

## Planning Committee

A meeting of Planning Committee was held on Wednesday, 3rd September, 2008.

**Present:** Cllr Roy Rix (Chairman), Cllr Hilary Aggio, Cllr Jim Beall, Cllr Mrs Jennie Beaumont, Cllr Phillip Broughton, Cllr John Gardner, Cllr Robert Gibson, Cllr Paul Kirton, Cllr Bill Noble, Cllr Mrs Maureen Rigg,

**Officers:** C. Straughan, R. McGuckin, J. Robinson, J. Hutchinson (DNS), J. Butcher, M. Jones, K. Wannop (LD).

**Also in attendance:** Applicants, agents, members of the public, Cllr Cherrett, Cllr Mrs Fletcher (Ward Councillors).

**Apologies:** Cllr David Harrington, Cllr Miss Tina Large, Cllr Ross Patterson, Cllr Steve Walmsley

### **P       Declarations of Interest**

**66/08**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **P       07/2319/ARC**

**67/08**

**Bishopsgarth Cottages, Darlington Back Lane, Stockton-on-Tees  
Application under section 73 to amend condition no.2 (approved plans) of  
planning approval 06/0461/REV**

Members were presented with an updated report and consideration was given to an application which sought retrospective planning permission to amend approved plans for application reference 06/0461/REV in order to regularise unauthorised changes made to the development as constructed. However, in order to regularise some of the details, and following consultation with officers the scheme had been submitted which sought approval for some of the changes with the intention of amending the scheme as built on site in respect to other changes.

Several planning approvals had established provision for two dwellings and associated works at the site. The initial approval attempted to restrict the overall scale and design of the development in order to control its impact in the landscape in view of it being on the urban fringe and outside of the defined limits of development.

Development had been undertaken on site which was not in accordance with the previously approved plans resulting in an unlawful development. The application had been submitted in order to regularise the development undertaken on site. The earlier approvals for the site were a material consideration in determining the application and as such, considerations in respect to the application generally related to the additional impact of the changes and beyond the impacts of the approved scheme, although the nature of the former development on the site had also been taken into account.

The initial plans submitted with the application and associated documentation were found to be inaccurate during the course of considering the application which was therefore made invalid albeit having been placed before committee on two separate occasions. The application details were considered to be

accurate and adequate information received to make the application valid.

Letters of objection had been received from local residents, mainly objecting to the impact on privacy and amenity and the numerous changes being made from the initial scheme. Letters of objection had also been received from Ward Councillors. Councillor objections were based on the level of changes to the previously approved details and the resultant impact of these changes on the appearance of the site and its impact on the character of the surrounding area.

Since some of these objections were received further amendments had been made and the main changes from the approved schemes related to the height of dwelling 2, location and addition of windows and the roofs gutter lines being set a greater distance above the 1st floor window headers. Members were reminded that the Planning Committee carried out a site visit to the properties on 21st November 2007

The revised plans showed a reduction in the scale of the buildings as constructed on site mainly as a result of the reduction in height and footprint of the garage blocks.

The applicant, agent, resident and Ward Councillors were in attendance at the meeting and the Ward Councillor gave their objections to the proposal.

Members were concerned with the application, and therefore requested a working group meeting be held with Planning Committee members, the applicant, Ward Councillors and Planning Officer to discuss the differences of the approved application and the application as-submitted. Members were presented with an updated report and consideration was given to an application which sought retrospective planning permission to amend approved plans for application reference 06/0461/REV in order to regularise unauthorised changes made to the development as constructed. However, in order to regularise some of the details, and following consultation with officers the scheme had been submitted which sought approval for some of the changes with the intention of amending the scheme as built on site in respect to other changes.

Several planning approvals had established provision for two dwellings and associated works at the site. The initial approval attempted to restrict the overall scale and design of the development in order to control its impact in the landscape in view of it being on the urban fringe and outside of the defined limits of development.

Development had been undertaken on site which was not in accordance with the previously approved plans resulting in an unlawful development. The application had been submitted in order to regularise the development undertaken on site. The earlier approvals for the site were a material consideration in determining the application and as such, considerations in respect to the application generally related to the additional impact of the changes and beyond the impacts of the approved scheme, although the nature of the former development on the site had also been taken into account.

The initial plans submitted with the application and associated documentation were found to be inaccurate during the course of considering the application which was therefore made invalid albeit having been placed before committee

on two separate occasions. The application details were considered to be accurate and adequate information received to make the application valid.

Letters of objection had been received from local residents, mainly objecting to the impact on privacy and amenity and the numerous changes being made from the initial scheme. Letters of objection had also been received from Ward Councillors. Councillor objections were based on the level of changes to the previously approved details and the resultant impact of these changes on the appearance of the site and its impact on the character of the surrounding area.

Since some of these objections were received further amendments had been made and the main changes from the approved schemes related to the height of dwelling 2, location and addition of windows and the roofs gutter lines being set a greater distance above the 1st floor window headers. Members were reminded that the Planning Committee carried out a site visit to the properties on 21st November 2007

The revised plans showed a reduction in the scale of the buildings as constructed on site mainly as a result of the reduction in height and footprint of the garage blocks.

The applicant, agent, resident and Ward Councillors were in attendance at the meeting and the Ward Councillor gave their objections to the proposal.

Members were concerned with the application, and therefore requested a working group meeting be held with Planning Committee members, the applicant, Ward Councillors and Planning Officer to discuss the differences of the approved application and the application as-submitted.

RESOLVED that the application be deferred to enable a working group meeting to be held.

**P**  
**68/08**      **08/0821/REM**  
**Goodrich Way, Ingleby Barwick, Stockton on Tees**  
**Reserved Matters Application for 41 no. Dwellings.**

Consideration was given to an application which sought permission for the erection of 41 dwellings on a site previously approved for 36 dwellings, which was within the centre of a new residential development located to the east of Myton Road and to the north of Ingleby Way. The application site was part of a development that was granted reserved matters approval for the erection of 418 dwellings in 2005.

The proposed plots would consist of mostly 3 and 4-bedroom dwellings, with 3no. 5-bedroom properties, while the previous application consisted mostly of 4-bedroom properties.

The planning application had been publicised by means of individual letters and a site notice and 6 objection letters had been received from 4 properties. The main reasons for objection related to a loss of privacy and amenity from 3no. 3-storey dwellings.

The main planning considerations related to the impact upon the character of the area and any impacts upon the privacy and amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties and highway safety.

It was explained that the design and layout of the proposed development was in keeping with the surrounding residential development and would not result in a significant impact upon the character of the area or the amenities of neighbouring residents.

A resident was in attendance and gave their objections to the application.

Members considered that the proposed development, accords with the Council's adopted standards and Adopted Stockton on Tees Local Plan Policies GP1, HO3 and HO11 and was therefore acceptable.

Cllr Paul Kirton left the room for part of the discussion of the application, and therefore, while he was able to take part in the discussion, he did not vote on the application.

RESOLVED that Planning application 08/0821/FUL be Approved subject to the following conditions:-

01. The development hereby approved would be in accordance with the following approved plan(s); unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Plan Reference Number	Date on Plan
D7-S-10	24 June 2008
D7-S-20	24 June 2008
D7-S-50	24 June 2008
D7-S-51	24 June 2008
D7-S-52	24 June 2008
D7-S-53	24 June 2008
D8-S-51	24 June 2008
D8-S-52	24 June 2008
D8-S-53	24 June 2008
SBC0001	14 May 2008
TG2(DET)-PL-0099	4 April 2008
TRG3(DET)-PL-0099	4 April 2008
SG2(DET)-PL-0099	4 April 2008
303-ED-01 REV A	4 April 2008
794/AS EXISTING APPROVED	4 April 2008
D8-S-50	24 June 2008
D8-S-20	24 June 2008
D8-S-10	24 June 2008
HY-S-10	24 June 2008
HY-S-20	24 June 2008
HY-S-50	24 June 2008
HY-S-51	24 June 2008
HY-S-52	24 June 2008
HY-S-53	24 June 2008
PG-S-10	24 June 2008
PG-S-20	24 June 2008

PG-S-25 24 June 2008  
PG-S-50 24 June 2008  
PG-S-51 24 June 2008  
PG-S-52 24 June 2008  
PG-S-53 24 June 2008  
TD/0075/01 27 June 2008  
TD/0075/05 27 June 2008  
TD/0075/07 24 June 2008  
01 24 June 2008  
D8\_DG-S-10 24 June 2008  
D8\_DG-S-20 24 June 2008  
D8\_DG-S-50 24 June 2008  
D8\_DG-S-52 24 June 2008  
D8\_DG-S-51 24 June 2008  
D8\_DG-S-53 24 June 2008  
D9-S-10 24 June 2008  
D9-S-51 24 June 2008  
D9-S-50 24 June 2008  
D9-S-52 24 June 2008  
D9-S-20 24 June 2008  
D9-S-53 24 June 2008  
D12-S-10 24 June 2008  
D12-S-50 24 June 2008  
D12-S-51 24 June 2008  
D12-S-20 24 June 2008  
D12-S-52 24 June 2008  
D12-S-53 24 June 2008  
D4-S-10 24 June 2008  
D4-S-20 24 June 2008  
D4-S-50 24 June 2008  
D4-S-51 24 June 2008  
D4-S-52 24 June 2008  
D10-S-10 24 June 2008  
D10-S-20 24 June 2008  
D10-S-50 24 June 2008  
D10-S-51 24 June 2008  
D10-S-52 24 June 2008  
D10-S-52 24 June 2008  
D5-S-51 24 June 2008  
D5-S-10 24 June 2008  
D5-S-20 24 June 2008  
D5-S-50 24 June 2008  
D5-S-52 24 June 2008  
D5-S-53 24 June 2008  
501/BW/DH/11a 4th April 2008  
Reason: To define the consent.

02. A landscape management plan, including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas, other than small privately owned domestic gardens, would be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the occupation of the development, or any phase of the development, for its permitted use. The landscape management plan would be carried out as

approved.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and the maintenance of landscaping features on the site.

03. No development approved by this permission would be commenced until a scheme for the provision and implementation of a surface water drainage and regulation system had been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such a scheme would be implemented prior to the construction of any impermeable surfaces draining into the system unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding.

04. Prior to being discharged into any watercourse, surface water sewer or soak away system, all surface water drainage from parking areas and hard standings would be passed through an oil interceptor installed in accordance with a scheme previously submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Roof water should not pass through the interceptor.

Reason: To prevent pollution of the water environment.

05. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking or re-enacting that Order), no garden fences, walls or other means of enclosure would be erected between the highway and any wall of the dwelling(s) which fronts onto the highway, without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order that the Local Planning Authority may exercise further control in this locality in the interests of the visual amenity of the area.

06. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking or re-enacting that Order), no integral garages shall be converted into part of the house without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure adequate garaging and parking spaces are made available.

07. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking or re-enacting that Order), no vehicle access should be created other than those hereby approved, without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To reserve the rights of the Local Planning Authority with regard to these matters.

08. No construction/building works or deliveries should be carried out except between the hours of 8.00am and 6.00pm on Mondays to Fridays and between 9.00am and 1.00pm on Saturdays. There shall be no construction activity including demolition on Sundays or on Bank Holidays.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of neighbouring residents.

09. Notwithstanding the submitted plans before development commences details of the provision of parking for each residential unit should be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Such details should be in accordance with the Council's Design Guide and Specification and shall provide 3no. spaces for 4 and 5-bedroom properties and 2no. spaces for a 3-bedroom properties. The development would be implemented in accordance with this plan unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure each residential unit has sufficient in-curtilage parking appropriate to its number of bedrooms.

**P 08/2345/FUL**  
**69/08 2 Mellor Street, Stockton**  
**First floor extension to rear**

Consideration was given to an application which sought permission for the erection of a first floor extension to the rear of 2 Mellor Street, Stockton. The applicant had stated within the application that they were related to an employee within the Council and therefore the application required to be determined by the Planning Committee.

The planning application had been publicised by means of individual letters and there had been no letters of objection.

The main considerations relate to the effect on the privacy and amenity of the neighbouring residents and the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Members considered the applicant was in accordance with policies GP1 and HO12 of the Stockton on Tees Local Plan and therefore acceptable.

The proposed extension would be positioned above the existing kitchen at the property and would be utilised as a bathroom. The proposed extension would be rendered blocks and artificial slate tiles.

RESOLVED that Planning application 08/2345/FUL be Approved subject to the following conditions:-

01 The development hereby approved would be in accordance with the following approved plan(s); unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Plan Reference Number	Date on Plan
SBC0001	22 July 2008
01	22 July 2008
02	22 July 2008
03	22 July 2008

Reason: To define the consent.

02. The materials used in the construction of the external walls and roofs of the development, hereby approved, should match those within the existing main dwelling unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory form of development

**P  
70/08 LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
PLANNING THE FUTURE OF RURAL VILLAGES IN STOCKTON-ON-TEES  
BOROUGH**

Consideration was given to a report that informed Members of the completion of the 'Planning the Future of Rural Villages' study prior to it being submitted to Cabinet and Council.

It was explained that the study of the rural villages within Stockton-on-Tees Borough had been undertaken to underpin and support policy development within the Local Development Framework (LDF) and to give clarity in the implementation of Core Strategy Policy 1 (CS1) point 5; 'In catering for rural housing needs, priority will be given to the provision of affordable housing in sustainable locations, to meet identified need. This will be provided through a rural exception site policy'.

In order to establish the levels of facilities available within the Borough's rural villages, an audit had been carried out. A consultation exercise on the initial findings was undertaken, ending on February 29th 2008. At the beginning of the consultation, an LDF training event was held for Ward Members and Parish Councillors and Clerks, which included a session discussing villages, their role and function.

Members were informed that it was evident from the feedback there was not a fair representation from all the villages and that there was a need to clarify the role of planning policies covering the villages as there appeared to be a misunderstanding amongst residents who responded. Therefore, to progress the study and improve the evidence base, it was decided to undertake further analysis and consultation.

Following consideration of the comments and views received, it was decided to take the study forward by undertaking a further consultation exercise in all villages included in the study in early July 2008. The consultation was based on further research into the sustainability, role and status of the villages within the Borough.

Members were informed that Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development (2005) stated "planning authorities should seek to provide improved access for all to jobs, health, education, shops, leisure and facilities on foot, bicycle or public transport rather than having to rely on access by car, whilst recognising that this may be more difficult in rural areas". Therefore a traffic light scoring system was used to rank each village in terms of their sustainability under the following categories:

- Employment



- Health
- Education
- Shops
- Leisure
- Ancillary facilities
- Access

From the results of the traffic light scoring system a village hierarchy was established. The purpose of this assessment was to spark debate about the villages and obtain information regarding services and facilities available to villages which had not been yet been recorded. Through the response questionnaire residents were also asked a number of questions regarding future policy considerations, such as the limits of development.

Members were informed that the traffic light scoring system used within the consultation session had been replaced by points based scoring system. This had provided a clear hierarchy of sustainability amongst the villages.

As an evidence base for policy documents emerging as part of the LDF the report made a number of recommendations:

- 1) Development limits should be maintained around all villages.
- 2) Infill development would be appropriate within Tiers 1 and 2. However, it would not be supported in Tiers 3 and 4 where residents had a greater reliance on the private car to access facilities.
- 3) Emerging policy should promote the development of shopping facilities and additional amenities as infill development to meet the needs of the villages.
- 4) Where a need for affordable housing had been identified through the rural exceptions policy it would be essential that these were located in areas where facilities were present or could be accessed by sustainable means, this would allow occupants of affordable housing to be able to access the services and facilities they require to live and not become marginalised.
- 5) It was suggested that a limits of development be placed around Wynyard in order to define the boundary of the village and create a policy stance in accordance with Hartlepool Borough Council (which had a limits of development in place around the section of Wynyard which lay within the Borough). As Wynyard lay within tier 4 further housing infill development would not be supported until services and facilities were in place to rate the village within tiers 1 or 2 and thus reducing reliance on the private car.
- 6) Update of the facilities and services audit would be undertaken in conjunction with Parish Councils in order to reassess the hierarchy of villages and direct development away from the least sustainable locations.

Members queried the presence of Port Clarence in the report, and the Sustainability scoring that this village had received. It was suggested that Port Clarence should be removed from the report, as this was not a rural village and had issues with accessible facilities highlighted. Members also queried the Sustainability scores received by other villages, particularly Aislaby.

The Committee was informed that the 'Planning the Future of Rural Villages in Stockton-on-Tees Borough' Report recommendations would inform the Regeneration Development Plan Document (DPD). Once the study had received Cabinet endorsement, a letter would be sent to respondents of the

consultation questionnaire advising that the document was completed and available to be viewed.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

**P**      **Local Development Framework Steering Group Minutes**

**71/08**

Consideration was given to the Local Development Framework (LDF) Steering Group Minutes held on 10th March 2008

RESOLVED that the minutes of the LDF Steering Group meeting held on 10th March 2008 be noted.

**P**      **Local Development Framework Steering Group Minutes**

**72/08**

Consideration was given to the Local Development Framework (LDF) Steering Group Minutes held on 27th May 2008.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the LDF Steering Group meeting held on 27th May 2008 be noted.

**P**      **Local Development Framework Steering Group Minutes**

**73/08**

Consideration was given to the Local Development Framework (LDF) Steering Group Minutes held on 18th June 2008.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the LDF Steering Group meeting held on 18th June 2008 be noted.

**P**      **1. Appeal – Mr and Mrs Holmes - The Stables, Redmarshall, Stockton –**

**74/08**

**08/0394/REV – DISMISSED**  
**2. Appeal – Fairfield and District Association - Land adjacent to 1 Manor Place, Off Bishopton Road West, Fairfield, Stockton on Tees –**  
**07/1817/OUT – DISMISSED**

**3. Appeal - Mr Danny Maher - Within an Arable Field to the South of the Seamer/Hiltan Road. The field is located approximately 1.7km to the North West of Seamer - 07/3519/FUL - ALLOWED WITH CONDITIONS.**

The Head of Planning drew the Committees attention to the decision at Appeal 2 and 3, and noted that proportional costs had been awarded for appeal 2.

RESOLVED that the information be noted.