the Parish Council believes that the proposal would still be considered harmful and would not be considered to either preserve or enhance as preserve means doing no harm and enhance relates to a positive change. It is considered UPVC stands out as an inferior modern alternative to the natural appearance of a more suitable and sustainable material such as traditional timber.

The Parish Council believes that the cumulative impact of these alterations would fail to preserve or enhance the designated Conservation Area, when tested against National Planning Policy Framework, the level of harm would be "less than substantial". As such, the Policy test of Paragraph 196 then applies stating that "Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use". In this particular case, no public benefits are identified for the use of this material and therefore this fails to conform with the NPPF.

Clearly, more information is required in terms of the use of this proposed building and its rooms. A change in the use of materials for the windows and the door from uPVC for this development would also satisfy the Parish Council's objection. This application should be refused in its current form. If amended plans are submitted, the Parish Council would expect to be re-consulted on this application.

Yours sincerely,

**Adam Shanley**  
**Clerk to the City of Durham Parish Council**