

DELEGATED

**AGENDA NO
PLANNING COMMITTEE**

10th OCTOBER 2007

**REPORT OF CORPORATE DIRECTOR,
DEVELOPMENT AND NEIGHBOURHOOD
SERVICES**

07/2109/FUL

**Public Open Space, Broomwood, Ingleby Barwick
Installation of 15 metre pole with CCTV camera.**

Expiry Date 26 October 2007

SUMMARY

The applicant seeks permission for the erection of the CCTV camera on a mast as required by the obligations of the 106 Agreement attached to the previous Reserved Matters Planning Application consent 05/0381/REM. The proposed pole and its base supporting the CCTV camera would occupy a very small part of the public open space, which would retain its open character. The CCTV camera would enable the recreational value of the space to be maximised and be for the overall benefit of the local community. The public open space will be landscaped with trees and shrubs and the plans approved by previous planning permissions show that play equipment will be installed for different age groups. When the public open space is developed the proposed pole and CCTV camera would not be seen in isolation but as a small part of this landscaped setting. The proposal would therefore have a satisfactory appearance and relationship to the surrounding area. The position and distance from residential properties is considered to ensure the proposal will not adversely affect the amenities or privacy of the occupiers of nearby dwellings. The proposed CCTV facility is therefore considered to comply with Local Plan policies GP1, EN15 and HO11.

Objections have been received from local residents and there is one letter of support. The main objections are that the CCTV will intrude into residential privacy and amenity and outlook. Other concerns relate to the overall size, proximity to residential properties and layout of the public open space itself, which is not the subject of this application.

RECOMMENDATION

Planning application 07/2109/FUL be Approved with Conditions subject to the following conditions: -

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

<i>Plan Reference Number</i>	<i>Date on Plan</i>
444	4 July 2007
51829-001 REV B	26 September 2007
5182-001 REV B	31 August 2007

Reason: To define the consent.

- 02. The field of view of the CCTV camera hereby approved shall be limited to that as shown on plan reference No. 5182-001 rev B received on 26 September 2007 and shall not include any other areas without the express written consent of the local planning authority having first been obtained.**

Reason: In the interests of the amenity and privacy of occupants of residential properties.

- 03. The hereby approved CCTV camera its pole/mast and all other associated apparatus and equipment shall be removed from the site within three months of the date that the camera is no longer required for CCTV purposes and ceases to operate.**

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

BACKGROUND

Previous Applications

1. S812/74
Outline planning permission for the Ingleby Barwick development was granted on appeal in 1978 subject to various conditions. The general principles of the Master plan for the remaining housing development within Ingleby Barwick including this site were approved at a special planning committee meeting held on 11th May, 2002.
2. 05/0381/REM
Reserved matters application for residential development for 418 dwellings comprising 104 flats/140 sheltered apartments and 172 terraced, semi and detached houses together with associated means of access and landscaping.

At the Planning Committee on 13.07.2005 Members resolved that Planning Application 05/0381/REM be approved subject to the applicant signing a Section 106 Agreement in accordance with Heads of Terms to be delegated to the Director of Law and Democracy in consultation with the Development Control Manager and the 14 conditions.

It was reported that: "The proposed open space located in the north east corner of the development has been so located to allow pedestrian access from adjacent housing developments. This area will also include an equipped play area. The completion of this open space area is to be the subject of conditions and the section 106 agreement."

The Fourth Schedule of the 106 Agreement states:

"1. Prior to the earlier of:

- (i) The occupation of any house/apartment adjacent to the Play Area or
- (ii) The occupation of the 150th dwelling (excluding Sheltered Housing Units) construction pursuant to the Planning Permission

the owner shall have constructed a Play Area in the location outlined in (green) on the Plan in accordance with the Council's Design Guide and more particularly the Specification attached as Appendix 1 to this Agreement unless otherwise agreed with the Council. The Owner shall install one CCTV camera within the Play Area in a location to be approved by the Council to be linked to the Council's Security and Surveillance Centre with the payment of £12,900.00 to the Council upon the installation of the CCTV camera for the costs of surveillance for 5 years by the Council. The CCTV camera shall be fully operational prior to the completion of the Play Area.

2. The Owner shall upon the completion of the Play Area to the reasonable satisfaction of the Council transfer it to the Council at no cost to the Council and on terms which are to be agreed but which shall include a restrictive covenant that such land shall only be used for the purposes for which it was transferred. (Part).”

3. 06/1076/FUL

Substitution and repositioning of house types and apartments for residential development of 418 no. dwelling units, renumbering of plot numbers and new electricity sub stations.

At the Planning Committee on 21 June 2006 Members resolved that Planning Application 06/1076/FUL be approved subject to 14 conditions.

It was reported that the changes proposed to the approved layout were very minor and would, before the recent Sage decision, have been agreed by letter as a minor amendment to the approved development. The proposed substitution of house types affected approximately 60 out of the 400 plus dwellings and largely replaced the same type with one of a different design. Members agreed that the application sought only very minor and modest changes to the approved plan. The same controls over the development as imposed previously including the retention of the boundary hedgerows (including any trimming, lopping or topping) and provision of detailed landscaping plans were attached to the planning approval. This approval did not alter the requirement for the Play Area or the terms of the 106 Agreement, which requires that a CCTV camera be provided.

PROPOSAL

4. The applicant seeks permission for the erection of the CCTV camera on a mast as required by the obligations of the 106 Agreement attached to the previous Reserved Matters Planning Application consent 05/0381/REM. The proposed 15m high 300mm diameter white finished pole would support a swan neck holding a downward facing surveillance dome containing the fully programmable camera. The pole would be bolted to a concrete base set below ground level. The field of vision of the camera would be restricted by the programming to the Public Open Space and updated plans showing the area in relation to the correct house types and layouts have been provided.
5. This application does not involve or include any other matters relating to the provision and layout of the Public Open Space. The details of the Public Open Space including layout and landscaping are shown on the Planning Approvals for applications 05/0381/REM and 06/1076/FUL. The conditions attached to these approvals require landscaping details to be submitted and agreed. The agreement of details submitted in compliance with those conditions is a separate matter and outside the ambit of the consideration and determination of this application for the CCTV camera.

CONSULTATIONS

6. The following Consultations were notified and comments received are set out below:-
7. **Parish Council**
It should be ensured that all residents in the vicinity are informed of the position of the CCTV camera, so that their views are taken into consideration.
8. **Urban Design - Landscape**
I have no objection to this application on landscape or visual grounds.

The proposal includes for soft landscaping to the southern and western boundaries in particular, these being the directions of properties potentially overlooked by the camera. The tree planting indicated is extra heavy large trees, and also over time these should break up any views, therefore offering screening. The siting adjacent to public footpath/cycleway avoids the impact of the necessary size that would be an issue if it were adjacent to gardens. Operational matters such as elevation of tilt, monitoring, etc, I understand are dealt with by others, and therefore not commented on here. Full hard and soft landscape details should be provided to the following minimum standard:
A detailed landscape plan indicating proposals for hard construction indicating materials and construction methods. Detailed treatments of the enclosures to all boundaries.
A detailed planting plan indicating soil depths, plant species, numbers, densities, locations, and sizes, planting methods, maintenance and management.

9. **Urban Design – Engineers Highways Comments**

Given that this has no adverse impact on the highway, I have no objection to this application on highway grounds.

10. **Care For Your Area - Sarah Edwards**

In regard to the above application I have no objections to the siting of the CCTV, as it is a part of the much needed play area development to be installed. I am aware that it is a requirement of a section 106 agreement for this development, which was agreed in October 2005. If you require any clarification on the above please do not hesitate to contact me.

PUBLICITY

11. Neighbours were notified and any comments received are below (if applicable): -

12. Paul Oliver-Armitage 58 Hillbrook Crescent' Ingleby Barwick

As the CCTV is to be installed to monitor the play areas, will it also be able to record sound, a main problem area associated with anti-social behaviour that cannot be detected by the viewing of images alone. Noise pollution disrupts the environment and can also cause distress. Are the residents living in view of the CCTV able to see the view from the camera to be assured that the recorded images do not invade personal privacy, and how will the field of vision be restricted? Will it be via mechanical means and can residents be assured the viewing restriction cannot be overridden? The site layout accompanying the application is incorrect, as it does not show the correct house types and layouts correctly.

A number of houses close to the CCTV location have not been purchased and so future residents will not have had any opportunity to be consulted on the location and use of this proposed monitoring system. The overall size and extremely close proximity of this whole development to residential properties is an issue that does not appear to have been taken into consideration at the design stage of this project. I and a number of my neighbours believe that residents either fronting or backing onto the POS should not lose any amenity from this construction, and that it should be an equal distance from all properties.

Can some changes can be made to the approved scheme that might lessen residents concerns regarding the extremely close proximity to housing in order to mitigate the impact on the amenities of adjoining residents.

Having had the opportunity to review the comments submitted by other residents, would it not be prudent to review the overall size of the scheme with the view that a smaller scheme would require a reduced coverage area for the CCTV and therefore allay resident's fears regarding intrusion and loss of privacy.

I take it number 35 Hillbrook Crescent does not overlook this public open space, and therefore does not have the same perspective that residents who are directly in line of sight of the CCTV have.

From reviewing consultee comments no.3 regarding the planting of extra heavy large trees I must comment that this seems to be an unviable proposition. Trees take tens of years to establish and will also block out natural light due to their extremely close proximity (less than 3 meters) to residential houses, thereby increasing residents reliance on artificial means of lighting. There are also problems associated with tree roots undermining the foundations, drainage systems and paths of nearby properties. These factors need consideration due to the substantial risk of subsidence from the planting of extra heavy large trees. From reviewing the finalised layouts that have been provided by persimmon on the current CCTV application, the play area locations seem to contradict Chapter 4 of The Six Acre Standard - Minimum standards for outdoor playing space which details:

1. A buffer zone, normally, a minimum of 20 meters should be provided between the activity zone and the habitable room façade of the dwelling. Where these minimum distances apply, careful consideration needs to be given to: -
 - (i) The design of the means of enclosure, planting scheme and/or other physical features on the boundary of the residential property, and
 - (ii) The siting of play equipment within the activity zone (to preclude opportunities for overlooking nearby gardens and a consequential loss of privacy for residents, see paragraph 4.37(6)).

The habitable rooms of dwellings on the drawing are less than 10m from the play areas. The front door of my own property is less than 5 meters from the boundary of the toddler area, and will also be overlooked thereby indicating that I will have a loss of privacy. Do you know if this was considered by the architect when they were presented with layouts and drawings of the houses fronting as well as backing onto the POS.

13. Domonic Hollaron 56 Hillbrook Crescent' Ingleby Barwick

I would like to point out that the application states that the CCTV will be positioned 50m away from residential properties, and 6m above the roofline of nearby dwellings. Has anybody been out and measured this distance, as it is physically impossible to position this CCTV mast 50m from dwellings. The POS itself is only approx 60m wide. The position shown on the plan will place the CCTV approx 20m from residential properties. Even placed in the middle of the POS, the furthest distance the CCTV would be is approx 25m from residential properties, therefore if the CCTV needs to be 6m above rooflines it will impinge on the privacy of all residents. Therefore the proposed CCTV is too big for the development. Reducing the overall size of the scheme would allow for a reduced CCTV mast covering a smaller area yet still making any play areas safe for children to use. Any CCTV in this area should be able to record sound. Anti-social behaviour cannot be detected by images alone. Boisterous and drunken youths can cause alarm and distress to residents which cannot be picked up by CCTV imagery alone. CCTV is a reactive tool and therefore will not prevent criminal and anti-social behaviour. More pro-active methods should be developed that prevent criminal and anti-social problems occurring in the first instance.

Excerpts taken from Stockton Borough Council's Open Space Audit:

"Within Thornaby there are numerous small amenity green spaces, with few sites large enough to allow for boisterous play without causing annoyance to local residents."

"The majority of the play areas within residential areas are subject to anti-social behaviour problems, and complaints have been received from residents."

"There are 34 play areas distributed across the Borough. The highest concentration of play areas is in the Thornaby and Ingleby Barwick study area."

With the imminent construction of Romano Park, why do we need a duplication of facilities in this area when Romano Park have the same facilities and will be accessible to everyone?

Quote from Councillor Lee Narroway regarding the provision of Romano Park:

"Of course there will be concerns from some residents living close by, let's take these on board and adjust the plans as needed". Source: - Evening Gazette (Page 22) Wed 15th Nov 2006.

14. Mr Stainton 52 Hillbrook Crescent' Ingleby Barwick

Could you please provide further details on this planning application with regard to the following questions?

Where exactly is the proposed pole to be installed?

Where will the camera be directed? Will it be able to view into peoples' homes?

What assurances would we have that the camera would not be able to view into anybody's home?

Would we personally be able to check that it cannot view into our homes?

Who will have overall control of the camera and footage once it is installed? Who will be able to have access to the footage?

15. Mr R Bainbridge 50 Hillbrook Crescent' Ingleby Barwick

I have just moved into the new house £320.000 I do not expect to have 15m CCTV camera overlooking us. Even rough council estates have taken them down why should we have one.

It is up to community police and people of the surrounding area to look after this estate.

16. Nicholas Joyce 44 Hillbrook Crescent' Ingleby Barwick

Whilst providing us with a clearer plan of the proposed development would be useful perhaps the developers could actually update the drawing legend/key to match the plan.

Some specifics about tree heights (planted and fully grown) would be useful also.

A public meeting is surely required to ensure that both neighbours, nearby residents/users and the council reach a happy medium with the development. The colossal number of complaints that will certainly arise if the development proceeds as planned will be a terrible waste of taxpayers' money and council time.

I wholly support the comments recently made by all objectors - specifically Mr D Hollaron of 56 Hillbrook Crescent. With the development on the horizon of Romano Park the idea of a duplicate facility nearby that requires such large CCTV mast seems unbelievable. The close proximity of the proposed development to neighbouring houses will cause many, many problems - most of which won't be able to be dealt with "using" CCTV. I would also like to point out that either the Field of View drawings are wholly inaccurate or that a substantial area of the POS will not be covered effectively by the CCTV's field of view. A human standing at 1.8m tall at the extremities of the POS will need to be identified by their shoes - any extra elevation of the field or view would result in the camera looking directly into residents properties. This is either highly ineffective or a breach of our privacy. Please would the council comment on this over sight. Mr Hollaron is also correct in stating that the proposed mast will be impossible to place 50m from residential dwellings.

17. Mr M Riordan 42 Hillbrook Crescent' Ingleby Barwick

I object to the proposed CCTV camera on the grounds that the POS development in the first place is unsuitable for the space available. The need for such a large CCTV installation would be lessened severely if the POS plans were scaled down by a considerable

magnitude. The CCTV WILL be a breach of resident's privacy and will serve little use in eliminating anti-social behaviour or crime from the POS.

18. Paul Race 40 Hillbrook Crescent' Ingleby Barwick

I object strongly and do not wish for it to be put in under any circumstances and propose the formation of a neighbourhood watch scheme, which will be more effective and not spoil the area like a camera on a pole.

Looking at the list of properties that have been "informed" of the proposal, it seems that a significant number of the properties are not even completed building and as such not occupied. It seems "informed" is a flyer through your letterbox and then comments are invited. If no one lives there how can comments be made?

In addition, I believe there should be a full open public consultation meeting with residents rather than relying on responses through the post (strikes possibly affecting) or Internet (not everyone up and running in a NEW property). This will let the councillors see every ones feelings, after all they will be the ones receiving the calls of complaint - at the time of the complaint, whether that's morning, afternoon or night.

19. Mr And Mrs Evans 35 Hillbrook Crescent' Ingleby Barwick

As the camera will only cover the "play area", this can only help towards keeping our children safe.

20. Mrs A Beverley 18 Warbler Close' Ingleby Barwick

I object to this as it would destroy the outlook, and also I don't think this area needs a CCTV camera. Places like Beckfields Shops where young people have been hanging out for years. If we have more visible policing we wouldn't need CCTV camera. So I don't want this happening thank-you.

I have already sent in my objection to this CCTV camera and I still object also like to know who will be monitoring this police private company just have a warden patrolling instead of this proposal [big brother] if it is rejected there should be a meeting to come up with another alternative i.e.: local residents monitoring the area which I will go along with.

21 Carly Britson 56 Hillbrook Crescent' Ingleby Barwick

The incorrect drawing accompanying the application shows a proposed hedgerow extension. If, once the correct layout has been provided will this not create a significant blind spot for the CCTV? Also, once the trees have become established around the play areas, how is the CCTV supposed to monitor these areas? What plans are in place for the continuous monitoring of these additional blind spots.

22. Mrs Anna Race 40 Hillbrook Crescent' Ingleby Barwick

Objection

PLANNING POLICY CONSIDERATION

23. Where an adopted or approved development plan contains relevant policies, Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 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)*.

24. The following planning policies are considered to be relevant to the consideration of this application: -

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 EN15

Development will not be permitted on urban open space unless:

- (i) It would enhance the sporting, recreational, or nature conservation value of the land and the space would still retain its open character; or
- (ii) The development of a small area of open space would result in the enhancement of the remainder to the overall benefit of the local community

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.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

25. The site is located within the planned settlement of Ingleby Barwick, which lies south of the river Tees between the settlements of Yarm and Thornaby. The CCTV pole and camera would be sited within the 0.6 hectares of approved Public Open Space (POS) within the housing development known as Broomwood. The POS land is rectangular in shape with a longer east to west axis and was part of an agricultural field. At the time of writing the report the land remains undeveloped, free of structures and largely covered in grass.
26. The northern boundary has a mature hedge remaining from the former field boundary. Between the hedge and the play area there is the route of a cycle/footpath link. To the north beyond the hedge there are the rear of houses and gardens currently under construction. The CCTV pole would be sited approximately mid distance along the length of the POS and towards the northern boundary and a minimum of 21m from the rear of the nearest house. The western and southern sides of the POS are faced by the front of new detached houses

which have been completed and occupied. The front of the nearest house to the south is over 45m away and that of the nearest house to the west is over 56m away. To the east is an uncompleted estate road, which will link areas of housing within the estate. Residential development in this direction is over 85m away from the siting of the proposed mast.

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

27. The main planning considerations in respect of this proposal are; the visual impact; the impact on the amenity and privacy of residential properties and; other material considerations. The application is not for the provision of the Public Open Space itself and therefore the principle of its provision; its extent, landscaping and play equipment layouts are not material considerations.

Visual impact

28. In order to provide the security the camera for CCTV coverage needs to be on a mast or structure from which the whole Public Open Space can be seen and has transmitter connectivity to the Surveillance Centre. There are no existing suitable structures available on this former agricultural land, which would provide the necessary height. The only structures in the vicinity are the new private houses. It is therefore proposed to use a slim mast with a swan neck so that the downward facing camera can provide the necessary surveillance and the attached dish can have a line of site over the houses. The pole would be the same height as those at other locations such as Primrose Hill Park. Its slim pole diameter and white colouring should help it be less noticeable.
29. The objections to the CCTV camera on the basis that the POS is too large or unsuitable for its space are not relevant to the current application. The size of the POS has been approved by previous applications and it is required to meet the needs of the area in addition to Romano Park. The height of the CCTV pole could not be reduced if the area for the POS was reduced, as a line of sight is required from the top of the pole to the Surveillance Centre. The height of the pole will mean that it is the tallest structure in the vicinity and visible from the surrounding houses. At 15m it will be no more than The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 deem to be permitted development for stand alone telecommunications masts.
30. The POS will be landscaped with trees and shrubs and the approved plans show that play equipment will be installed for different age groups. When the POS is developed the pole would therefore not be seen in isolation but as a small part of this landscaped setting. It would then not be so readily noticeable as the landscape matures. No landscaping is proposed or considered necessary as a direct result of this proposal. The Head of Technical Services has no objection on landscape or visual grounds. The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Local Plan policy GP1 and its criteria assessments relating to the external appearance and relationship with the surrounding area.
31. The comments by the Head of Technical Services and objectors relating to the landscaping shown on the plans are not relevant to the consideration of this application. The comments about the landscaping, tree heights, species and positions etc. are noted but will apply to the submission of details received in compliance with the previous conditional permissions, not to this current application. When landscape details are submitted by the developer as required by the conditions of previous approvals neighbouring residents will be given a further opportunity to comment. It will be an important consideration at that time that planting does not create blind spots to the camera.

32. It is the intention of policy EN15 to protect urban open space from development. In this instance the pole and its base would occupy a very small part of the POS, which would retain its open character. The CCTV camera would enhance the recreational value of the space and be for the overall benefit of the local community. The proposal therefore accords with this policy.

Residential amenity and privacy

33. The siting for the camera on its pole has been chosen to limit its impact on the residential amenity and privacy of the occupiers of the new houses surrounding the POS as much as possible. The pole is situated a minimum of 21m from the nearest house which is to the north beyond the retained hedge line. It is considered that with the restrictions on the operation of the camera this will adequately prevent overlooking, loss of amenity or privacy.
34. The other properties to the west and south facing the POS are at least 45m away from the proposed site for the camera pole. These properties have their frontages facing the POS and so this elevation is already readily visible at close quarters to any one walking along the pedestrian route running in front of them or who may in future use the POS.
35. The field of view of the proposed camera is shown on a submitted plan. This shows that the camera will only view the area of the POS and not be able to see into people's homes. This will be controlled so that there is even a margin of the POS that will be excluded to view. This is to ensure that in addition to the great distance from residential properties that there is no chance of invasion of privacy. The use and control of the footage will be the responsibility of the Security Centre and is explained on the Council's website.
36. The overall size and proximity of the POS to residential properties are not issues that have any bearing on the current application for the reasons given above.
37. The proposals are not considered to adversely affect the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties and ensure that residents of the new dwellings will have a satisfactory degree of privacy and amenity. The proposed CCTV facility is therefore considered to comply with Local Plan policy GP1 and HO11.

Other matters

38. All the surrounding houses have had notification letters about the proposal even those that are in the course of being built or are unoccupied. In addition a site notice has been displayed.
39. The CCTV operation by the Council's Surveillance Centre is tried and tested and provides 24 hour coverage which is not likely to be the case if it is patrolled by a warden as suggested by an objector. If local residents wish to have a Neighbourhood Watch scheme they can do so with the support of the police. This would be an additional measure but would not be a substitute for the CCTV camera.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion it is considered that the proposed scheme complies with policies GP1, EN15 and HO11 of the Stockton on Tees Local Plan and is therefore recommended for approval.

Financial Implications:
As report.

Environmental Implications:
As report

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

Community Safety Implications:
The provisions of Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 have been taken into account in the preparation of this report.

Background Papers:
Stockton on Tees Local Plan
Planning applications S812/74, 05/0381/REM and 06/1076/FUL,

**Corporate Director of Development and Neighbourhood Services
Contact Officer Mr Andrew Bishop Telephone No 01642 527310**

WARD AND WARD COUNCILLORS

**Ward Ingleby Barwick East
Ward Councillor Councillor K C Faulks**

**Ward Ingleby Barwick East
Ward Councillor Councillor D C Harrington**

**Ward Ingleby Barwick East
Ward Councillor Councillor A M Larkin**