

DELEGATED

**AGENDA NO
PLANNING COMMITTEE**

DATE 22nd MAY 2008

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

08/0298/OUT

Land to the Rear of the Stables, Kirk Hill, Redmarshall

Revised outline application for affordable housing scheme of 10 no. residential units.

Expiry Date: 23rd May 2008

UPDATE REPORT

1. Since the publication of the Committee Report additional correspondence has been received. Additional correspondence is summarised as follows;

Consultation responses:

Stockton Housing

2. In terms of housing need, the LHA study 2006 identified a 'mean' affordable housing requirement of 10 units over a 5 year period for Rural Locations, however it should be noted that this includes all Rural areas of the Borough and is not limited to Whitton Ward (it also includes for example all outlining areas including Long Newton for example). In determining this 'mean' figure of 10 dwellings, the LHA also states that unlike other areas of the Borough the 'mean' is higher for Rural Villages than the affordability and suitability percentages and that this is because "the mean also takes into account the preference of survey respondents in housing need wishing to move who may or may not currently live in those areas". This suggests there is a preference for people to move to Rural areas rather than having an identified housing need which requires them to live in these locations.

Redmarshall Parish Council

3. There are many more suitable sites within the Western villages which could be used to provide 10 no. affordable homes and that developments within the villages have all been on brownfield land, within the limits of development. Redmarshall residents have to drive for shopping, leisure, work etc whilst there is not a direct bus to the local Doctors at Stillington, residents instead having to take a bus towards Stockton and then change busses.
4. An access on Kirkhill Road must lead to increased danger for road users and pedestrians. To suggest a road calming scheme on the brow of a hill is beggars belief whilst the proposal to extent the 30mph zone will mean that other speculative developers come forward to develop the green space between the villages.
5. Redmarshall is not at the centre of Carlton, Thorpe Thewles, Stillington, Whitton and Redmarshall.
6. To allow the erosion of the small green space between Carlton and Redmarshall will be detrimental to both villages. The land is at the highest point of the surrounding area and will be visually intrusive.

7. The applicants claim that house prices have increased 100% since 2004 does not relate to Redmarshall.

Head of Technical Services

8. The Head of Technical Services previously considered that the traffic speed at the point of the access would be likely to be in excess of 37mph, which meant that, in accordance with paragraphs 7.5.8 and 7.7.10 of Manual for Streets, the Stopping Site Distance would have needed to be taken from the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) and not the manual for street principles.
9. A speed survey has now been undertaken by SBC Highways traffic management. The survey was carried out on the 19th May 2008 between the hours of 9.55 and 11:40am. The results of the survey show a maximum speed of traffic of 50mph, a minimum speed of 27mph and an 85th percentile speed of 38mph. In view of the results of this survey, the Head of Technical Services consider that the visibility splays for the proposed access can be reduced to that required on roads with traffic having an 85th percentile speed of 40mph, this being 4.5 x 120m. Having assessed the proposed point of access it is considered that this level of visibility can be achieved.
10. In order to ensure the overall scheme is acceptable in highway safety terms it is considered appropriate to require a traffic calming scheme to be implemented as well as there being a requirement to relocate the bus stop further to the west. Such works would need to be controlled as being a requirement of the development.
11. A Section 278 Agreement and a Section 38 Agreement would be required for the access road if the application were to be approved.

Neighbour consultation responses:

12. A total of 11 letters of further comment have been received from the following addresses:
5 Coniston Crescent
Objectors detailed within the main report
An occupier of Carlton Village
13. This correspondence included a total of 10 letters of objection and 1 letter of support .
14. Additional objections are as follows;
 - The land should be donated to the village by the applicant for use as a park in order to keep the area open.
 - Properties back onto the field which have low fencing and garden areas which currently get sun and are used by residents. The proposal would detrimentally affect their outlook and having an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of adjacent properties.
 - The applicants comments about incomes in the village is purely guess work whilst there is a mix of people living in Redmarshall including children.
 - There is an identified need for 14 rural affordable houses across 15 villages being less than 1 per village.
 - There are many accidents on the roads around the village, a very serious accident occurred on the 18th April 2008 and to allow inappropriate development will jeopardise peoples lives.
 - The extension of the 30mph zone will represent a massive intrusion into the green wedge between the two villages. The gateway calming features would not be at the entrance to Redmarshall, but are on a road which passes Redmarshall and in that respect serve no useful purpose and would adversely affect safety being located on the brow of a hill.
 - It appears that the levels indicated do not relate to Ordnance Survey data.

- Maximum visibility splays should be maintained as a safeguard against errant drivers.
- The previous inspectors comments about the access for stables to the site was based on a particularly low figure of 20 additional vehicles per month.
- Various statements of the application are a misrepresentation of fact including the size of the land, health services, Redmarshall as being a retirement village, the nature of the fence associated with adjoining properties.
- The movement of vehicles, noise and headlights would affect adjoining properties.
- Objects to the application which attempts to gain approval for a garage and parking space for the existing dwelling on land outside of the development limits on a greenfield site.
- The applicant states that the field is characterless which is not true, it is home to a variety of wildlife.

15. Comments of support are as follows;
Approve of the application as it is much needed.

Comments of the applicant: Summarised

16. The site is not 1.2m higher than the adjacent road, only the verge is banked up and the site slopes back into the site with ground levels of the field being the same as the properties on Drovers Lane.
17. The applicant has advised that in order to allay local residents fears about the types of people occupying these properties, he would be prepared to propose an entire shared equity Scheme.
18. The applicant has further advised that half of the site would be available for amenity and play provision.
19. The applicant has submitted various extracts from Manual for Streets in relation to the access which he believes to be relevant and which he believes indicate the proposals as being acceptable.

Material Planning Considerations

20. The proposal from the applicant to make the scheme entirely a shared equity scheme is not considered to have any impact on the suitability of the principle of the scheme when considered against planning policy whilst comments made that half of the site would be provided as amenity play space, although potentially beneficial to the development and residents of the village, is not sufficient to outweigh the planning policy issues which relate to the principle of the development being undertaken on this area of land.
21. The description within the main report advising that the site is 1.2m higher than that of the adjacent road is misleading in that only part of the site (that adjacent to the highway) is at this raised level and the site does slope back down as it goes further into the site to the south. The issue of site levels has however not been perceived as being an issue.
22. Additional comments from the Housing Team indicate that the indicative 10 rural affordable houses being needed over a 5 year period as indicated by the LHNA includes a desire element. Planning Policy for rural exception sites requires a real demand being demonstrated from either existing residents or those with close family ties and such sites should not provide for a desire element from residents who do not specifically require to live within such a settlement. As such, it remains to be considered that there is no robust

justification to indicate that 10 units of affordable dwellings are required at this location on an exception site.

23. In view of the Head of Technical Services response to the required visibility splays and the withdrawal of their previous objection to the proposed access it is considered that were the scheme to be acceptable in principle then it would be necessary to attaché a Grampian Condition to achieve the provision of a highway improvement scheme which would include the provision of visibility splays, traffic calming scheme and scheme to move the bus stop prior to commencement on site whilst impose a condition that would require the existing access to 'The Stables' to be blocked off and linked to the new access road.
24. Details have been submitted which include a copy of an email which detail the applicants apparent previous considerations and intentions for residential development on the site, however, these are not considered to be relevant to the determination of this application.
25. Comments have been made in regard to the nature of the levels on the site and whilst there is a change in ground levels between the highway and the pint of the site which abuts the highway, it is considered that were an access to be provided in the proposed location, this could be acceptably achieved with some earth works being required to take place and there then being a requirement for appropriate landscaping to be undertaken.
26. Objection has been made in respect to a variety of misleading information and whilst these comments are noted, the assessment of the proposal within the main report has been based on site assessment and points of fact as against any estimated or un-referenced material and as such has taken the relevant points into account.
27. Objections have included further comment relating to impacts on adjoining from residents from vehicles headlights and general noise, however it is considered that the scale of the development and the ability to carry out a fencing and landscaping scheme within the site, the proposal would be able to adequately mitigate these impacts were it to be approved.
28. Objection has been raised in respect to the indicative layout plans which show a garage and access to the existing bungalow on the adjacent site. In view of the proposal being on a Greenfield site outside the limits of development it is considered that additional provision for the existing dwelling would not be acceptable. This detail is not included within the proposal description whilst is not for consideration within this outline application.
29. Where an outline scheme is submitted for access it should indicate the internal access road. Whilst an internal access road has been indicated, the applicant wanted this to be indicative only. The precise location of the indicative internal road is not considered to be appropriate in view of the likely constraints it would make for the site layout, however, were the application to be approved then this detail could be conditioned accordingly.
30. In addition to the above, the applicant submitted a draft S106 agreement relating to the provision of affordable housing. The agreement has been checked and requires minor amendments and the applicant has been advised accordingly.

Recommendation

31. That the application be determined in accordance with the recommendation of the main report subject to the removal of reason for refusal no. 4 of that report relating to the proposed access.

Corporate Director of Development and Neighbourhood Services
Contact Officer Mr Andrew Glossop

Telephone No 01642 527796

Email address: development.control@stockton.gov.uk

Financial Implications

As report

Environmental Implications

As Report

Legal Implications

As report

Community Safety 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

Background Papers

Adopted Stockton on Tees Local Plan (June 1997)

Planning Policy Statement Delivering sustainable development'

Planning Policy Statement Note 3 'Housing'

Planning Policy Statement Note 7 'Sustainable development in rural areas'

Planning Policy Guidance Note 13: Transport

Communities and Local Government: Delivering Affordable Housing

Stockton on Tees Local Housing Assessment

WARD AND WARD COUNCILLORS

Ward

Western Parishes

Ward Councillor

Councillor F. G. Salt