

DELEGATED

AGENDA NO . 5.

PLANNING COMMITTEE  
21<sup>st</sup> June 2006

REPORT OF CORPORATE DIRECTOR  
OF DEVELOPMENT AND  
NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES.

06/1064/OUT

**LAND IN THE VICINITY OF BETTYS CLOSE FARM, INGLEBY BARWICK  
OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR 17 NO. SELF-BUILD HOUSING PLOTS AND THE  
CREATION OF A RIVERSIDE PARK/LOCAL NATURE RESERVE.  
EXPIRY DATE: 11<sup>TH</sup> JULY 2006**

### **Summary**

This application site has been the subject of several applications in recent years which have included the provision of a country park in order to facilitate a housing development. In 2000 an application was originally submitted for 98 dwellings and later amended to 60 dwellings and a country park, this was refused in December 2000. A further application was received in 2001 which reduced the area of land occupied by the housing and included a large area of planting to separate the proposed housing from the country park. This application was determined by the Planning Committee and it was resolved that the Committee were minded to approve the application. The application was referred to Government Office North East (GONE) as a Departure to the Development Plan and was "called-in" for determination by the Secretary of State. However, the application was withdrawn before it was determined at inquiry.

Members may be aware that a subsequent application was received in 2005 that proposed 19no. self build plots and the provision of a country park and this application was subsequently withdrawn. This new application has reduced the no. of proposed dwellings and the amount of land proposed for housing

107 objections have been received in relation to the proposed development at the time of writing, along with 7 letters of representation and 51 letters of support. These responses have been detailed within this report and have been addressed in the material planning considerations section.

Whilst it is appreciated that the proposed development would result in the loss of some of the green wedge and a greenfield site it is considered that the provision of a Riverside Park and Nature Reserve is in accordance with policy REC8 of the Local Plan, and provides a community benefit which carries significant weight. Notwithstanding the planning history of the site the Head of Planning considers that this is significant enough to outweigh any conflict with planning policies.

### **Recommendations:**

**RECOMMENDED that application 06/1064/OUT be recommended for approved subject to planning conditions and the entering into of a section 106 agreement.**

**Conditions:**

**To accord with the submitted plans**

**Time limits**

**Reserved matters**

**Materials**

**Contaminated Land**

**Hours of working**

**Access**

**Drainage**

**Foul drainage**

**Design Guide/specification**

**Nature conservation/mitigation**

**Landscaping**

**Means of enclosure**

**Height restriction of proposed dwellings**

**Heads of Terms:**

**£5,000 towards the provision of an informal kickabout area**

**£5,000 towards grassland management**

**£15,000 towards fencing and barrier to control access onto the site**

**£10,000 towards additional tree planting**

**£15,000 towards the provision of interpretation facilities on site**

**£15,000 towards footpath provision**

**£15,000 towards the provision of woodland management**

**£15,000 towards site maintenance**

**£40,000 towards the provision of a mooring jetty**

**Contribution toward footbridge over the River Tees – to be negotiated**

Policies GP1, HO3, HO11, EN4, EN6, EN7, EN11, EN14, EN29, EN30, EN32a, REC 8, REC 9, REC 20, and REC 21 of the adopted Stockton-on-Tees Local Plan and Planning Policy Guidance No. 3; Housing were considered relevant to this decision.

**History**

1. The application site has been subject to several applications in recent years which have included the provision of a country park in order to facilitate a housing development. In 2000 an application was originally submitted for 98 dwellings and later amended to 60 dwellings and a country park (00/0741/P), this application was refused in December 2000 for the following reason;

*“The proposed development with an area designated as Green wedge in the adopted Stockton on Tees Local Plan would be contrary to the provisions of Policy EN14 of the adopted Local Plan which states that development will not be permitted which detracts from the open nature of the landscape so as to threaten, by itself or cumulatively, the local identity of the areas separated by the green wedge.”*

A further application was received in 2001 (App No. 01/1132/P) which reduced slightly the area of land occupied by the housing and included a

large area of planting to separate the proposed housing from the country park. This application was determined by the Planning Committee and it was resolved that the Committee were minded to approve the application. However, the application was referred to Government Office North East (GONE) as a Departure to the Development Plan and the application was "called-in" for determination by the Secretary of State. The application was withdrawn before it was determined at public inquiry.

2. A subsequent application (05/3047/OUT) differed from the earlier 2 in that the number of houses proposed was reduced down to 19 although the actual area shown on the plans submitted did largely follow a similar area to the two previous applications for much larger housing numbers.
3. This current application differs in that the housing numbers have again been reduced down to 17no. executive style self build plots, the amount of land proposed for housing has also been reduced and the landscaping mound and park proposals have been provided in greater detail with mooring provision on the river.

### **The Proposal**

4. The application site is a large area of former agricultural land situated to the south-west of Ingleby Barwick. Residential properties are situated to the east of the application site while the River Leven and River Tees bound the site to the south and west with further former agricultural land to the north.
5. Outline planning consent is sought for 17no. self build housing plots and the creation of a Riverside park/local nature reserve. The applicants wish only for the siting of the proposed allocated housing site and the means of access into the development to be considered.
6. The proposed housing development is to be situated to the west of the western edge of the existing residential properties on Ingleby Barwick with a landscaping buffer of approximately 10 metres separating the access road from the rear boundary of the existing residential properties. A riverside park is proposed to the west and north of the proposed housing with a local nature reserve to the south of the housing area adjacent to properties on Caldey Gardens and Trevine Gardens.
7. Access into the application site is proposed to be via the existing residential roads of Nevern Crescent and Ramsey Gardens, a link road will link these two existing roads together within the site and serve the proposed residential properties and provide access to a small car park serving the country park.

### **Consultations**

8. The following responses have been received from departments and bodies consulted by the Local Planning Authority

#### ***Landscape officer***

I refer to your memo dated the 19 April 2006, various meeting and emails and comment as follows:

The principle of the riverside park on this site should be supported, In addition to providing a valuable recreational resource for local residents the park would reinforce the existing green wedge concept by securing a viable open space land use. A managed land use is considered essential to secure the separation of the built form of Ingleby Barwick from further physical and visual intrusion into the wider open countryside.

Whilst the question of the gain of the park at the cost of additional development is a consideration for the town planning process; I offer the following comment in support of the scheme.

1. The mitigation proposals prepared in support of the housing scheme would significantly improve the poor quality views that are currently afforded from the surrounding area towards the existing built development of Ingleby Barwick. The existing houses in this location are prominent in the landscape sitting on a ridgeline without the benefit of mitigation i.e. tree buffer. As such these houses are considered to be visual detractors in the local landscape. The additional houses proposed in this application are considered to slightly increase this impact but with the benefit of time the proposed planting will mitigate both the predicted increase in impact and that of the existing adverse visual detractors.
2. The concept of the 'countryside/country park' is welcomed. Obviously details of the layout including hard and soft landscape features will have to be agreed. The proposed screen planting; species, planting density, stock type and specification for planting and maintenance would also need to be agreed as part of any conditional approval. The outline details submitted in the Landscape Management plan are acceptable in principle.
3. The acceptance of the freehold of the land and long-term maintenance requirements would have to be agreed via a Section 106 Obligation. With reference to the submitted heads of terms I make the following comment:
  - I recommend that the applicant during on-site operations e.g. preparation of mounds also forms the kick about area. The area selected is according to the applicant already relatively flat in nature and as SBC will not be maintaining it, then the applicant would only need to provide general site levels, method of drainage and specification for grass seeding to enable discharge of planning conditions. Given the lie of the land I don't presume piped drainage will be required. The £5000 identified for this area should be reallocated to fund the proposed footpath.
  - £20K (£15K plus £5K from kickabout area) for footpath construction will only provide approximately 1660 linear metres (1m) of surfaced footpath, if installed by voluntary labour such as Tees Forest or TVWT. I noted the applicant has proposed approximately 2800 1m on the proposals drawing. This commuted lump sum should therefore be increased.
4. Nature conservation issues. I recommend that the detailed landscape proposals take account of any English Nature. Comments.
5. SAM I recommend that the detailed landscape proposals take account of any English Heritage and Cleveland Archaeology comments.

6. Detailed issues raised in the submission are assessed as follows;

- The "siting" box was previously ticked for the earlier application 05/3047. I recommend that siting will still need to be conditioned as location is directly linked to the position, footprint, height and profile of the proposed mound.
- The landscape buffer should be wrapped around the southern perimeter of the proposed housing to provide screening of this edge and to reinforce the separation of the residential area from the surrounding open countryside/country park;
- The height of the mound and profile should to be detailed to form a local ridgeline that on completion totally screens the roofline of the proposed dwelling when viewed from the Teesdale Way. At present the roofline is only screened on maturity of planting. This will require that the maximum roof height of all proposed dwellings to be conditioned so that the height of the mound is equally controlled.
- All access points that will be created through the planting buffer should be angled so as to prevent direct views into the development.
- Access routes and their construction would have to be agreed as part of the detailed submission. The applicant should undertake consultation with adjoining landowners to ascertain the viability of extending the proposed footpath system along adjacent stretches of the river corridors.
- I recommend that destruction of Hogweed is undertaken at the earliest opportunity following any planning consent. This dangerous and invasive species presents a danger to the general public who currently trespass on to this land.

***Parks and Countryside***

I would support the comments of the Landscape officer and be happy to support the application. The site would potentially be a catalyst for the development of the proposed Tees Valley Heritage Park stretching along the river from Thornaby to Yarm, and providing important new access opportunities to an attractive area of countryside. The creation of the riverside park would allow informal recreational use for local residents in an area where high quality publicly accessible green space is at a premium, and allow on site interpretation of important natural and local history features that could be of significant educational value.

***Tees Archaeology*** have commented that as stated in the 'Outline Management Plan', submitted with the application, the site contains the Scheduled Monument of Castle Hill - Motte and Bailey Castle. I presume that English Heritage have been consulted on the application. If not a consultation should be sent to Kate Wilson, English Heritage, Bessie Surtees House, 41 Sandhill, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 3JF.

The monument comprises a low mound set on ridge overlying the confluence of the River Tees and River Leven. The site is a small medieval earthwork castle, probably of 12<sup>th</sup> century date, which undoubtedly served a strategic purpose to control the upper reaches of the river. The mound or 'motte'

would have had a timber tower set on top of it and would have been surrounded by an enclosed area known as the 'bailey', this would have contained living quarters and ancillary buildings.

The scheduled area is currently rough grass with some scrub including a small tree. The surrounding area is all grassland with scrub development. There should be no ground disturbance within the scheduled area, however every effort should be made to prevent further scrub regeneration and that which exists including the tree should be cut off at the bases and the stumps poisoned. To enhance access to the mound for visitors it would be beneficial if nettles on top and around it could be cut with mown paths leading to the summit.

If access is improved the mound will become a natural magnet to users of the park given the views it offers over the surrounding area. I support the suggestion in the Management Plan that interpretative panels are provided to explain the monument. These should be sited **outside** the Scheduled area. I would recommend at least two panels, in different locations, at the main approaches to the monument.

In terms of the new build element of the scheme I have no comments to make. This area was the subject of archaeological evaluations in the 1990s and no important remains were noted.

**English Heritage** have commented that the application should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance, and on the basis of the Council's specialist conservation advice.

**Development Plans Officer**

It is understood that the applicant seeks outline planning permission for 17 no. self build housing plots in order to create a country park / local nature reserve on land in the vicinity of Betty's Close Farm, Ingleby Barwick.

Planning applications are to be determined in accordance with the relevant development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The proposed housing development lies outside the land reaffirmed as an exiting commitment for residential development under Policy HO1 (f) of the Stockton-on-Tees Local Plan (1997). The land is allocated as Green Wedge. Policy EN14b states that development, which detracts from the open nature of the landscape, will not be permitted.

EN14

"Within the following green wedges, development will not be permitted which detracts from the open nature of the landscape so as to threaten, by itself or cumulatively, the local identity of the areas separated by the green wedge.  
b) Leven Valley between Yarm and Ingleby Barwick."

In addition, policy EN7 (b) indicates that development will not be permitted that harms the special landscape value of the Tees Valley.

EN7

"Development which harms the landscape value of the following special landscape area will not be permitted:  
b) Tees Valley."

The site also lies within the Community Forest area that encourages the planting of trees of locally appropriate species.

There is great potential along both Tees and Leven Valleys to develop the country park, and land is identified to be protected for this purpose. The Local Plan accepts that this is likely to be developed for recreation purposes and opportunities exist to extend footpath links into the valleys and provide other recreational facilities in association with the development of Ingleby Barwick. Policy REC8 states: "Land along the Tees and Leven Valleys will be designated as a Country Park."

The existing Local Plan seeks to avoid inappropriate development in the vicinity of Betty's Close Farm however the Local Plan also recognises the potential for a country park.

**Lee Narroway – Local Ward Councillor**

I would like you to register my objection to the above proposed development on the following grounds:

Firstly the residents of Ingleby Barwick do not want this development built. I have received over 80 emails from residents complaining about the plans and a recent ward surgery was attended by over 50 residents who wished for their objections to be noted. I have not received a single email of support for this development neither have I met a single person in favour of it, despite the promise of a country park. Ingleby Barwick has also seen a Parish Council meeting and public meeting both attended by similar numbers of residents opposed to the development.

Too many times our green wedge land on Ingleby Barwick has seen incursions and residents clearly would like to see what we have left protected, I believe this particular piece of land is protected already under the local plan policy (EN7). If we allow this to go ahead we would be setting a precedent and give a green light to other builders to develop outside of the agreed "Development Line", comply with the Local Plan. The residents of Ingleby Barwick would feel betrayed again. I have to respect those views as ward councillor.

There is no demand for this type of housing as there are many self build plots on the Riverview development are still unsold. We should be looking at ways of slowing down house building on Ingleby Barwick as our infrastructure is already stretched.

There are also many issues and concerns with regards to additional traffic, noise pollution, air pollution, anti-social behaviour, safety and the overall effect on the quality of life of the residents of Round Hill in Ingleby Barwick.

Safety considerations, an objection was submitted last year to this development by the Stockton Borough Council, Highway & Transport Dept. Regarding the inadequacy of the permanent access roads, Nevern Crescent, Ramsey Gardens, and Hasguard Way. These roads were not designed to take all of the additional vehicle traffic; this is still the case, reference document Teesside Highway Design Guide and Specification.

**Ross Patterson – Local Ward Councillor**

I would like you to register my **objection** the above proposed development on the following grounds:-

Firstly the residents of Ingleby Barwick, and those living in the Round Hill village, do not want this development to be built. I have received numerous e-mails from residents complaining about the plans and on 4th May 2006 my ward surgery was attended by over 30 residents who wished for their objections to be noted. Despite the promise of a country park not one resident has contacted me in favour of the proposals. Since this date Ingleby Barwick has seen a Parish Council meeting and public meeting both attended by similar numbers of residents opposed to the development.

Too many times our green wedge land on Ingleby Barwick has seen incursions and residents clearly would like to see what we have left protected, I believe this particular piece of land is protected already under the local plan policy (EN7). I have to respect those views as ward councillor. There is no demand for this type of housing, as there are over 40 self build plots on the Riverview development are still unsold. We should be looking at ways of slowing down house building on Ingleby Barwick as our road infrastructure is already stretched to say the least and future mayhem could ensue.

There are also many issues and concerns with regards to additional traffic, noise pollution, air pollution, anti-social behaviour, safety and the overall effect on the quality of life of the residents of Round Hill in Ingleby Barwick.

Although a country park could be developed under a Section 106 agreement. However, this is a poor trade off for the people of Ingleby Barwick. Parks need to be built into the infrastructure carefully and not seen as add on's. Access to this park by car would create a danger for children living in adjacent streets. That is why my colleagues and I are working with officers of SBC and fellow members to produce a strategic plan for leisure and recreation facilities in Ingleby Barwick.

The developer sights a lack of parks within Ingleby Barwick. Ward Councillors have been working with Council Officers to plan an extensive provision of parks and recreation facilities within Ingleby Barwick over the coming years. This will be consulted on with residents of Ingleby Barwick in the fullest sense. Extra houses are not needed to pay for the facilities that should be provided by public funds and lottery grants and in a planned manner and NOT as the result of apparent 'get quick rich schemes' such as this. If the potential developer enjoys self-build so much, then buy a plot on The Rings.

I must therefore AGAIN object to this scheme vehemently.

#### **David Harrington – Local Ward Councillor**

After studying the plans and listening to both sides of the argument for the above application, I would like to register my formal objection to the revised planning application.

I cannot support the application for a number of reasons:-

- The area of the proposed application is green wedge (as identified on the local plan) and is outside the development line for Ingleby Barwick. The development would impact on the natural wildlife habitats in this area.
- Developments in other parts of Ingleby Barwick are continuing and over the coming years, approx. 2,000 additional houses will be built. A



large self-build site already exists nearby on the rings. A large number of the plots remain to be sold.

- In this location (Betty Close Farm), I believe that the Country Park together with the associated car parking and open spaces will contribute towards public order problems and vandalism.
- The local road network is not constructed to accommodate cars visiting the country park or indeed additional traffic accessing the additional housing proposed under this application.

***Council for the Protection of Rural England (CPRE)***

We welcome the opportunity to comment on this resubmitted planning application. We object to the proposal most strongly for a number of reasons.

The proposal is in direct contravention of the approved Green Wedge zoning and does not accord with stated purposes of preserving and enhancing the natural landscape and open character along the Tees and Leven river valleys. The constant nibbling away of open space around residential areas will eventually result in the remaining space being meaningless in visual and environmental impact.

There is no justifiable need for additional housing in green wedge. We understand that a number of sites for sale (not Green Wedge), similar to those proposed, remain unsold.

The area is designated as an 'Area of Special landscape Value'. The visual folly of allowing development to encroach onto the valley ridges is already only too apparent and to provide an artificial mound in front as proposed in this application is clear confirmation that this is the case.

The distinctive identity of the Norman Mound, at the junction of the Tees and Leven is already compromised, but still manages to act as a visual "cornerstone" to the two river valleys. The Integrity and setting of this important Ancient Monument would be seriously threatened by further residential development nearby, and its status would be undermined by a rival mound.

The land to the southern half of the overall site fronting the confluence of the two rivers is an important natural habitat for wildlife and is part of the Leven Valley, already identified as "a sensitive river wildlife corridor requiring environmental protection measures" and "a site of protected species activity" (Tees Navigation Study). Uncontrolled public access along the river frontages as proposed could have a disastrous effect on this natural and unique piece of land and therefore an extremely dubious benefit to support the application.

Access to the proposed development will be through a housing area, which was not designed to accommodate any vehicular access to the green wedge land. Consequently, the additional traffic and activity would seriously affect the residential amenities of those already living there. The vast majority of those living nearby do not appear to feel that the "park" proposals justify more housing. We also believe that the current unstructured landscape and developing wildlife are more appropriate than a more formalised "park" with car park, kick about area, etc.

CPRE are currently liaising with Stockton Council to identify and secure the long-term development for a "River Tees Heritage Park" stretching from Yarm to Stockton and including the area in question. We believe that proposals for the land should be related to the longer-term objectives. We would prefer the Council, local groups, and other interested parties to examine other means to acquire and integrate the land in a more visionary (but achievable) strategy for the wider area. Therefore, there seems no justification to consider a short term, expedient solution at the cost of Green Wedge at this point in time.

In addition we would also raise concerns about the validity of some of the statements of support.

### ***Engineers And Transportation***

- The proposed dwellings are outside the agreed limits of development, therefore the provision of 17 dwellings is in addition to the agreed housing allocation for the outline planning approval for Ingleby Barwick. There are signs of distress on the highway network, consequently a traffic model has been developed to assess the impact of the housing number already agreed. The model indicates considerable network congestion with the implementation of all committed development in Ingleby Barwick and considerable queuing already occurs in the morning peak and evening peaks on the highway network. In the morning peak Ingleby Way queues from Myton Road to Barwick Way, Ingleby Way from A1044 to Lowfields Avenue and Myton Road from Broom Hill Avenue to Ingleby Way. In the evening peak queues extend from the Myton Road/Fields Avenue roundabout towards the centre of Stockton. Considerable evening peak queuing also occurs from Ingleby Way roundabout on A1044 Thornaby Road. The proposal would add to the operational network problems and may as a result be detrimental to highway safety.
- Although 17 houses is a relatively small number in isolation it is above the number of houses in the master plan and the cumulative effect of such development will have a material impact on the operation of the highway network and for this reason I object to the principle of this development.
- Access to the proposed Country Park and 17 houses is via residential roads (Nevern Crescent and Ramsey Gardens), which were not designed to accommodate buses and maintenance vehicles needing to gain access to the park.
- A small car park is proposed and I have concerns regarding congestion, road safety and quality of life issues for residents due to the potential of on street parking should the car park not prove to be suitable for the demand.
- The only formal access into the park is via Nevern Crescent. Public Rights of way exist to the north and south of the site, however, there is no direct link to the park over land in private ownership. In order to provide alternative means of access into the park other than via Nevern Crescent, this issue would need clarification.

Should my recommendation be overturned and approval be given, the provision of a Country Park would give the opportunity to provide a riverbank footpath and or cycleway along this stretch of the River Tees and the River Leven, as indicated in the Local Plan and the Councils Cycling Strategy documents. It would also give the potential of linking the existing PROW network to the north and south of the site. A section 106 contribution to the creation/construction of a footpath/ cycleway together with a contribution

towards the construction of a bridge across the River Tees as indicated in the Local Plan and Cycling Strategy documents would be required

The Council has no specific information regarding any flooding of this site. The applicant is advised to make local inquiries.

Whilst the application is in outline, should approval be given, further details regarding the design and layout of the proposed access would be required for further consideration before I can comment upon the design and layout of the proposed access.

The development would need to comply with the Design Guide and Specification (Residential & Industrial Estates Development). To that end the following matters are among those requiring further consideration and details,

- The proposed road alignment may be a concern depending on landownership boundaries
- The proposed road would need to be a loop road between Ramsey Gardens and Never Crescent

In summary, whilst I appreciate the benefits of the creation of a riverside park, this does not outweigh my very serious concerns regarding traffic congestion and potential access issues resulting from the development, therefore I object to the application on the grounds it would be detrimental to the free flow of traffic and to highway safety.

***The Ramblers Association***

1. We thank the council for consulting the Ramblers' Association on the above proposal (letter dated 19/4/06)

2. We welcome the creation of a country park. It will provide a much needed amenity for the community.

3. As far as we can see there is a gap of about 100m between the eastern end of the riverside path in the park and the path to be dedicated from Crosswell Park to the riverside and then continuing southwards and eastwards to meet the BW Ingleby Barwick 14 near Challacombe Crescent (ref 1). We ask the council to do its best to connect the paths.

4. The site will also provide access to the projected footpath/cycle track bridge across the Tees mentioned in the Local Plan in the 'River Tees Navigation Strategy'

Also draw attention to a site for a bridge across the River Leven immediately upstream of its junction with the Tees (policy REC21) and note should be taken to the Tees Navigation Strategy which details a footbridge across the Tees near Leven Mouth as well as a continuous public way along the Leven.

***Northumbrian Water*** have no objections to the proposed development but require the developer to contact them to discuss connections to the water supply and sewage system.

***Northern Gas Networks*** have no objections but request that the applicant contacts them to discuss their requirements in detail.

**NEDL** have no objections but refer the applicant to the Health and Safety Executives publications of working safely with electricity

**The Environment Agency**

Both the River Tees and the River Leven are classed as 'main river'. Under land drainage legislation any proposed works in, under, over or within 5m of the channel require the Agency's prior written consent. Applications can take up to eight weeks to process therefore if consent is necessary an early submission is advisable. Please consult the Agency's Authorisations team for further information regarding the proposed landing stage.

It should be noted that the Flood Risk assessment should be formally submitted to the Local Planning Authority as part of the application.

**Ingleby Barwick Parish Council**

Ingleby Barwick Parish Council has considered all of the information provided in respect of planning application no. 06/1064/OUT.

The Parish Council **object** to the proposed development on the following grounds:

The site is designated 'Green Wedge' in the Stockton-on-Tees Local Plan and therefore **should not** be used for housing development.

It is understood that this particular site is already protected under the Local Plan Policy EN7, which should be enforced.

There are a number of self-build plots still available at Riverview. The current provision for executive housing is therefore adequate with no requirement for additional plots.

Access to the proposed 17 houses and country park would be via Nevern Crescent and Ramsey Gardens, which are narrow residential roads and not suitable for the additional traffic which would be generated.

Traffic generated from this proposal may include buses for visitors and school parties and the existing roads are not provided to the correct design standard to accommodate this.

The 17 properties would be in addition to the agreed housing allocation for the outline planning approval for Ingleby Barwick and there are already signs of strain on the road infrastructure. A 'Traffic Model' is being developed to look at the impact of the housing number already agreed.

There are also various other factors to be considered, including:

- the site is recognised as a flood plane;
- the proposed car park would attract cars when people should be encouraged to be on foot/cycle;
- the area would be difficult to police;
- disruption to the wildlife.

It is noted that the hogweed identified within the site should be eradicated by the landowner regardless of any development.

**Round Hill Action Group**, comment that whilst the residents have many and various reasons for objecting to the proposed development, cite the following reasons in general:

- 1) There are already enough dwellings in Ingleby Barwick with around 2,000 still to be built. Also, there are several self-build plots which remain unsold.
- 2) We believe that the Country park project, with the associated car park and kick about area will cause serious public order problems, together with vandalism and other associated issues. Furthermore, it is highly likely that the police will find it difficult to provide effective cover within the area.
- 3) The Round Hill area of the Ingleby Barwick is now an established residential area. The proposed development will substantially increase traffic volume, noise pollution and be a constant danger to the many children who live on all connecting roads. The roads were not designed to accommodate a sudden surge of heavy plant vehicles.
- 4) Residents have chosen Round Hill because of its quiet peaceful location. Their privacy and general quality of life will be greatly diminished. The road infrastructure was not designed to accommodate visitors to a country park.
- 5) The land is designated as 'green wedge', will be greatly reduced. Disrupting and destroying natural wildlife habitats in the process.
- 6) The kick about area by its very design will create issues and problems for the residents nearby. These will include noise, unruly behaviour and a potential gang gathering area
- 7) There is a professional and concerted effort by Nature/Rural groups, IBIS Councillors and the local residents to create a more appropriate natural area, not only at Betty's Close Farm, but one encompassing a much larger area along the Tees River. This will have the approval of the residents and will involve them pro-actively in its creation, administration and use.

**English Nature** have commented that based on the information provided they have no objection to the proposal in relation to species especially protected by law, subject to the following conditions being attached to ensure:

- Full adherence to the mitigation recommendations as contained within the report (An Ecological Assessment of land at Betty's Close Farm, Ingleby Barwick; E3 Ecology Ltd, R02 Final 22/3/06 – section E) including all checking surveys proposed, and;
- That if the checking survey of the off-site pond to be undertaken in 2006 were to identify the presence of great crested newts, no works to facilitate the development can commence until a detailed mitigation strategy has been devised which adequately addresses all potential impacts on this species and has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority as advised by English Nature
- Before any works to facilitate the development commence greater details are provided regarding the creation and ongoing management of the proposed SUDS system. The details provided should be sufficient to reasonably demonstrate that the biodiversity benefits identified in the Ecological Assessment report will be delivered.

- Before any works to facilitate the development commence greater details are provided regarding the creation and ongoing management of the proposed country park/local nature reserve to address the following inconsistency between the documents currently submitted:
  - The mitigation section of the Ecological Assessment Report proposes pond creation with the objective of increasing local amphibian populations. The Wardell Armstrong Landscaping Management Plan makes no reference or provision for pond creation or ongoing management of ponds
  - The mitigation section of the Ecological Assessment Report proposes that scrub clearance or tree felling will not be carried out during the bird-breeding season (March to September inclusive). The Wardell Armstrong Landscape Management Plan Management Summary Table for Existing Hedgerows (pg.15) proposes biannual trimming of hedgerows in March.

**The Environmental Health Unit** have commented that they have no objections to the proposed development in principle but request that conditions be imposed to address the following issues;

- i. Possible Land Contamination
- ii. Construction Noise

9. The Local residents and occupiers have been individually notified of the application, an advert placed in the local press and a site notice has been placed adjacent to the site. The neighbour consultation period expired on the 10<sup>th</sup> May 2006. 107 letters of objection, 7 letters of representation and 51 letters of support have been received as follows (in summary).

It is important for members to note however that some of the letters of support contain inaccurate addresses, however the comments received relate to the principle of the Riverside development and are considered to be acceptable.

#### **Objections**

- The propose development is contrary to Local Plan policies EN7, EN14 and REC9
- The land is designated as green wedge in the local plan and should remain so
- The land is already a pleasant piece of green land and should be left unspoilt
- The proposed development would cause a loss of views
- The development would be detrimental to the nature of the countryside
- Location of car park would cause a loss of privacy and attract anti-social behaviour
- Objections are raised to an increase in traffic and issues of public safety
- The car park shows that the development will attract people from outside the area and residents will have cars parked outside their homes.
- Issues raised over the impacts of construction traffic
- Questions are raised as to the need of more houses

- The demand for Executive homes and self build homes in Ingleby Barwick is also questioned, particularly as Persimmon are 'struggling to sell their self build plots'.
- The Teesside Princess is a licensed boat and a landing platform would increase taxi's picking up in the area.
- Various forms of wildlife currently reside in the area and the proposals will disturb and harm the wildlife on the site
- The housing proposed lies outside of the housing allocation of Ingleby Barwick and should not be developed.
- Questions are raised over the delivery of the Country Park and when this would be achieved i.e before or after the self built houses are constructed.
- Proposal will be detrimental to property prices in the area.
- The proposed access route is unsuitable and an alternative should be sought
- Question raised as to who would be responsible for the upkeep of the Country Park.
- Questions are asked over the accuracy of the supporting information in relation to the trespass issues.
- Ingleby Barwick has already surpassed the initial plan of housing numbers.
- Security concerns are also raised, as it would allow people to access the rear of their properties.
- The development will set a precedent and enable other builders to develop outside the Ingleby development line
- The whole area should be designated as Country park with the minimal disturbance
- The construction of self-build housing would last a long time, and could be as much as 10 years.
- The Country Park would be impossible to police
- The proposal is contrary to PPG3 and the sequential approach for housing sites.
- There is very little difference in the scale of development to previous applications by Bellways and Yuill's.
- Amenities in Ingleby Barwick should not be provided by private individuals in return for more housing.

### **Support**

- Ingleby needs a play area and access to the river, the benefit of the proposed facilities far outweigh the additional houses
- Ingleby would benefit from recreational area used freely by all residents
- Insufficient recreational areas in Ingleby
- Development would be a much needed resource/community benefit
- It would be a small-scale development with little impact on wildlife.
- Development would save people travelling to areas such as Preston or Ropner Park
- Land can be used legitimately without need for trespass
- Additional 17 dwellings will make little difference to traffic in the area given the additional housing to come
- Good/benefits of the scheme outweigh the negative
- Landscaping mound and landscaping Would improve the view from Egglecliffe

- ❑ The country park would ensure that the green wedge in this particular area is protected for good
- ❑ Development would provide a valuable and safe area to disadvantaged users such as the blind and disabled groups
- ❑ Improve the quality of life for many people

A letter has also been received from one of the applicants (Mr Wetherill) in reference to the Head of Integrated Transport and Environmental Policy's comments (In summary);

It is stated that the proposed development will not have any impact on the existing problems. Once Ingleby Barwick has been fully completed approximately 10,000 homes will have been built in the area. At a conservative guess approximately half the families will have teenage children and half again will be coming up to driving age of 17. If half reach a pass then there would be approximately 1000 drivers and approximately 500 more cars within Ingleby every 2-3 years, so the additional 1700 houses would therefore not make matters worse.

Questions are also raised over the overall opposition to the proposed development and that this has rarely reached more than 100 in the 6 years the park and additional housing have been talked about.

### **Planning Policy Considerations**

10. Where an adopted or approved development plan contains relevant policies, Section 54A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) requires that an application for planning permissions shall be determined in accordance with the Development Plan(s) for the area, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this case the relevant Development Plans are the Tees Valley Structure Plan (TVSP) and the Stockton on Tees Local Plan (STLP).
11. The following policies of the adopted Stockton on Tees Local Plan are considered to be relevant to this decision;

#### **Policy GP1**

Proposals for development will be assessed in relation to the policies of the Cleveland Structure Plan and the following criteria as appropriate:

- (i) The external appearance of the development and its relationship with the surrounding area;
- (ii) The effect on the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties;
- (iii) The provision of satisfactory access and parking arrangements;
- (iv) The contribution of existing trees and landscape features;
- (v) The need for a high standard of landscaping;
- (vi) The desire to reduce opportunities for crime;
- (vii) The intention to make development as accessible as possible to everyone;
- (viii) The quality, character and sensitivity of existing landscapes and buildings;
- (ix) The effect upon wildlife habitats;
- (x) The effect upon the public rights of way network.



### **Policy HO3**

Within the limits of development, residential development may be permitted provided that:

- (i) The land is not specifically allocated for another use; and
- (ii) The land is not underneath electricity lines; and
- (iii) It does not result in the loss of a site which is used for recreational purposes; and
- (iv) It is sympathetic to the character of the locality and takes account of and accommodates important features within the site; and
- (v) It does not result in an unacceptable loss of amenity to adjacent land users; and
- (vi) Satisfactory arrangements can be made for access and parking.

### **Policy HO11**

New residential development should be designed and laid out to:

- (i) Provide a high quality of built environment which is in keeping with its surroundings;
- (ii) Incorporate open space for both formal and informal use;
- (iii) Ensure that residents of the new dwellings would have a satisfactory degree of privacy and amenity;
- (iv) Avoid any unacceptable effect on the privacy and amenity of the occupiers of nearby properties;
- (v) Pay due regard to existing features and ground levels on the site;
- (vi) Provide adequate access, parking and servicing;
- (vii) Subject to the above factors, to incorporate features to assist in crime prevention.

### **Policy REC 8**

Land along the Tees and Leven Valleys will be designated as a country park.

### **Policy REC9**

Outdoor recreational developments will be permitted in the green wedges and in the countryside provided that:

- i.) They do not result in the irreversible loss of grade i, 2 or 3a agricultural land; and
- ii.) Buildings are sited, designed and landscaped to complement the surroundings; and
- iii.) There is no undue disturbance to occupiers of nearby properties or other countryside users; and
- iv.) The road network is capable of accommodating the Development

### **Policy REC20**

The following footpath and cycle routes are proposed:

- (a.) A footpath from Yarm to the borough boundary along the south bank of the tees;
- (b.) A footpath from Leven bridge (at low lane, near Yarm) to its junction with the tees, then a combined footpath and cycle route along the east bank of the tees to the Thornaby bypass bridge;
- (c.) A cycle route along the southern boundary of Eaglescliffe golf course;
- (d.) A combined footpath/cycle route on the west and north banks of the tees from Preston lane to the barrage;
- (e.) A footpath from the proposed Thornaby bypass bridge (south bank) along the east bank of the tees to Surtees Bridge;
- (f.) A combined footpath/cycle route from Surtees Bridge (south bank) through Teesdale to the barrage and the borough boundary.

**Policy REC 21**

The following sites are identified as suitable locations for bridges for combined pedestrian and cycle use:

- (a.) Immediately south of the Eaglescliffe Golf Club;
- (b.) Preston park;
- (c.) Across the Leven river, immediately upstream of its junction with the tees.

**Policy EN4**

Development which is likely to have an adverse effect upon sites of nature conservation importance will only be permitted if:-

- (i.) There is no alternative available site or practicable approach; and
- (ii.) Any impact on the site's nature conservation value is kept to a minimum.

Where development is permitted the council will consider the use of conditions and/or planning obligations to provide appropriate compensatory measures.

**Policy EN6**

Development proposals likely to result in harm to a protected species or its habitat will not be permitted unless satisfactory provisions for these species have been made

**Policy EN7**

Development which harms the landscape value of the following special landscape area will not be permitted:

- (a.) Leven Valley
- (b.) Tees Valley
- (c.) Wynyard Park

**Policy EN11**

The planting of trees, of locally appropriate species, will be encouraged within the area indicated on the proposals map as community forest. In considering applications for planning permission in the community forest area, the Local Planning Authority will give weight to the degree to which the applicant has demonstrated that full account has been taken of existing trees on site, together with an appraisal of the possibilities of creating new woodland or undertaking additional tree planting. In the light of the appraisal the Local Planning Authority will require a landscaping scheme to be agreed which makes a contribution to the community forest.

**Policy EN 14**

Within the following green wedges, development will not be permitted which detracts from the open nature of the landscape so as to threaten, by itself or cumulatively; the local identity of the areas separated by the green wedge.

- (A.) River Tees floodplain from Surtees Bridge, Stockton, to Yarm;
- (B.) Leven Valley between Yarm and Ingleby Barwick;
- (C.) Bassleton Beck Valley between Ingleby Barwick and Thornaby;
- (D.) Stainsby Beck Valley, Thornaby;
- (E.) Billingham Beck Valley;
- (F.) Between north Billingham and Cowpen Lane Industrial Estate.

**Policy EN 29**

Development which will adversely affect the site, fabric or setting of a scheduled ancient monument will not be permitted.

### **Policy EN 30**

Development which affects sites of archaeological interest will not be permitted unless:

- (i.) An investigation of the site has been undertaken; And
- (ii.) An assessment has been made of the impact of the development upon the remains; and where appropriate;
- (iii.) Provision has been made for preservation 'in situ'. Where preservation is not appropriate, the local planning authority will require the applicant to make proper provision for the investigation and recording of the site before and during

### **Policy EN32a**

Proposals for new development will not be permitted within Flood Zones 2 or 3 as shown on the Proposals Map, or other areas identified as at risk of flooding, unless the applicant can demonstrate by means of a Flood Risk Assessment and sequential tests that:-

- i) there is no alternative site at no risk or at lower risk of flooding; and
- ii) there will be no increased risk of flooding to the development; and
- iii) there will be no increase in risk of flooding elsewhere as a result of the development.

Where permission is granted for development in flood risk areas, or for development that would increase the risk of flooding, appropriate flood alleviation or mitigation measures, to be funded by the developer, must be undertaken.

Planning Policy Guidance No.3 – Housing is also considered to be relevant to this decision.

### **Material Planning Considerations**

- 12. The main planning considerations of this application are the impacts on the planning policies, character of the area, provision of the country park, amenity of neighbouring occupiers and access and highway safety.

#### **Principle of development**

- 13. The application site lies within the limits to development and is allocated as green wedge, special landscape area, community forest and country park in the proposal map of the 1997 adopted Local Plan. The application is therefore subject to national planning guidance, the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS), the Tees Valley Structure Plan and Local Plan policies GP1, HO3, HO11, REC8, REC9, REC20 and REC21, EN4, EN6, EN7 EN11, EN14, EN29 EN30 and EN32a.
- 14. Planning Policy Guidance No. 3 advocates that Local Planning Authorities should provide sufficient housing land but give priority to re-using previously developed land within urban areas and create more sustainable patterns of development near to public transport and local services. Although the application site lies within the limits to development it cannot be classed as previously developed land as defined above due to its green field nature and the previous agricultural use

15. The submission draft of Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) (June 2005) and the Tees Valley Structure Plan (February 2004) state that emerging Local Development Frameworks should take note of the need to reuse derelict land and adopt a sequential approach to highlight land suitable for development on the basis of being previously developed urban sites, particularly around public transport nodes.
16. In terms of the Stockton on Tees Local Plan the proposed development lies within an area designated as green wedge, special landscape area and community forest, therefore policies EN7(b), EN14(b) and EN11 specifically apply. Land adjacent to the Tees and Leven Valley's is also designated as a country park under policy REC8.
17. In the determination of this application members should have regard to the principle of housing on the site against the benefits that the proposed development has in terms of the Local Nature Reserve, Riverside Park and associated landscaping.

### **Provision of the Riverside Park**

18. The proposed Riverside Park element of the proposed development is fairly straightforward in planning policy terms. Policy REC8 of the adopted Local Plan states that land alongside the Tees and Leven valley will be designated as a country park and the scheme clearly makes a contribution towards achieving this goal. The proposed footpath access along the bank of the River Tees also would assist to meeting the part of the goal of policy REC20 and in terms of these specific policies the proposed development has many merits. However, as the proposed country park can only be provided by the inclusion of a small scale housing development it is necessary to assess whether the benefits of the country park outweigh the potential impacts of a residential development on a greenfield site.
19. It is however, considered that the reduced housing numbers, improved landscaping details and mounding, and potential community benefits in the provision of the Riverside park and mooring provides significant benefit and material weight to the determination of this application and mitigates any loss of greenfield land and green wedge.
20. Questions have also been raised during this and the previous application from objectors as to why a private development should aid in the delivery of a Riverside Park and how this would be delivered and who would be responsible for its ownership there after. The land of the Riverside Park would be passed into the Council's ownership and be provided through the Heads of Terms and the section 106 agreement. Initial discussions have also taken place with other public bodies in relation to the on-going management of the land.

### **Impact on the adjacent green wedge**

21. Policy EN14 of the adopted Local Plan states that developments in the green wedge will not be permitted where they detract from the open nature of the landscape so as to threaten by itself or cumulatively the local identity of the areas separated by the green wedge. As the applicants have revised the proposed development by reducing both the number of dwellings and the amount of land proposed for housing use that it is considered that the

provision of 17no. self build dwellings leaves the vast majority of the site open and with the proposed landscaping mound would mean that the development would not encroach on the green wedge. Indeed the mounding and landscaping would provide a green edge to the hard outline of the built up area on the edge of Ingleby Barwick and improve views from the other side of the river.

22. The Local Planning Authority are satisfied that approval of the development would not set an adverse precedent for future residential developments to encroach into the green wedge across the borough as the adopted Local Plan details the provision of a country park in this locality. Given the amount of land left open and the landscaping provided within the site to enhance the existing natural state of the land it is now considered that the proposed development is in accordance with the aims of policy EN14. Additional tree planting proposed as part of the Riverside park and included in the Head of Terms of the section 106 agreement mean that the development would also help to achieve some of the aims of the Community Forest designation outlined under policy EN11 of the Local Plan.
23. Equally policy REC9 of the adopted plan also refers to the green wedge in terms of outdoor recreational development. As the proposed development provides an element of outdoor recreation space in form of the Riverside Park and informal kickabout area and has the benefit of opening the land up to the general public and the development is in accordance with policy REC9.
24. Many objectors have also stated that they are concerned over the potential loss of green wedge and existing open nature of the site at the hands of the proposed development. These concerns are appreciated and it is considered that they have been addressed in both this section and earlier section of this report.

#### **Site of Archaeological Importance**

25. As the application site contains a scheduled ancient monument policies EN29 and EN30 are considered to be relevant to this application. Policy EN28 refers specifically to Scheduled Ancient Monuments whilst policy EN30 refers to sites of archaeological interest.
26. Both Tees Archaeology and English Heritage have been consulted on the application and neither have raised any objections in principle to the proposed development. The proposed development would result in the Scheduled Ancient Monument being brought back into public ownership where it can be maintained and enhanced for the enjoyment of the general public. Interpretation signage will also be provided and this is considered to be an additional benefit and significant material planning consideration in relation to the proposed development and is in accordance with policies EN29 and EN30 of the Local Plan.

#### **Impact on the character of the area**

27. Given the allocations of the application site under the proposals map of the 1997 adopted Stockton on Tees Local Plan, consideration must be given to the potential impacts on the character of the area in relation to the green wedge and special landscape area designation.

28. The application is only an outline planning application to establish whether the siting of the housing land and means of access are acceptable. The application does not therefore contain any elevations as to potential appearance of the properties. It is considered reasonable for the applicant to produce a design statement/guide incorporating the eco-homes excellent standard to ensure that the future self build properties are in keeping with the existing size and character of properties throughout Ingleby Barwick and will not have a detrimental impact on the visual amenities of the locality as a whole.
29. The applicants have sought to minimise the potential impacts of the proposed development on the existing open character of the area by detailing a landscaping mound and demonstrating that this will screen existing and future development from the banks of the River Tees. It is considered therefore that with the reduced housing land and provision of a landscaping mound that the proposed 17no. dwellings should not encroach sufficiently into the green wedge or have a detrimental impact on the special landscape area or open nature of the site to justify a reason for refusal of the application. The proposed development is therefore deemed to be acceptable and is in accordance with policies GP1, EN7 and EN14 of the adopted Local Plan.

#### **Impact on residential amenity.**

30. A distance of approximately 25-30 metres would separate the rear of existing residential properties of the existing western edge of Round Hill village to the nearest edge of the proposed residential housing land. As this distance exceeds the minimum rear-to-rear distance of 21 metres it is considered that there would not be a significant loss of privacy or amenity caused to the surrounding residents. This minimum distance would be imposed under any future reserved matters applications to ensure that the existing and future residents would enjoy a reasonable level of privacy and amenity.
31. The location of the proposed car park would also be approximately 30 metres from the rear of No.'s 14-18 Nevern Crescent and should be located a sufficient enough distance away from the existing properties in planning terms so as not to justify a reason for refusal.
32. Issue with construction traffic and noise have also been raised. It is accepted that if the application was given approval that it would be likely that there would be instances of noise and disturbance during construction of the proposed dwellings and country park. However, this is likely to only be a short to medium term issue and planning conditions could be imposed to restrict the hours of construction to limit any potential noise and disturbance issues.
33. Several objections have been received in relation to the impacts of the proposed development over a potential loss of views from the existing residential properties. Whilst these concerns are appreciated under planning law no one person has a right to a view and these concerns cannot be considered as material planning considerations.

#### **Issues of Flood Risk**

34. The application site falls within flood risk zones 2 and 3 as outlined by the Environmental Agency. However, the housing element of the proposed

development is located away from these flood risk zones due to the topography of the land.

35. The Environment Agency has been consulted on the proposed development and have raised no objections to the proposed development. It is therefore considered that the proposed development poses no significant flood risk in accordance with policy EN32a of the Local Plan Alteration.

#### **Impacts on wildlife habitats**

36. It is accepted that the application site has been returning to a more natural state in recent times and it is likely that there is a variety of wildlife species and wildlife habitats in the area, all of which may potentially be affected by the proposed development. This is reflected in comments received which object to the proposed development.
37. The applicants have submitted an ecological survey of the site and English Nature have commented that they have no objection to the proposed development subject to the imposition of planning conditions to ensure that there is minimum impact on the protected species within the area. The proposed development is therefore in accordance with policy EN4 of the adopted Stockton on Tees Local Plan.

#### **Departure from the Local Plan**

38. In terms of the Town and Country Planning (Development Plans and Consultation) (departures) direction 1999 and the Town and Country Planning (Residential Development on Greenfield Land) (England) Direction 2000, the proposed development represents a departure from the Local Plan and has been advertised as such. Indications from Government Office North East (GO-NE) are that they are not expecting the application to be referred to them by the local authority and are comfortable with this, although they reserve the right to have the application called in for determination by the Secretary of State if they so choose.

#### **Impact of Traffic and Highway safety**

39. The application site will be served by the existing highway network and the existing residential roads of Nevern Crescent and Ramsey Gardens. The Head of Integrated Transport and Environmental Policy has raised concerns over the increase in traffic arising from the proposed development and the impacts of the development on existing traffic congestion in the area. However, this problem already exists to a degree and no evidence has been provided by the Head of Integrated Transport and Environmental Policy to substantiate these concerns with regards to the relatively small increase in housing numbers. Equally whilst the number of proposed dwellings may fall outside the number indicated in the approved master plan of Ingleby Barwick, this in itself is not a valid planning reason for refusal of the application.
40. The Head of Integrated Transport and Environmental Policy has commented that the existing road infrastructure is inadequate for buses visiting the riverside park. The proposed development includes linkages to the bridleway to the north and existing permissive footpaths to the southern edge of the site to encourage residents of Ingleby Barwick to the nearby Riverside Park. A small car park is provided for those who insist on using the private motorcar

to prevent on-street parking in the locality. It is not envisaged to be a facility that attracts buses but rather to satisfy a local need. In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the development therefore provides mitigation measures against concerns raised and should not pose a significant issue in terms of highway safety.

41. Whilst there are concerns over the impacts on the Highway network it is considered that these comments are made without significant evidence to justify the comments and the Local Planning Authority consider that on balance the proposed benefits of the development outweigh any potential issues of highway safety.

#### **Impact on property value**

42. Several objectors have also raised the issue of the potential impact the proposed development may have on property prices in the area. The potential impacts of proposed developments on property prices is not a material planning consideration and cannot therefore be taken into consideration in the determination of the this planning application.

#### **Conclusion**

43. Since the previous application, the applicants have revised the proposals by reducing the number of dwellings proposed, improved the layout and facilities provided for the riverside park and mooring and worked up a section 106 agreement to ensure that the provision of the Riverside Park is completed.
44. Whilst the development may propose an incursion into the Green Wedge and would involve the loss and part development of a Greenfield site, the area of proposed housing land has been significantly reduced and it is considered that the provision of the Riverside park in helping to achieve the aims of policy REC8 of the adopted Local Plan is a significant material planning factor in leading to the Local Planning Authorities recommendation for approval.
45. Whilst it is appreciated that the provision of a Riverside Park and Nature Reserve does involve additional housing beyond the existing line of built development and a loss of green wedge the development would result in a considerable community benefit and bring a scheduled ancient monument back into public ownership. Given the benefits of the proposed development, the development is on balance judged to be acceptable and is consequently recommended for approval

**Corporate Director of Development & Neighbourhood Services**  
**Contact Officer: Simon Grundy**  
**01642 528550**

#### **Financial Implications**

As report.

#### **Environmental Implications**

As Report

#### **Community Safety Implications**

N/A



**Human Rights Implications**

The provisions of the European Convention of Human Rights 1950 have been taken into account in the preparation of this report.

**Background Papers**

Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS)

Tees Valley Structure Plan

Planning Policy Guidance Note 3: Housing

Stockton-on-Tees Adopted Local Plan (1997)

Planning Applications 00/0741/P, 01/1132/P and 05/3047/OUT

**Ward and Ward Councillors**

Ward Ingleby Barwick West

Ward Councillors Mr K Dixon, Mr L Narroway and Mr R Patterson.