

**STOCKTON-ON-TEES BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**CABINET RECOMMENDATIONS**

**PROFORMA**

Cabinet Meeting .....14th January 2016

1. Title of Item/Report

Yarm Back Lane and Harrowgate Lane Masterplan

2. Record of the Decision

Consideration was given to a report on Yarm Back Lane and Harrowgate Lane Masterplan.

The report advised Cabinet on joint working to prepare a masterplan for a strategic sustainable urban extension at West Stockton and sought approval of a masterplan for use in the determination of planning applications at the site and as an evidence base in support of the emerging Regeneration and Environment Local Plan (RELP).

The Council had identified land at Yarm Back Lane and Harrowgate Lane as housing allocations within the RELP. The RELP was at publication stage and emerging policies (H17, H18 and H19) highlighted the need for development to be delivered in accordance with a masterplan to ensure that a sustainable urban extension of 2,150 dwellings, including associated infrastructure, was successfully delivered.

The scale of the development meant that there were numerous shared infrastructure requirements which needed to be delivered; this included but was not limited to a primary school and highway junction improvements. In addition to this there were numerous landownerships across the site. A masterplan was seen as essential in ensuring that:

- individual planning applications come forward in accordance with the masterplan to deliver a sustainable and integrated urban extension; and
- infrastructure is delivered when it is required

The purpose of this masterplan was to provide a robust and comprehensive evidence base to support the allocation of the sites and to guide individual planning applications. .

The Council had been working in collaboration with the Advisory Team for Large Applications (ATLAS), landowners and developers and agents

to prepare a comprehensive masterplan for the sites.

Planning Committee had refused a planning application on part of the site, known as Tithebarn Land (planning application reference (14/2291/EIS). This decision was being appealed by the applicant and was progressing towards a public inquiry. The reasons for refusal were as follows:

- **Development does not represent sustainable development:**  
In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposal in coming forward ahead of an established masterplan, could lead to an unfair distribution of uses and another developer coming forward later being asked to provide more than is justified by their own development. This could make some parcels unviable and risk necessary infrastructure not being provided for the proper planning of the area, resulting in significant social and economic harm which would be contrary to the definition and aims of sustainable development as set out in the NPPF (paragraph 7, 9 and 14).
- **Highway Safety:**  
The applicant has failed to provide sufficient information to satisfactorily demonstrate that the proposed development would not have a detrimental impact on highway safety and the free flow of traffic to both the Local and Strategic Highway Networks or that the impact could be satisfactorily mitigated to the reasonable satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority and is therefore contrary to guidance within policy CS2 of the Core Strategy (1&2) and paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

The first reason for refusal highlighted concern with development preceding in advance of a masterplan and the implications this could have for the wider site.

The planning application, which was subject to public inquiry sought permission for 340 dwellings whilst the masterplan only distributes 250 dwellings to this element of the site. The appellant was not in agreement with the distribution of dwellings identified within the masterplan. As all elements of the collaborative masterplan could not be agreed the Council had sought to progress a separate masterplan albeit the contents of this masterplan maintains the main elements of the collaborative process undertaken.

The masterplan, which was attached to the report, sought to:

- Outline the vision and development objectives for the site;
- Identify constraints and their impact on development;

- Identify infrastructure requirements;
- Provide a Strategic Framework Plan to shape development proposals;
- Provide clarity regarding the requirements for planning applications; and
- Provide clarity regarding the phasing and delivery of housing and infrastructure

Following allocation of the sites within the RELP the masterplan could be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Should the Council decide to take the masterplan forward as an SPD so that it formed part of the Development Plan there would be a requirement for a statutory period of consultation and potentially a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).

The emerging RELP was supported by an Infrastructure Strategy and Schedule which provided a strategic level assessment of the infrastructure requirements arising from the RELP as a whole. Building upon this strategic assessment, a detailed Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) had been produced as part of the masterplan to co-ordinate the delivery of the infrastructure which was necessary to support residential development on the Yarm Back Lane and Harrowgate Lane sites.

The IDP drew upon the evidence base prepared to support the preparation of the masterplan and set out what infrastructure was needed and the anticipated timescales / phase of development when this should be provided. The key infrastructure requirements identified in the IDP include the provision of:

- Junction enhancements;
- Other access and transport infrastructure;
- Community hub (incorporating a primary school, community centre and neighbourhood centre);
- Green infrastructure;
- Surface water drainage infrastructure;
- Affordable housing;
- Utilities related infrastructure.

The Council had been working with landowners and developers to agree an approach to contributions and the delivery of infrastructure which was both equitable and CIL compliant. At the present time no agreement had been reached. The masterplan identified that until agreement had been reached, to the satisfaction of the Council, it would not be possible to determine planning applications at the site. The Council would continue to liaise with landowners and developers to reach agreement.

RECOMMENDED to Council that the Yarm Back Lane and Harrowgate Lane Masterplan be approved for use in the determination of planning applications and as an evidence base in support of the emerging RELP.

3. Reasons for the Decision

To ensure the masterplan can be used as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications and to support allocation of the sites within the RELP.

4. Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

None.

5. Declared (Cabinet Member) Conflicts of Interest

None.

6. Details of any Dispensations

N/A

7. Date and Time by which Call In must be executed

N/A

Proper Officer  
18 January 2016