

DELEGATED

**AGENDA NO
PLANNING COMMITTEE:**

4th June 2013

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

12/2047/OUT

**Field at Grid Reference 440817 514442, Urlay Nook Road, Eaglescliffe
Outline application for residential development (C3) and creation of new highways access.**

Expiry Date: 3 December 2012

SUMMARY

Outline planning permission is sought for a residential development on land to the west of Hunters Green, Eaglescliffe. The site is split by the A67 with the northern part being proposed for housing and open space and the southern part being utilised for a sustainable urban drainage scheme (surface water holding basin). Having initially been submitted as an outline application for up to 159 houses and seeking detailed approval for the access / spine road (with other matters being reserved), the application now leaves all matters reserved with only approval for the principle of development being sought. Notwithstanding this, with all outline applications there is a requirement to indicatively demonstrate the development is achievable. The indicative details as revised show the development site being accessed off Urlay Nook Road, with landscape buffers to the north, south and east, an area of open recreational space to the south west corner and 145 dwellings within the developed part of the site.

The site is located within the Defined Limits to Development, within the Yarm, Eaglescliffe and Preston Housing sub division area as detailed in the Core Strategy and an area indicated within the Core Strategy as being suitable for industrial uses. It lies adjacent to housing at Hunters Green (to the east), an approved industrial estate site to the west (subject to S106 being signed) and an approved housing site of Allens West (also subject to S106 being signed) to the north, beyond Urlay Nook Road and a railway line.

Significant objection has been raised against the application, the main thrust of which relate to the proposal being premature to the democratic process of site allocations via the development plan, the impact of traffic, the lack of services and resultant pressure on services including schools, the impact on wildlife and the overall sustainability of the proposal.

Consultation responses have been received from the Highways Agency, Natural England, the Environment Agency, Tees Archaeology, Tees Valley Wildlife Trust, the Head of Technical Services, The Head of Housing, Environmental Health and others. No objections are raised from statutory consultees subject to the imposition of conditions and agreements requiring mitigation and further investigative work to be undertaken at a later stage. This includes for works to the highway to mitigate traffic impacts, contaminated land survey work, ecological mitigation, demonstration of a suitable surface water drainage scheme and provisions / contributions to be made towards highway related matters / education / affordable housing as detailed within the Heads of Terms.

As the site is within the limits of development its development for housing is generally in accordance with the principles of saved Local Plan Policy HO3. Notwithstanding this, Core Strategy Development Plan Policy CS7 indicates that no additional housing sites would be

allocated before 2016 and land for only 50 – 100 dwellings (approximate) will be allocated between 2016 and 2021 in this area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to this policy; however, guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) advises that authorities adopted housing policies should be considered out of date where the authority cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land. The Council has currently demonstrated a 4.08 year supply of housing land. In view of the advice within the NPPF, the site being an unallocated greenfield site within the Limits of Development and within the Yarm, Eaglescliffe and Preston Housing Sub Division area, the principle of residential development is considered to be acceptable.

Being outline with all matters reserved, the main considerations of the application beyond the principle of development relate to sustainability, traffic, indicative layout, contributions / provisions, ecology, archaeology, contamination. These have all been considered in detail within the report. It is considered that the impacts of additional traffic can be adequately mitigated as can impacts on archaeology and ecology, being limited likely impacts. The site is considered to be within reasonable distance of a range of services including education, retail, employment, leisure etc. and a bus service exists near to the local centre. It is therefore considered to be sufficiently sustainable in locational terms. Contamination and drainage along with other matters are recommended to be dealt with in detail by condition.

In view of all of the above it is considered that although contrary to the housing policies within the Core Strategy, the scheme would be in accordance with relevant saved policies of the local plan, the NPPF and other remaining core strategy policies.

RECOMMENDATION

That planning application 12/2047/OUT be **approved** subject to the following conditions and informatives and subject to a Section 106 Agreement being signed as detailed in the Heads of Terms below.

Should the S106 agreement not be signed within 2 months of the committee decision then the application be refused based on lack of adequate provision to make the development suitably operate, its inability to provide for future occupiers and it being contrary to policy requirements and the NPPF.

1. Approved Plans

The development hereby approved shall be in accordance with the following approved plans;

| <i>Plan Reference Number</i> | <i>Date on Plan</i> |
|------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <i>SI-001-Rev A</i> | <i>24th August 2012</i> |

Reason: To define the consent.

2. Reserved Matters - Details

Approval of the details of the Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale of the development known as the 'Reserved Matters' shall be obtained in writing from the Local Planning Authority before the development is commenced. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans

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

3. Reserved Matters - Time Period for submission

Application for the approval of reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: By virtue of the provisions of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

4. Period for Commencement

The development hereby permitted shall be begun either before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission, or before the expiration of two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved, whichever is the latest.

Reason: By virtue of the provisions of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

5. Street furniture

No development hereby approved shall be commenced on site until a scheme of street furniture including lighting columns has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include details of implementation and short term maintenance.

Reason: In order to achieve a satisfactory form of development in accordance with the requirements of Core Strategy Development Plan Policy CS3.

6. Surface Water Drainage / Run Off Rate

No development shall commence on site until a scheme of surface water drainage for the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall detail matters including discharge rates, overland flows, attenuation, future maintenance requirements and responsibilities and a timetable for implementation. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: In order to adequately provide surface water drainage for the site without undue detrimental impact to Flood Risk, ecology and landscaping associated with the environment in accordance with the guidance of Core Strategy Development Plan Policy CS10.

7. Foul Water Drainage

No development hereby approved shall be commenced on site until an adequate scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority which demonstrates that Foul Water Drainage from the site can be adequately dealt with taking into account connections and available capacity. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: In order to ensure the development adequately provides for its demands in this regard.

8. Preliminary Risk Assessment

No development hereby approved shall be commenced on site until a preliminary risk assessment for the contamination of the site has taken place and the results of this has been submitted to and approved in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The preliminary Risk Assessment shall identify;

- all previous uses*
- potential contaminants associated with those uses*
- a conceptual model of the site indicating sources, pathways and receptors*
- Potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at the site.*

No development hereby approved shall be undertaken on site until mitigation of the findings of the preliminary risk assessment has been undertaken in accordance with a scheme which has first been submitted to and approved in writing with the Local Planning Authority and verification of the schemes implementation has been submitted to and accepted in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To adequately deal with any contamination of the site in accordance with the requirements of NPPF.

9. Soil testing and mitigation

No development hereby approved shall be commenced on site until a scheme of testing of surface soils where infrastructure of the Elementis drainage system is near to surface (i.e. inspection chambers) and in areas intended for landscaping and residential gardens in close proximity to the drainage system, has been undertaken in accordance with methods to be first agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include testing for heavy metals, Cr6 and Chromium III Cr3.

No development hereby approved shall be undertaken on site until mitigation for soil pollution has been undertaken in accordance with a scheme which has first been submitted to and approved in writing with the Local Planning Authority and verification of the schemes implementation has been submitted to and accepted in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The developer must ensure that access is given at all times by means of the wayleave granted to Elementis on this land.

Reason: Due to the potential for contamination from historical and adjacent land uses in accordance with the requirements of NPPF.

9. Levels

The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with a scheme of levels to be submitted to and approved in writing with the Local Planning Authority prior to the development commencing. The scheme shall detail existing and proposed land levels and finished floor levels of properties within the site.

Reason: In order to ensure sufficient amenity is provided for future occupiers in accordance with guidance contained within the NPPF.

10. Means of Enclosure

No development hereby approved shall be commenced on site until a scheme detailing boundary treatments has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This scheme shall include a schedule of implementation of all boundary treatments and maintenance for those boundary treatments out-with property curtilages. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure a high quality treatment is achieved at an appropriate time during the construction phase of the development in the interests of visual amenity, privacy and highway safety in accordance with Stockton on Tees Core Strategy Policies CS2 (Sustainable Transport and Travel) and CS3 (Sustainable living and climate change).

11. Minimise energy consumption

Prior to the above ground commencement of any of the development hereby approved, a written scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority which details how the predicted CO2 emissions of the development will be reduced by at least 10% through the use of on-site renewable energy equipment or the use of specific building materials. The carbon savings which result from this will be above and beyond what is required to comply with Part L Building Regulations or other such superseding guidance. Before the development is occupied the approved scheme of reduction shall have been implemented on site and brought into use where appropriate. The approved scheme shall be maintained in perpetuity thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of promoting sustainable development in accordance with the requirements of the Regional Spatial Strategy and Stockton on Tees Core Strategy Policy CS3(5) Sustainable living and climate change.

12. Code construction

All residential units shall be built to achieve Code Level 4 of Lifetime Homes Standards or any other equivalent Building Regulation rating at the time of the submission of the application for reserved matters and shall have been agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority before development commences.

Reason: In order to minimise energy consumption in accordance with Stockton-On-Tees Core Strategy Development Plan Policy CS3.

13. No burning of waste.

During the construction phase of the development there shall be no open burning of waste on the site.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the occupants of nearby properties.

14. Construction working hours

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

Reason: To protect the amenity of the occupants of nearby properties.

15. Public Open Space

Development hereby approved shall not be commenced on site until the applicant has submitted to and had approval in writing from the Local Planning Authority for a scheme detailing arrangements for the provision of the Public Open Space and play facilities associated with the development. The scheme shall be in accordance with the Stockton on Tees Open Space, Recreation and Landscaping Supplementary Planning Document and shall address the following matters:

- a) The delineation and siting of the proposed public open space.*
- b) The type and nature of the facilities to be provided within the Public Open Space including the provision of any play facilities.*
- c) The arrangements the developer shall make to ensure that the Public Open Space and play facilities are laid out and completed during the course of the development and / or any phasing of provision.*
- d) The arrangements the developer shall make for the short term and long term future management and maintenance of the Public Open Space and play facilities. Where Title Transfer is not proposed the management details shall be prepared for a minimum period*

of 25 years from practical completion of the completion of the POS works. (Refer to informative)

The Public Open Space and play facilities shall be completed in accordance with the approved scheme and phasing arrangements as agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of Stockton on Tees Core Strategy Development Plan Policies CS3 (8) and CS11 (2).

16. Temporary Car Park for Workers

Prior to works commencing on site a scheme for a temporary car park and materials storage area shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented on site and brought into use prior to commencement of any development.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy GP1 of the Stockton on Tees Local Plan.

17. Existing Public Right of Way

The properties within the development hereby approved shall not be occupied until a scheme of works to upgrade the Public Right of Way to the south of the site has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include a timetable and arrangements for works to be carried out and the development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: In order to provide for the demands of the development on the existing PROW network in accordance with the requirements of Stockton on Tees Core Strategy Development Plan CS3 (8).

18. Archaeology

No development hereby approved shall be commenced on site until a programme of archaeological works for the western third of the southern field within the site, including a Written Scheme of Investigation, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include the following;

- an assessment of significance and research questions;*
- The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording;*
- The programme for post investigation assessment;*
- Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording;*
- Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation;*
- Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation;*
- Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation;*
- Nomination of a competent person or persons / organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.*

The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation.

The development shall not be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the

approved Written Scheme of Investigation and provision has been made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured.

Reason: To take account of archaeological deposits in accordance with the requirements of Stockton on Tees Core Strategy Development Plan Document Policy CS3 (8).

19. Protected Species

The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with a detailed scheme of mitigation which has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and which is based upon the principles detailed within section 4 (Mitigation) of Great Crested Newt, Risk Assessment and Protected species management plan V2 dated 19th Dec 2012.

Reason: In order to ensure the development takes account of ecology within the site in accordance with the requirements of Stockton on Tees Core Strategy Development Plan Document Policy CS3 (8).

20. Site Waste Management Plan

No development shall commence within any phase until a site waste management plan for that phase has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The site waste management plan shall be prepared in accordance with Non-statutory guidance for site waste management plans April 2008 [DEFRA]. Thereafter, the site waste management plan shall be updated and implemented in accordance with the approved scheme unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure a sustainable form of development and to accord with guidance contained within Stockton on Tees Core Strategy Policy 3 (CS3) – Sustainable Living and Climate Change

21. Unexpected land contamination

In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development, works must be halted on that part of the site affected by the unexpected contamination and it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken to the extent specified by the Local Planning Authority and works shall not be resumed until a remediation scheme to deal with contamination of the site has been carried out in accordance with details first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This scheme shall identify and evaluate options for remedial treatment based on risk management objectives. Works shall not resume until the measures approved in the remediation scheme have been implemented on site, following which, a validation report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The validation report shall include programmes of monitoring and maintenance, which will be carried out in accordance with the requirements of the report.

Reason: To ensure the proper restoration of the site and to accord with guidance contained within Stockton on Tees Core Strategy Policy 10 (CS10) - Environmental protection and enhancement

INFORMATIVES

Informative – Summary reasons and policies

The proposed scheme has been considered against the policies and documents identified below. It is considered that the proposal is in compliance with the principles of the saved Local Plan Policy

HO3 being development within the limits of development, although being contrary to saved Local Plan Policy EN13 due to the SUDS scheme falling outside of the limits of development and contrary to the Core Strategy which sought to not allocate new housing sites at the current time and which sought to limit housing numbers within this area. Notwithstanding this, guidance contained within the NPPF supports housing in circumstances relevant to this proposal in that the council does not have an identified up to date 5 year housing supply which the NPPF advises should result in officers viewing their development plan policies on housing as being out of date.

The site is considered to be of a size which can accommodate the development whilst adequately provide for open space and access and being able to adequately mitigate impacts relative to traffic, ecology, archaeology and drainage and through the use of conditions and the S106 agreement ensure that there are no significant adverse impacts for surrounding uses. There are no material considerations which suggest the application should be determined otherwise.

Core Strategy Policy 2 (CS2) - Sustainable Transport and Travel
Core Strategy Policy 3 (CS3) - Sustainable Living and Climate Change
Core Strategy Policy 7 (CS7) - Housing Distribution and Phasing
Core Strategy Policy 8 (CS8) - Housing Mix and Affordable Housing Provision
Core Strategy Policy 10 (CS10) – Environmental Protection and Enhancement
Core Strategy Policy 11 (CS11) - Planning Obligations

Local Plan Policy HO3 – Housing
Local Plan Policy EN13 – Limits to Development

Informative - Title Transfer

It should be noted that the council will not generally accept Title Transfer of any areas of land containing easements unless such areas are additional to the main areas of POS provision and conform to the apparatus supplies restrictions e.g. do not contain structures or planting. This will relate to the majority of the land currently being out forward as public open space. As such, for this land to be taken into account as some form of open space, a management scheme for implementation in perpetuity would need to be agreed.

Small areas of open space would not be considered for title transfer to the council where they are not deemed to be usable open space for ball games and would therefore need to be maintained by Management Company.

Informative – Northumbrian Water

Northumbrian Water's apparatus is located in the development site, including a 375mm Trunk Water Main. They require unrestricted access to this apparatus at all times and will not permit the erection of buildings or structures over or within 6m to it. Any proposed crossing, landscaping, parking areas or tree planting must comply with the standard Northumbrian Water guidelines. Diversion or relocation of the apparatus may be possible at the applicant's full cost. The Developer should contact Peter Heppell Advisor (tel 0191 419 6613) to agree the detailed scheme for the accurate location, protection of and access to its apparatus in accordance with Northumbrian Water's standard easement conditions.

Informative - Biodiversity

The site may contain Great Crested Newts and other protected wildlife and their habitat. These or their habitat are formally protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, and licences may be required to work / develop areas of the site. Appropriate contact should be made with Natural England in these regards.

Informative – Existing Landscaping

Some of the existing trees and hedges are considered to be important features of the site and beneficial for any site redevelopment in visual terms and for the benefits of screening. It is suggested that the existing landscaping is not removed from the site or affected until a final layout

and landscape scheme has been agreed for the site. The reserved matters applications should incorporate existing landscaping into the site. Removal of any landscaping which has the ability to perform valuable functions for any future residential layout may need to be re-provided by large / numerous specimens to achieve suitable setting / screening for the development.

Informative – SUDS schemes

In determining SUDS measures that can be incorporated into a surface water drainage scheme, the developer should refer to the advice given in CIRIA report C697, The SUDS Manual. JBA have suggested that ponds will be used in order to attenuate flows to agreed rates. The provision of SUDS measures closer to source, within the development site, rather than an 'end of pipe' solution such as a pond, may offer advantages in terms of water quality, amenity, and a reduction in required pond volumes.

The following is a summary of SUDS measures that may be incorporated into the drainage scheme by the developer.

Roadside swales

Swales are shallow vegetated channels designed to convey road runoff and treat pollutants, and can be used for treatment, attenuation and storage. There may need to be additional land take in order to provide space for swales between highways and footways.

Maintenance requirements are as follows:

- Monthly inspections to identify mowing requirements;
- Monthly litter removal;
- Scarifying and spiking as required following inspection;
- Repair damaged vegetation as required following inspection.

Roadside filter strips

Filter strips are roadside trenches filled with a permeable media to provide treatment and temporary storage of runoff before either infiltration or conveyance to downstream SUDS features. They can be used for treatment, attenuation and storage. There may need to be additional land take in order to provide space for filter strip between highways and footways. Due to their appearance, filter strips may not be suitable for use in residential areas. Maintenance requirements are as follows:

Monthly inspections;

Weed control, as required, following inspections;

Replace clogged material, as required, following inspections.

Bio retention Areas

Bio retention areas are shallow landscaped depressed areas that are under drained and rely on enhanced vegetation and filtration to reduce runoff volumes and remove pollutants. They often rely on infiltration, but positive outfalls can be provided where ground conditions are unsuitable for infiltration. There may need to be additional land take in order to provide space within footway for bio retention areas, although often these areas can form part of the general landscape strategy. They rely on small catchment areas to avoid clogging.

Maintenance requirements are as follows:

Monthly inspections;

Weed control, as required, following inspections;

Annual replacement of top mulch layer;

Replace damaged vegetation, as required following inspection;

Spiking or scarifying every 3 years.

Ponds

Ponds are basins that embody a permanent pool of water in the base. These may be formed within natural depressions or formed by excavation. The permanent pool provides the required treatment with temporary storage above providing flood attenuation for the

required rainfall events. The development indicates a number of green spaces, and it may be possible to incorporate ponds into these green spaces that would provide both amenity and SUDS benefits. Maintenance requirements are as follows:
 Monthly inspections to determine frequency of maintenance activities;
 Grass cutting following inspection, if required;
 Bank clearance annually following inspection, if required;
 Manage and repair landscaping following inspection, as required;
 Forebay sediment removal, as required;
 Sediment removal from main pond area, typically 25 years or greater.

Basins

Basins are either naturally occurring vegetated depressions, or excavated depressions in the ground designed to retain surface water runoff for the required period of time to allow treatment and attenuation to take place. If it is not appropriate to have permanent bodies of water incorporated into the green spaces, then shallow basins that only fill during periods of heavy rainfall may still be possible. Maintenance requirements:
 Monthly inspections to determine frequency of maintenance activities;
 Grass cutting following inspection, if required;
 Bank clearance annually following inspection, if required;
 Manage and repair landscaping following inspection, as required.

Private SUDS measures

In addition to the above, and in accordance with Building Regulations Approved Document H3, 2.6-2.13, the developer should consider the use of permeable surfacing to driveways and other private paved areas, or draining these areas onto/into soft landscaping in preference to a positive outfall. Permeable surfacing could comprise blockwork, or gravel driveways with flagged wheel tracks. Whilst underlying ground conditions may still result in some run-off from these areas, permeable surfacing may provide benefits in terms of attenuation and water quality improvements.

Development Phasing

The drainage strategy for the whole development should be planned such that it isn't reliant on futures phases, should the development be constructed in a phased manner. The philosophy of SUDS is that surface water is managed as close to source as possible. The incorporation of swales, ponds and basins alongside highways and in open green spaces will contribute towards a surface water drainage system that follows this philosophy.

Adoptability

SBC highways have confirmed that they are not averse to the use of SUDS features such as swales and ponds; however a full maintenance plan is required. As part of their surface water drainage strategy, the developer should prepare a SUDS management and maintenance strategy to be discussed and agreed with SBC.

The design of the drainage system should be carefully considered and discussed with both SBC and Northumbrian Water (NW), in order to ensure that the provision of elements within the system does not compromise the adoptability of other elements (for example, any piped systems that would be offered to NW for adoption under a Section 104 agreement). Particular elements of the drainage system, together with where the potential adopter of each element are summarised in the table below:

| Drainage Element | Potential Adopter |
|--|--------------------|
| Piped surface water drainage from buildings and highways, including oversized pipes used for storage | Northumbrian Water |
| Piped surface water drainage taking only run-off from highways and/or footways | Local Authority |
| Roadside swales | Local Authority |
| Bio retention areas | Local Authority |

Ponds and basins

Local Authority/Private management company

Private SUDS measures would be maintained by the relevant home owners.

HEADS OF TERMS

Highways

The provision of 7 off street car parking spaces close to Yarm High Street (or a financial contribution of £64,166) laid out in accordance with the operational requirements of SBC. This car park must be fully operational as a long stay car park prior to the occupation of the 10th dwelling.

The provision of an additional crossing point (including dropped kerbs and tactile paving) on Uraly Nook Road to improve connections to the south-east and linked.

Enter into a S278 Agreement for the following works;

- a new cycle link between Lartington Way and Lingfield Drive and to be paid by the applicant.
- the Junction improvements at the Durham Lane / A66 Elton Interchange, these being;
 - Northern dumbbell improvements
 - Durham Lane – increase approach flare by 3m
 - Darlington Road – increase approach flare by 2m
 - Southern dumbbell improvements
 - Increase approach flare by 3m

Travel Plan

Prior to commencement of development, submit a Travel Plan for approval by the Local Planning Authority including a proposal to ensure the appointment of a Travel Plan Co-ordinator for a minimum of 5 years, details of the welcome/marketing pack that is to be given to buyers/occupiers, including any electronic media (e.g. webpage); incentive payments of £100 per dwelling. The Travel Plan Co-ordinator should devise a list of priorities for the remaining funding should all dwellings not take up this incentive.

Affordable Housing

The provision of 20% of the units within the site shall be provided as affordable housing. Affordable housing shall be provided as follows unless an alternative scheme is agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority;

- 75% of which will be 2 bedroom properties and 25% 3 bedroom properties.
- Tenure based on 75% 2 bedroom properties and 25% 3 bedroom properties would then be split as follows:
 - of the 2 bed units. Two thirds shall be Rented Tenure and one third of units will be Intermediate Tenure.

%’s of units shall be rounded up or down accordingly. All affordable housing will comply with the Homes and Communities Agency space/quality standards.

Education

The provision of a commuted sum for school places. The rate of contribution required from developers for school places would be £8000 x 0.26 = £2080 per family home (homes with two or more bedrooms).

The calculation to reflect a discount of £8000 per vacant place in Durham Lane Primary School as recorded within the Annual School Census current at the time of the Occupation of the relevant dwelling, subject to a pro-rata allocation of this discount amongst other committed development within the local area. The Local Authority is to provide (within 1 month of a request being made) its confirmation of the applicable discount by reference to the Annual School Census and specific details of other developments to benefit from the discount.

The contribution is to be held within an interest-bearing account. Payment to be used for the purposes identified within 5 years of payment being made or otherwise returned together with the interest accrued.

To pay to the Council the Education Contribution by four instalments being:

two equal instalments (each being 25% of the overall contribution) payable prior to the Occupation of the 40th Dwelling and the Occupation of the 60th Dwelling respectively calculated pursuant to the First Formula and

two equal instalments (each being 25% of the overall contribution) payable prior to the Occupation of the 75th Dwelling and the Occupation of the 90th Dwelling respectively calculated by reference to the Second Formula

Public Open Space

Prior to the Occupation of the First Dwelling the Owner shall submit to the Council for approval a Public Open Space Maintenance Plan (such approval not to be unreasonably withheld or delayed) which may include provision for the transfer of the Public Open Space either to the Council (subject to the agreement of the Council and the payment of a commuted sum as a 25 year maintenance charge) or (at the discretion of the Owner) a management company experienced in the management and maintenance of land and facilities similar to the POS.

To manage and maintain the Public Open Space in accordance with the Public Open Space Maintenance Plan in perpetuity.

BACKGROUND

12/0372/SCO Screening opinion request for proposed residential development of land known as Urlay view, Urlay Nook, Eaglescliffe. Decision – EIA not required. 28th March 2012

12/2113/SCO Extended Screening opinion request for proposed residential development of land known as Urlay view, Urlay Nook, Eaglescliffe. EIA not required. 8th October 2012

Land adjacent to the site - 08/0241/OUT - Revised Outline application for industrial estate comprising the erection of B2 and B8 use class units and associated means of access. Minded to approve subject to a Section 106 Agreement being signed. (S106 not yet signed).

Allens West gained permission for 843 properties although development has not yet commenced and the site remains to be characterised by a mix of buildings, hard standings and semi –natural areas.

The applicant undertook a public consultation exercise in May 2012.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The 8.95ha site is located on the western side of Eaglescliffe and its associated urbanised area. The site is made up of two parts, one being immediately to the south of the A67 and one

immediately to the north with an interlinking section across the A67. The site to the northern side includes agricultural / scrub land which the submission indicates has been used as pastured grassland for a considerable length of time. The northern part of the site also includes a tree / hedge lined corridor which has a more natural character, within which lies a public footpath. The northern area has been the subject of recent ploughing.

The part of the site to the south of the A67 is sloping ground, from a high point at the roadside to a low southern point which leads down towards Nelly Burdon's Beck. This area of land is known locally as Eliff's Mill and contains a pond and scrubland. Nelly Burdon's Beck borders the site to the south and allotments lie immediately to the eastern boundary. The southern part of the site has the appearance of an overgrown paddock which slopes down towards a beck and which contains trees and scrub.

The existing residential development of Hunters Green lies to the east on the opposing side of Urlay Nook Road. The site and surroundings are illustrated at appendix. 1. Surrounding built development includes;

- a police tactical training centre to the north west,
- small industrial premises to the west
- Railway line bordering the northern side of Urlay Nook Road (Darlington to Teesside stations)
- Urlay Nook Road borders the northern part of the site with a railway line beyond which runs between Darlington Station and other small stations in Teesside.
- Two large Industrial complexes lie to the north of the railway line, Elementis Chromium to the north west and Allens West to the north east of the site. Elementis Chromium has largely been decommissioned and only a few buildings of the former complex remain on site.

The northern part of the site is bounded to the north, east and south by a roadside hedge which includes sporadic trees. To the west of the site lies open agricultural fields.

The site includes a number of service easements which are detailed on the constraints plan (appendix. 2).

PROPOSAL

Outline planning permission is sought for a residential development, initially seeking permission for 159 houses and for the detail of the access and internal spine road, the permission now only seeks approval in principle of residential development.

Matters of access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale are to be reserved matters which would require further approval. Notwithstanding this, outline permissions are required to indicatively show the general extents of the development to demonstrate what is proposed is achievable. In this regard the submission has detailed an indicative site layout (appendix. Ref. 3). The application site includes areas on both sides of the A67, with residential being proposed on the northern part and its associated Sustainable Urban Drainage Scheme (SUDS) on the southern side which is intended to provide an area which can be used for the surface water drainage of the development.

The indicative site layout shows a single highway access into the site taken from Urlay Nook Road along with a main spine road with several cul de sacs off. The proposal indicates the retention of an existing public footpath along the southern side of the area proposed for residential development.

The application has been supported by submissions of the following documents;

- Design and Access Statement

- Great Crested Newt Survey – On the SUDS area (Elif's Mill)
- Road Traffic Noise Impact Assessment
- Energy Statement
- Air Quality Impact Assessment (re: Road Traffic Pollution)
- Geophysical Survey
- Travel Plan
- Topographical Survey (existing levels plan)
- Indicative Proposed Site Plan
- Landscape Masterplan
- Arboricultural Method Statement
- Existing Tree Plan, Tree Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan
- Flood Risk Assessment
- Phase 1 Habitat Surveys

CONSULTATIONS

Consultations were notified and any comments received are summarised below:-

Councillor Phillip Dennis

I wish to object to the proposal on the following grounds:-

Environmental and Highways

There are several environmental reasons why this development should not go ahead:-
If this site is developed for housing significant effort must be made to ensure the site is well drained, currently this site holds a significant volume of water and releases it slowly into the surrounding water courses. By taking away this natural sponge we are affecting the flow rates and capacity of the local streams and waterways, this will increase the risk of flooding in other locations including the homes in the neighbouring residential development and adding to volume of water entering the river Tees at Yarm increasing the risk of flooding.

Historically there were several ponds on or around this site that over time have been filled in, a number of these are re-establishing themselves due to settlement and hold large populations of newts. The desk based surveys of this site fail to take these into account. I call on the planning authority to instigate an independent survey of the area during the relevant breeding cycle to establish how these creatures will be effected. Currently this site is also used by the newts as a highway between various locations depending on the seasons. By building on this site we will block their route and seriously damage this meta Population.

The air quality along the A67 Uraly Nook Road already reaches the minimum standard permitted by statute, several times a week. The addition of extra traffic onto this road from this development will reduce the air quality significantly further, this is caused by increasing the length of time car engines are operating at their least efficient at lower speeds. These times of higher air pollution match precisely the times of day traffic tails back from the A135 A67 junction. The officers at the technical services department of this authority have offered little if any positive hope on how to increase capacity and improve traffic flows at this junction, whilst ensuring the safety of motorists exiting Aislaby Road which is located 50 yards away. Aislaby Road serves a significant community, and is the only practical link to the many services they need.

The figures provided for air quality come from a measuring station located within the grounds of a school that holds over 1300 children and is passed by many other children on foot attending primary schools in the area. The pollutants in question have been linked to various serious ailments and if significant steps are not taken to reduce them, it will lead this authority to miss several key targets set nationally to improve the health of its residents.

There is also a prospect of an increase in traffic along Long Newton Lane, in order to reach the A66 without getting caught up in the traffic chaos that will develop further in Eaglescliffe. The access to Long Newton Lane is very close to the level crossing adjacent to this site. Long Newton Lane as the name suggests a poor rate country lane with many twists and turns unable to cope with an increase of traffic.

Sustainability.

This site is not sustainable for a number of reasons. It is a site that is located as far as it is possible to get in the ward of Eaglescliffe from the core area and many other significant employment locations. Its transport links are therefore inherently dependent on the use of private cars. There is no significant access to public transport on this site, the nearest rail station at Allens West is twenty minutes away by foot, and in itself necessitates a car journey to allow for reasonable access. The alternate station at Teesside Airport is served so infrequently as not worthy of mention. The bus service at this site is also very poor, as this initial proposal is for around 160 homes it will not generate sufficient passengers to justify any improvements to bus services of a viable nature to the transport providers.

The desk based study for services in this area is also clearly inadequate and assumptive in its recommendations; it takes into account a Post Office that closed some years previous. It does not take into account the significant lack of capacity in primary school places in the community or the distance to the nearest doctors surgery. Both of these will result in extra car journeys being undertaken adding to the volume of traffic into the junction mentioned earlier.

In summing up the community of Eaglescliffe has reached its capacity to grow and be healthy. Any section 106 agreement for this site will not be able to cover the uplift in capacity required in the highways in the area or schools. This authority needs to concentrate on delivering homes in the core area as outlined in the adopted Core Strategy, this remains the only strategy in place and should be promoted and supported vigorously.

This site currently is designated as employment land in support of Teesside airport, as such it is vitally important to keep this option available so that future sustainable industries be allowed to develop.

Councillor Mrs M Rigg

I am a ward councillor for Eaglescliffe ward and have been a resident of Eaglescliffe since 1978. I make these comments based on the evidence before me at present, though it is possible that if further evidence came to light I might change my views on some or all of the issues below.

- There are already severe traffic problems at peak times on this side of Eaglescliffe. When planning permission was granted some years ago for warehousing very close to this site mitigation measures at the Tesco roundabout were a condition on the approval. Housing is likely to produce at least as much traffic as the warehousing, especially as we know that in the past it has been stated that Hunters' Green estate has abnormally high traffic movements at the exit points. The warehousing approval is still current so the housing traffic must be assumed to be in addition to that already accounted for. What further mitigation measures are physically possible? We know that neither Yarm Bridge nor Yarm High St can be widened and it seems impossible to increase the speed of traffic travelling through Yarm so build-up of congestion will happen further and further into Eaglescliffe with every new housing development.
- Any further housing development is likely to put pressure on primary school places in Eaglescliffe. There are very few empty spaces in Eaglescliffe primary schools at present. The expansion at Junction Farm school will cater for the approved housing at Allen's West. Where will the children of a further 160 families attend school?
- Secondary provision in the area currently caters for children from Ingleby Barwick in significant numbers. If the proposed "Free School" at Ingleby Barwick does not go ahead where will the extra children from this housing development receive their secondary education?

- Further housing development means a need for expanded health services. The emphasis is increasingly on services being provided in communities rather than at hospitals. As far as I know there is no spare capacity at Eaglescliffe Medical Practice.
- I have a number of comments on the Transport Assessment:
 - 2.3: To the west the A67 does extend as far as the A66 at Bowes junction, but that is more than 8 km away. That distance is probably correct for the junction between the A67 and the A66 at Morton Palms, Darlington.
 - 2.8: Although Durham Lane primary school is nearer than Junction Farm primary school it is the latter which is being extended in order to accommodate children from the new development at Allen's West. Durham Lane is operating very close to capacity at present.
 - 2.9: The Post Office in Durham Lane closed some years ago and has not been replaced. Currently most of the Durham lane shops are closed owing to severe fire damage and there is no indication at present of any plans for rebuilding. The Tesco supermarket is not a "large" supermarket. It is small in the range of Tesco supermarkets. Although these shops are an acceptable walking distance for a reasonably fit person the walk back carrying shopping, up a slight slope, is unlikely to encourage people to leave the car at home when shopping.
 - 5.9: The westbound bus stop 300 metres away is served only by buses terminating at the roundabout near the SE corner of the Application Site. As stated above, there is no post office within 930m.
 - 5.18: The route for cyclists into Yarm involves crossing Yarm Bridge which does not have space for a cycle lane and is intimidating to many cyclists. The route out of Yarm is up a fairly steep hill, unlikely for all but the fittest cyclists. This is not really a viable destination for most cyclists.
 - 5.19: There is no evidence presented to support the assertion that the TRICS prediction for cycling would be exceeded. My view is that the combination of contours and congestion would be more likely to reduce the number of cycle trips at peak periods.
 - 5.22: Bus service 87A comes no nearer to the Application site than Long Newton and Elton and is therefore of no use to potential residents. Services 87, 87A & 87B do not operate at school-run times in term time or at all in the evenings. The nearest that Service 7 comes to the Application Site is Yarm Road and it does not operate evenings and Sundays. Service 7A operates only hourly each way, weekday evenings and Sunday daytimes. However, this paragraph omits mention of Service X6 (Eaglescliffe - Yarm - Ingleby Barwick - Middlesbrough), operating half-hourly weekdays (not evenings) along Durham Lane and Uray Nook Road (SW of the Tesco roundabout).

App. C: Service X6 no longer serves the stops in Uray Nook Road at Valley Drive. However, they and a relatively new stop W of Lartington Way are served by the 87B. Services 7 & 87B do not serve the stops at Egglecliffe School.

 - While I recognise that the layout is only indicative, and I have no desire to imply that the granting of approval is a foregone conclusion, If the outline approval is granted then the following should be considered at detail stage:
 - I hope that all dwellings will be designed not just to the building regulations applicable at the time of the detailed application, but will be able to take full benefit of passive heating and solar power.
 - There need to be binding arrangements for the prompt provision of an acceptable standard of Public Open Space and thereafter its maintenance and/or adoption. This must not wait until all houses are occupied.
 - That Open Space must be securely fenced from the A67, which is a 60 mph road W of the roundabout.
 - There should be adequate provision for children to play, and provision for the maintenance of such play space. There is nothing apparent on the indicative layout which would provide play space overlooked by housing to give safety and security to young children playing

there. The nearest designated play area is in Lingfield Drive; the nearest with play equipment (provided by the parish council) is in Amberley Way. Young children should not be expected to cross Uray Nook Rd to access play space.

- Consideration should be given to the provision of facilities for older children and teenagers, possibly in partnership with the council, in order to avoid the problems of low level ASB associated with lack of "hanging out" space or space for energetic activities.

Yarm Town Council

Object. The proposed development must not take place until the Infrastructure in and around the area is addressed. The roads cannot sustain any more traffic than we have on a day to day basis. Additional traffic will only exasperate an already serious situation and could cause gridlock. This site is outside the current limits of development and is a Greenfield site. The development would lead to serious drainage and flooding problems which would affect local becks and streams and farm land. There would also be significant detrimental disruption to the wildlife corridor. Additional homes would cause serious pressure on the existing infrastructure of Yarm and on Yarm High Street and local services would be under immense pressure to cope with additional housing demands.

Egglecliffe and Eaglescliffe Council

Egglecliffe & Eaglescliffe Council objects to this application on the grounds that there are issues that need to be addressed further; regardless of whether this particular proposal goes ahead all developments should contribute to the community infrastructure which at present will struggle to support 150 more houses:

- a) Traffic assessment - the Council is concerned by the cumulative impact that this type of development will have on the road infrastructure, cycle ways and bus network.
- b) School places - E&EC recognises that there will be provision for more primary school places associated with the Allen's West development; however the need for more secondary school places should also be taken into consideration.
- c) Consideration should be given to provision of more play spaces
- d) E&EC is concerned that further stress will be placed on health services in the area.

Longnewton Parish Council

Long Newton Parish Council strongly object to the application.

This application together with the already approved application to build over 800 dwellings at Allen's West will only exacerbate the already congested traffic system in the area.

The suggestion in the Travel Plan that the A66 will be easily accessed via Long Newton is of great concern to the Parish Council.

Long Newton Lane is a narrow country lane, which does not have a drainage system; it is prone to flooding even after one heavy shower water lies in large puddles at the side of the road, often joining in the middle. Over the years there have been road traffic accidents including fatalities. One particularly dangerous area is the stretch over Burnwood Bridge. In recent years since the Coatham Wood Community Forest was created there has also been an increase in horse riders using the lane to access the wood, as well as extra traffic. Long Newton Lane is also a popular route for cyclists.

Long Newton Lane cannot sustain any further volume of traffic which will result from this development and possibly from Hunters Green and other areas once the Allen's West development is complete. In one objection to this application an objector from Eaglescliffe stated that due to the possible traffic problems he and a lot of other residents option for accessing the A66 will be to drive through Long Newton.

The Parish Council would request that the supporting documents regarding traffic and the relationship this has on Long Newton Lane should be investigated and the full potential impact

assessed by SBC. The Council feel that the long term impact regarding extra traffic using Long Newton Lane and the village has not been established therefore if not already undertaken a traffic survey on the potential impact his scheme will have on the village should be performed.

Highways Agency

Thank you for your recent consultation dated 7 September 2012, in relation to the above planning application.

The Highways Agency (HA) has reviewed the Transport Assessment and Framework Travel Plan submitted by Fairhurst on behalf of Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd and West Raynham Developments Ltd, dated July 2012. A review has been undertaken and comments are provided below.

Transport Assessment

Trip Generation

The trip rates were previously agreed. However, following comments from Stockton-On-Tees Borough Council, an alternative method was suggested. This consists of calculating a more locally accurate trip rate using Grassholme Way residential development. Turning counts were undertaken and the alternative trip generation determined. However, arithmetic errors have been found in the table which result in fewer development trips. This has repercussions through all subsequent calculations and assessments. An amended table can be found below.

Table 1 Trip generation table

| | | AM Peak Hour 0745-0845 | | PM Peak Hour 1645-1745 | |
|---------------|--|---------------------------|------------|---------------------------|------------|
| | | Arrivals | Departures | Arrivals | Departures |
| Table in TA | Observed Trips | 16 | 92 | 61 | 41 |
| | Trip Rate (Based on 126 units in Grassholme Way) | 0.126 | 0.730 | 0.484 | 0.325 |
| | Development Trips (160 units) | 20 | 108 | 72 | 120 |
| | 2-way trips | 128 | | 192 | |
| Amended Table | Observed Trips | 16 | 92 | 61 | 41 |
| | Trip Rate (Based on 126 units in Grassholme Way) | 0.126 | 0.730 | 0.484 | 0.325 |
| | Development Trips (160 units) | 20 | 117 | 77 | 52 |
| | 2-way trips | 137 | | 129 | |

The total number of trips is slightly fewer than when TRICs was used. However, as this is based on a local development, it is considered acceptable.

Traffic Distribution and Assignment

During the scoping process JMP provided the Penelope distribution and compared it to Fairhurst's distribution using journey to work (JTW) data where they were asked to provide more justification for their distribution. What they have done however is state that they have used the JTW data for their distribution in the main body of the report (para. 7.4) but used the Penelope distribution in the traffic impact diagram in what presumably should be appendix G although appears to be in the wrong order. We have therefore extrapolated the information necessary for our review.

Traffic Growth Rates

The growth rates were previously agreed as part of the scoping process but the years have changed in the TA. Fairhurst is also using the obsolete TEMPRO dataset 6.1. Dataset 6.2 is the definitive version which should be used. Dataset 6.2 however usually results in lower growth rates and, having looked at the growth rates for this area, we can confirm that this is the case in this instance and therefore the growth rates that Fairhurst has used can be considered acceptable as it results in a robust assessment.

Committed Developments

The committed developments are considered acceptable.

Scope of Capacity Assessment

To identify the number of vehicles predicted to use each of the junctions and determine whether additional impact assessments are required, given the correct trip generation and distribution, we have produced the table below which shows the vehicle impact on the junctions along the A66 in the study area.

Table 2 Vehicle impact on junction within the study area

| Junction | Number of two-way trips through junction | |
|---|--|-------------------|
| | Morning peak hour | Evening peak hour |
| A66 / Mill Lane / Long Newton Lane | 18 | 17 |
| A66 / Durham Lane / Yarm Back Lane (Elton Interchange) | 78 | 74 |
| A66 / A135 Yarm Road | 1 | 2 |
| A66 / A135 Bowesfield Lane (South Stockton Link Road Junction) | 27 | 25 |

For the grade separated junctions, vehicle impact was only counted where the vehicles use the junction and not vehicles which continue along the mainline.

Based on the information in the table above, we would suggest that you would only require the Elton Interchange to be assessed.

Capacity Assessment for Elton Interchange

An assessment has been undertaken for the existing layout and the mitigation layout committed as part of the Allens West development. Fairhurst's also proposed further improvements so that the Uray Nook development trips result in no detrimental effect on the operation of the roundabout – however the junction still operates above capacity during the morning peak. Furthermore, these assessments were based on the incorrect trip generation.

The proposed mitigation works are summarised in Table 3 below.

Table 153 Elton interchange improvements

| Arm | Committed improvement as part of the Allens West development | Proposed improvement as part of Uray Nook development |
|-------------------|--|---|
| Northern Dumbell: | | |
| Durham Lane | Widen approach flare to include a short second lane | Increase approach flare by 3m |
| Darlington Road | Widen approach flare to include a short second lane | Increase approach flare by 2m |

| | | |
|-------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| Southern Dumbell: | | |
| Durham Lane | Widen approach flare to include a short second lane | Increase approach flare by 3m |

As the assessments were based on incorrect trip rates, it would be prudent to redo these to ensure that the proposed mitigation is still appropriate. In addition, prior to determination of the application, the proposed works would need to be subject to an independent road safety audit. However, as the dumbbell roundabout junction is not part of the HA network this would be a matter for the local authority.

Merge / Diverge Assessment

Merge / diverge assessments have been undertaken at the Elton interchange on the eastbound merge and westbound diverge. The committed development flows were not included in the assessment however it is not thought this would drastically alter the conclusion made in the TA. The results show that the addition of the development trips does not change the merge/diverge category and therefore no mitigation work is required.

TRAVEL PLAN

A Framework Travel Plan has been prepared to accompany the TA, which contains an accessibility assessment, multi-modal trip generation and a small number of potential measures. We would suggest that there is no reason why a full Travel Plan cannot be submitted at this stage and approved prior to determination of this application. This will demonstrate a firmer commitment to the promotion of sustainable modes of transport.

SUMMARY

Transport Assessment:

There are many errors throughout the Transport Assessment, however, it has been determined that this development is unlikely to have a detrimental effect on the SRN. Therefore please find attached a TR110 direction offering no objections to the above named development proposals.

I trust that my comments are clear, however, if you require anything further then please do not hesitate to contact me.

The Head of Technical Services (Stockton Borough Council)

General Summary

The Head of Technical Services has reviewed the information submitted by the applicant and has no objection to the development, subject the comments outlined in the report below.

Highway Comments

All comments are made taking into account that all matters for this development would be reserved, with the exception of the access and main spine road.

A number of additional sources of information have been provided since the application was initially submitted and this report summarises the findings of the review of all information submitted including:

- Review of development layout proposals based on submitted plans.
- Consideration of the Transport Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan submitted with the Planning application;
- Review of additional transport modelling of the A67 / Durham Lane / Tesco roundabout undertaken by the applicant; and
- The results of the transport modelling commissioned by Technical Services to assess the wider impact of this development and others locally on the highway network.

Development Layout

One vehicular access to the development is proposed. The access location is suitably located between the two existing access points to the residential development opposite (Grassholme Way). No obstructions should be placed within the visibility splay of the access to ensure vehicles could emerge from the site safely. An analysis of the operation of the junction shows that the site access and the A67 / Urray Nook Road roundabout could accommodate the development traffic with both junctions operating with plentiful spare capacity in future years.

The internal layout should be designed in accordance with Manual for Streets guidance. The route through the site should be a minimum of 4.8m wide (this could be reduced on the minor access routes) and a 2m wide footway should be provided on both sides of the carriageway. The applicant would need to enter into a Section 38 (S38) Agreement for the highway and footpaths which are to become highway maintainable at the public expense.

The previous layout proposed a POS to be delivered as a linear corridor following the line of the corridor of the A67. This proposed location would have brought the active ball games ('kick about' area) in close proximity (12 metres) to the carriageway of the A67. It was subsequently considered that there would be a risk to safety (both to the children playing on the 'kick about' area and to drivers from miss kicked balls entering the busy highway) and the applicant was asked to amend the proposal. A revised layout plan has been provided (81165-G7-SI-102-F) and the revised proposal is acceptable (see Open Space comments for more details).

An existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) runs through the proposed site and is incorporated within the open space to the south of the proposed residential properties. As the area is to be developed for residential development it is necessary to improve the condition of the path to provide an 'all weather path'. As the footway is within the area of open space the applicant has asked if this could be upgraded as part of the development construction works rather than the improvements being undertaken by the Highway Authority (at the developers' expense). This is acceptable subject to the works being implemented to the required specifications and being approved by the Council's Right of Way officer. It should be noted that granting of planning permission does not entitle the developer to obstruct the Public Right of Way and permission would need to be granted to temporarily close the route during improvement works. Enforcement action may be taken against any person who obstructs or damages a Public Right of Way.

Additional pedestrian and cycle links should be incorporated into the development layout to provide attractive pedestrian and cycle links which reduce the need for pedestrians to divert off their desire line. Community facilities are located to the south-east of the development and therefore the layout should consider how it could reduce pedestrian journey lengths between the community facilities and the site to encourage pedestrian trips and discourage short distance car trips. An additional crossing point (dropped kerbs and tactile paving) on Urray Nook Road would improve connections to the south-east and should be provided as part of a Section 278 Agreement with the Highway Authority. A crossing located between the proposed vehicular access to this development and Grassholme Way would strengthen pedestrian connections between the site and the surrounding area (see Travel Plan comments). The applicant is also asked to contribute towards cycleway improvements as outlined in the Travel Plan comments (detailed in later section of report).

The application is in outline; however details of car parking are indicated. Car parking should be provided for each dwelling in accordance with SBC parking standards. A total of 395 car parking spaces are proposed but it is not specified (or clear from the site layout plan) how these spaces would be delivered. Parking provision should be as follows:

Table 1: Parking Provision

| Number of Bedrooms | Standard | Proposed Dwellings | Spaces |
|--------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|--------|
| 4 bed | 3 spaces per dwelling | 79 | 237 |
| 3 bed | 2 spaces per dwelling | 61 | 122 |
| 2 bed | 2 spaces per dwelling | 19 | 38 |

Total 397

The standards require an additional 2 spaces compared to the 395 proposed - the applicant should confirm details of the proposed parking provision as part of any future reserved matters application.

Each in-curtilage parking space should be 6 metres in length to ensure that parked cars do not overhang the footway. In accordance with the parking standards, a garage can only be counted as a parking space if it meets the minimum internal dimensions of 6m x 3m.

Transport Assessment (TA)

Trip rates used in the TA have been derived from traffic surveys at the residential estate opposite and this methodology is considered to be acceptable. However, the calculation of trip forecasts, based on the trip rates, presented in the original TA was incorrect. The trip rates would result in 137 two-way trips in the AM peak hour and 129 two-way trips in the PM peak hour generated by the development (compared to 128 and 192 outlined in the TA report). Trips in the AM peak hour are therefore under-estimated in the TA assessment and trips in the PM peak hour are over-estimated.

The TA explains that the traffic distribution forecast has been based on journey to work data from the 2001 Census and the Highways Agency PENELOPE distribution which looks at the wider strategic network distribution. This was considered to be acceptable during pre-application discussions between the Council, Highways Agency and the applicant.

However, it was raised with the applicant that just using Census journey to work data misses the opportunity to use the actual traffic data collected from the residential estate opposite (Grassholme Way residential development). Traffic surveys at the two access points to the Grassholme residential development were conducted in November 2011 and the information derived from these surveys should have been given due consideration and informed the overall assessment. The traffic counts from these surveys have informed the development trip rates and therefore they should also have been reviewed to inform the development traffic assignment. The traffic surveys from the Grassholme Way development show the traffic distribution of vehicles accessing the estate during the peak hours as shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Traffic Distribution based on November 2011 Traffic Surveys at Grassholme Way

| | Total Inbound Distribution | | Total Outbound Distribution | | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|-------|-----------------------------|--------|-------|-----------|
| | South | North | South | North | South | North |
| AM Peak (07:45 - 08:45) | 16 | | 15 (94%) | 1 (6%) | 92 | 91 (99%) |
| PM Peak (16:45 - 17:45) | 61 | | 56 (92%) | 5 (8%) | 41 | 41 (100%) |

The traffic distribution from the surveys at Grassholme Way (Table 2) clearly show that in the AM and PM peak hour the majority of trips travel south towards the A67 / Urray Nook roundabout. The TA however, using the wider network strategic distributions, proposes the distributions at the development site access as outlined in Table 3.

Table 3: Traffic Distribution (to / from the site access) applied in TA

| | Inbound | | Outbound | |
|-------|---------|-------|----------|-------|
| | South | North | South | North |
| Daily | 87% | 13% | 87% | 13% |

The traffic distribution applied in the TA shows a greater proportion of traffic travelling to/from the north on the A67 and avoiding the A67 / Urray Nook Road roundabout. This distribution could under-estimate the forecast number of trips travelling towards Eaglescliffe / Yarm and is less robust than using the distribution assignment from the traffic counts.

The observed traffic assignment at the A67 / Urray Nook Road roundabout (from SBC traffic surveys in January 2012, supplied to inform the TA) is shown for the AM and PM peak period in Table 4.

Table 4: Traffic Assignment based on Traffic Surveys at A67 /Urray Nook Road Roundabout

| | From Urray Nook Rd North | | | From A67 west | | From A67 east |
|----|--------------------------|------|-------|---------------|-------|---------------|
| | East | West | North | East | North | West |
| AM | 94% | 6% | 1% | 99% | 14% | 86% |
| PM | 93% | 7% | 1% | 99% | 26% | 74% |

Table 5 shows the development traffic distribution at the roundabout that has been applied in the TA.

Table 5: Traffic Distribution for Development Traffic at the Roundabout applied in TA

| | From Urray Nook Rd North | | | From A67 west | | From A67 east |
|-------|--------------------------|------|-------|---------------|-------|---------------|
| | East | West | North | East | North | West |
| Daily | 72% | 15% | 15% | 0% | 72% | 0% |

The key assumption that would affect the wider network is the proportion of traffic that comes to / from the east and would travel through the A67 / Tesco roundabout. The observed data shows that currently 94 / 93% (AM and PM peak periods respectively) of traffic approaching the roundabout from Urray Nook Road travels east towards the Tesco roundabout. The TA assumes that only 72% of development traffic would make this trip. This is a result of the distributions at the access being based on Census data rather than observed data and assuming that a greater proportion travels north and never enters the Urray Nook Road / A67 roundabout. The actual data shows that whilst trips may be travelling to final destinations to the north, linked trips are being made to locations to the south (e.g. schools).

At the A67 / Durham Lane / Tesco roundabout the traffic assignment in the TA shows that from the A67, development traffic is only forecast to travel to / from the north on Durham Lane (57%) and to / from the south (15%) on the A67. The same distribution proportions are applied in both the AM and PM periods. The distribution of trips based on the SBC traffic surveys carried out in January 2012 (and supplied to inform the TA) are shown in Table 6.

Table 6: Traffic Distribution based Traffic Surveys at the A67 /Durham Lane Roundabout

| From | To | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------|-------------|-----------------------|
| | Durham Lane (north) | A67 (south) | A67 / Urray Nook Road |
| AM Period | | | |
| A67 / Urray Nook Road | 26% | 65% | |
| Durham Lane (north) | | | 14% |
| A67 (south) | | | 45% |
| PM Period | | | |
| A67 / Urray Nook Road | 24% | 64% | |
| Durham Lane (north) | | | 22% |
| A67 (south) | | | 42% |

The data in Table 6 further exemplifies that the assumption applied in the TA (that the majority of development traffic that travels through this junction would travel to / from Durham Lane to the north) is unrealistic. Current distributions show that 65 / 64% (AM and PM peak periods respectively) travel to the south towards Eaglescliffe and Yarm.

The results of the junction analysis in the TA at the A67 / Durham Lane / Tesco roundabout show that this junction currently experiences no issues in the base year with queues below 1 PCU (passenger car unit - units used in the model to represent vehicles) on each arm in the AM period and the highest RFC (ratio of flow to capacity) on the Durham Lane arm of 0.46 (RFC <1 is considered to be operating within capacity). This appears low for a junction which is generally known to be busy in the peak periods. In the future year scenarios, the RFC at the Durham Lane arm of the Tesco roundabout increases to 0.84 with the queue rising to 4.98 PCU's. Without this development (but with committed development), the queue is forecast to be 4.43 with an RFC of 0.82 in 2022. Therefore, it would appear that this proposed development does not significantly worsen the situation with committed developments accounting for the increase. However, given the concerns raised with the traffic distributions, the applicant was asked to undertake additional testing at this junction (see comments in 'Additional Modelling' section).

The distribution at the Durham Lane / A66 Elton interchange junction applied in the TA is based on Highways Agency data and the majority of traffic is assigned to the A66. This assignment is considered to be acceptable. The junction assessment however demonstrates that the interchange operates over-capacity in the future year, with and without the development. The applicant proposes measures to mitigate the impact but some arms of this junction would still operate over capacity, but this is attributed to the Allen's West development rather than this proposed development.

The proposed improvements to mitigate the impact of the traffic associated with this development are to increase flare widths at three of the roundabout approaches at Elton Interchange to increase capacity as follows (specified works):

- Northern dumbbell
- Durham Lane - increase approach flare by 3m
- Darlington Road - increase approach flare by 2m
- Southern dumbbell
- Increase approach flare by 3m

It should be noted that these improvements build upon committed improvements as part of the Allen's West development. The Allen's West committed improvements include widening the Yarm Back Lane and Darlington Road approaches to the northern roundabout of the dumbbell arrangement and also the Durham Lane approach to the southern roundabout. These committed improvements would be undertaken as part of a S278 Agreement with the Highway Authority and were estimated (when the Allen's West application was being reviewed) to cost approximately £63,000.

It would not be practical to bring forward the mitigation measures associated with this development (the specified works) before the committed improvements for the Allen's West development were implemented - the improvements would benefit from being delivered in a coordinated approach. However, it is possible that this development may come forward before the Allen's West development. It is therefore suggested that if upon occupation of the 20th property of this development the applicant has not entered into a S278 Agreement for the coordinated highways works required at the junction, the applicant should provide a Section 106 (S106) for the specified works. The S106 contribution would be for the amount applicable for the specified works that would be delivered as part of a S278 Agreement with the Highway Authority for the coordinated improvements at the interchange.

The TA does not identify the impact of the development on Yarm High Street. The applicant was advised during pre-application discussions about the congestion and parking concerns at Yarm High Street. It was noted that any increase in traffic would be considered material and would require mitigation. This has not been covered in the TA but it is anticipated that some future residents of the proposed development would use the facilities in Yarm as it is the nearest local service centre.

As the impact on Yarm High Street has not been demonstrated in the TA, the ratio derived from the Allen's West development has been applied. Based on 160 dwellings, the development is forecast to generate demand for an additional 7 spaces close to Yarm High Street (0.046 spaces per dwelling). In line with other local developments the applicant is therefore required to provide these spaces in a fully operational long-stay public car park to serve Yarm High Street prior to occupation of the 10th dwelling. If the applicant cannot deliver this car park then an alternative financial contribution towards a Local Authority operated public car park to serve Yarm High Street could be provided (£64,166). Should this alternative financial contribution be provided then this public car park must be fully operational prior to the occupation of the 10th dwelling.

Travel Plan

The Framework Travel Plan suggests that the volume of cyclist trips is low - an ideal target for the Travel Plan would be to address this, especially given that there are several employment opportunities within the desirable 5km distance from the site (Tesco, Yarm High Street, Durham Lane Industrial Estate, Nifco, Preston Farm Industrial Estate). Stockton Town Centre and Teesdale are also approximately 8km from this development, which is not beyond the distance travelled by cyclists to and from work.

The Framework Travel Plan highlights several local amenities which are within the reasonable walking distance of 2km and local residents may choose to cycle to these locations, especially children to the local schools. To assist in the use of cycling as a sustainable mode of transport from this site there is scope for improvements to the highway network. A new cycle link should be provided between Lartington Way and Lingfield Drive. This would provide a connection from the promoted on-road cycle routes (SBC walking and cycling map) through the Grassholme Way (Hunters Green) estate and Lingfield Drive to nearby schools and other community facilities. The provision of this link should be included in the S106 agreement and all external works should be installed in accordance with the SBC Design Guide standards. This would provide not only a linkage to Tesco, Durham Lane shops and local schools but also to the cycleway network along Yarm Road.

Pedestrian crossing facilities should be improved on Urlay Nook Road. An additional crossing point (dropped kerbs and tactile paving) on Urlay Nook Road would improve connections to the south-east and should be provided as part of the S278 Agreement with the Highway Authority. These improvements should link to the cycleway.

A full Travel Plan should include targets for both an increase in sustainable modes of transport as well as a reduction in single occupancy car trips. Baseline data could be established from surveying the neighbouring residential estate. In addition to the Travel Plan incentive of cycle vouchers, bus travel vouchers should also be included in the welcome pack.

The full Travel Plan should include details of the Travel Plan Coordinators (TPC) roles and responsibilities and timescales. An important action for the TPC for a residential Travel Plan would be to establish an exit strategy for the Travel Plan by enabling the residents to take the Travel Plan forward.

In summary therefore, should this application be considered for approval, a full Travel Plan must be submitted prior commencement of the development and must include:

- Contact details for the Travel Plan Coordinator;
- Timescales for the Travel Plan Coordinator to be in place;
- Modal split targets and measures to achieve these targets;
- Details of the welcome/marketing pack that is to be given to buyers/occupiers;

In accordance with other developments locally, the Heads of Terms of the S106 agreement should request £100 per dwelling be made available as a travel plan incentive payment. A total cost of £16,000 to be used towards sustainable travel incentives including the provision of discounted bus

or rail passes and cycle vouchers. The Travel Plan Coordinator should also devise a list of priorities for the remaining funding should all dwellings not take up this incentive.

A67 / Durham Lane / Tesco Roundabout - Additional Modelling

Additional sensitivity tests were carried out to assess the impact of the development at the A67/Tesco roundabout with different scenarios. There are issues with local congestion at this roundabout and therefore it was imperative that the assessment fully considered the different scenarios to provide a robust assessment of the impact of development traffic on this part of the highway network. Concerns were raised with regards to the original assessment in the TA (see above) that an error in trip forecasts and the methodology applied to calculate traffic distributions in the assessment could under-estimate the impact of development traffic at this junction. The applicant was therefore asked to review the assessment.

The first sensitivity tests at this junction considered the impact if all traffic from the development travelled through the junction in the AM peak and traffic from the development was distributed based on traffic surveys / turning proportions from the traffic model rather than the HA PENELOPE distribution (which looks at the wider strategic distribution). This scenario included all committed developments (and associated infrastructure improvements e.g. widening on the Durham Lane approach associated with the Allen's West development). The results indicate that the critical link is Durham Lane where the Ratio of Flow to Capacity (RFC) increases to 0.86. The queue of PCU's is 5.89. This is compared with a 2022 base forecast (without Uraly Nook but with committed development) of 0.82 with a queue of 4.43 PCUs. Thus the development would impact the junction but the impact is minimal and does not appear to significantly worsen the capacity issues.

The second sensitivity test removed the Allen's West development and associated infrastructure improvements (widening on Durham Lane approach) from the model. The results indicate that without the widening at the junction (and without the Allens West traffic) the RFC is 0.70 with a queue length of 2.29. The results demonstrate that the junction would operate within capacity without the Allen's West traffic and without widening on the Durham Lane approach.

The results of both sensitivity tests therefore show that the roundabout junction would operate within theoretical capacity in future years with both the development traffic and the traffic from other nearby developments.

Technical Services Transport Modelling

The TA included the agreed list of committed developments within the analysis. However, since the TA scoping study, additional planning applications within the local area have come forward. Whilst these are not yet committed, it is imperative that Stockton Council review the wider network impact of all these proposals.

Technical Services therefore commissioned the development of a micro-simulation model to assess the traffic impacts of this development and others locally. This site is one of a number of proposed developments within the Eaglescliffe and Yarm area which, if granted planning approval, could create a cumulative impact within Eaglescliffe and Yarm. Developing a transport model helps to provide a greater understanding into the impact of this development on the wider network and the effectiveness of proposed mitigation measures.

The modelling exercise started with a review of existing traffic patterns using information from the existing Tees Valley TRIPS Model. An AIMSUN micro-simulation transport model was then developed and the base model validated using existing traffic counts and journey time data. The latest journey time data was collected for Yarm High Street on 9th November 2012.

Committed development traffic was added to the base model to allow the assessment to review what the traffic conditions would be like once traffic associated with committed developments is added to the network. The committed developments included within the model were the residential developments at Tall Trees, Morley Carr, Allen's West and The Rings (Ingleby Barwick). Once the base model was validated and agreed, the development traffic was added to the model.

The results from the model, with development traffic, show that in the morning peak journey times through Yarm High Street (on the A67) would increase by 00:14 minutes southbound and 00:48 minutes northbound. In the evening peak, journey time increases are of a similar magnitude with a journey time increase of on 00:09 minutes southbound and 00:46 minutes northbound.

The results from the micro-simulation model show that the development would only marginally increase journey times through the network and there is a negligible deterioration due to the addition of traffic from the development. Subsequently, there is no evidence to object to the development on highway capacity grounds as the changes in journey times are not considered to be of significant adverse impact.

Highway Conclusion

The impact of this development on the local highway network has been assessed using different scenarios and different assessment tools and the outputs have shown the impact to be acceptable subject to mitigation. This is to be secured via S106 contributions, S278 agreements for works to the highway and a Travel Plan. These requirements are summarised as follows:

S278 works

- Junction improvements at the Durham Lane / A66 Elton Interchange. These works should be delivered along with the improvements associated with the Allen's West development. This development may however be implemented before the Allen's West development. In which case if upon occupation of the 20th property of this development the applicant has not entered into a S278 Agreement for the coordinated highways works (with the Allen's West improvements) at the junction, the applicant should provide a S106 for the specified works. The Section 106 contribution would be for the amount applicable for the specified works that would be delivered as part of a S278 Agreement with the Highway Authority; and
- An additional crossing point (dropped kerbs and tactile paving) to be installed at a suitable location on Uray Nook Road to facilitate pedestrian connections between the site and the areas to the east.

S106 Contributions

- The provision of 7 off-street car parking spaces close to Yarm High Street (or financial contribution - £64,166) equipped in accordance with the operational requirements of SBC. These car parking spaces must be fully operational as long-stay parking provision prior to the occupation of the 10th dwelling on the site;
- A contribution (£50,000) towards improvements to the existing cycle network to be provided between Lartington Way and Lingfield Drive. These works would be subject to a S278 Agreement and the contribution (£50,000) is therefore an estimate with the actual costs of the Highway Works to be paid by the applicant; and
- Provision of a £100 Travel Plan incentive per dwelling (£16,000).

Other Measures

- It is agreed that the Public Right of Way through the site could be upgraded by the developer but the works should be implemented to the required Council specifications and should be approved the Right of Way officer.

Landscape & Visual Comments

There are no landscape and visual objections to this development subject to the comments below.

Site Character

The site is presently undeveloped agricultural pasture land. It has a generally flat open character and lies within the development limits of west Stockton. A well-established hedge containing

largely hawthorn fringes the eastern and northern boundaries of the site and this varies in quality and density with some large gaps present. Although this hedge contains only one tree at its southern most starting point it is still a strong visual feature in the area when viewed from Uraly Nook Road.

The western site boundary is formed by a species poor remnant hedge of low visual quality broken up by many gaps. The southern site boundary touches the A67 and is framed by the tree belt planted on the northern boundary of The A67. These trees form a natural barrier to the A67 and are very important to reduce both noise and visual intrusion into the site from this road.

Two other hedges cross the site from east to west. The first crosses the centre of the site and is a species poor mainly hawthorn hedge with a number of gaps. The second hedge is located near the southern site boundary and is a mainly hawthorn hedge of varying heights again with many gaps and contains a mature tree at its eastern end. A public footpath runs from east to west just south of the southern-most hedge exiting the site at its south west corner.

Existing site trees and hedges

All the information contained within the tree report and associated documents is acceptable and no trees or hedges of high quality will be removed to carry out this development.

The site contains 6 no. specimen mature trees all of which are Ash contained with the site hedgerows. Another mature Ash tree is located on the southern edge of the site within the screen planting along the A67. A tree survey has been conducted which has revealed that 5 of these trees have substantial decay and should be felled. Of the remaining trees tree ref no.T8 located near the middle of the site is of low visual quality therefore it is not required to be retained within the development. The final tree, ref T4 is the one located on the southern site boundary and is a good quality tree that should not be damaged by any development. All trees that are required to be felled should be replaced within the open space on the estate as large forest species such as Ash, Lime and Oak.

The tree belt on the southern boundary (north of the A67) forms a dense group of trees that screen the A67 from the site. Parts of this tree belt could benefit from thinning to enhance their screening function.

The hedge (ref hedge 1) that's forms the northern and eastern site boundaries should be retained within any development as it is an important visual feature that frames this part of the site. All other hedges are species poor and contain numerous and sometimes lengthy gaps, but where the development allows their retention and improvement within any scheme would be welcomed. Tree protection and management should form part of a reserved matters application.

General layout

The layout indicated on plan SI-102 rev F is being considered as indicative only, but notwithstanding this there are a number of areas that would need addressing having undertaken a basic level of assessment as follows:

In order to improve the visual setting of the main site entrance on the eastern side of the layout more open landscaped space is required with dwellings set back and curving into the estate. The existing boundary hedge could be extended into the site to help facilitate this aspect of the design. The main highway into the estate provides little opportunity for landscape with many site frontages formed only from driveways with no planting or lawns. The highway should be opened out to allow specimen tree planting and front gardens thereby providing a good visual quality to the main road. This may require the substitution of building types to reduce and break up the extent of surfaced car parking which dominates the streetscape in the illustrative Masterplan.

A buffer area of planting is required on the western site boundary to screen the adjacent site where an industrial development has been approved subject to a S106 Agreement. The area for this buffer could also be used to provide a footpath, thereby achieving a circular route around the estate linking the areas of open space within the development.

The perimeter hedge to the eastern and northern site boundary would need to be managed as part of the wider open space within the site rather than being in the ownership of individuals as this is an important feature of the site that needs to be retained, matching the hedge on the estate opposite this site to the east. Garden boundaries would need to be revised to allow the hedge to be maintained and this could form part of a footpath links between the open spaces - see section on Open space within the development below.

It is anticipated that the potential number of units would need to be reduced to accommodate these landscape improvements relating to both the provision of the additional open space and improved visual quality. The general soft works specification and planting choices indicated on the Landscape Masterplan submitted with the first development plan are broadly acceptable and should be used on the final layout.

The landscape design concept for the estate laid out in the landscape chapter of the design and access statement will need to change to reflect the comments already provided notably relating to the open space provision and design of the site entrance road. These matters must be addressed as part of a reserved matters application.

Open space within the development

The council's Open Space, Recreation and Landscaping SPD (2010) calculator (for the provision of open space) indicates that 0.7 hectares of amenity green space is required within the development site. In accordance with this SPD, 0.6 hectares of this amenity green space should be provided as a whole piece of land roughly square in shape to enable maximum usage. Such an acceptable space has been provided in the south west corner of the site which conforms to the 0.6 hectares size requested with a usable area roughly square in shape. Planting buffers around the edge of the site should be designed to enhance the landscape quality of this area. This space also allows for an acceptable 30 lin m from the A67 highway to the south. The existing buffer tree planting on the northern edge of the A67 must be enhanced with new native tree planting to further screen the play area from this road allowing for the existing service easements - a low mix of thorny small trees such as blackthorn, hawthorn and holly should be used nearer the service easement to act as a physical barrier and thereby prevent 'trespass' on to the A67. The existing public right of way should be diverted as shown in the sketch plan below and surfaced to deter ball games in this area. No links must be provided from the site to the A67.

The longitudinal open space along the southern and south eastern site boundaries follows the service easement corridors and should be used for informal green corridor space utilising the route of the existing public footpath and enhancing the existing hedge and tree planting, allowing for buffer planting for the housing to the north. The buffer planting to the south of this area (on the northern boundary of the A67) should also be enhanced with new planting. All planting must allow for the location of the service easements in the area.

The open space on the northern site boundary should be planted to create a buffer for the surrounding houses and the road to the north (Urly Nook Road). All planting must allow for the location of the service easements in this area. This space is somewhat isolated from the other open space and footpath links should be provided to link all the open spaces in the development. In order to improve the housing layout there is the potential to allow some properties to be outward facing into the open spaces improving their relation with the open space and surrounding areas. A management scheme for the POS would be required to be agreed. This would be for perpetuity (25 years). Maintenance of the main areas of POS as land subject to Title Transfer may be considered by the Local Authority. Further details are noted in the Informative Section. All these matters must be addressed as part of a reserved matters application.

Old Ellif's Mill Site - SUDs Area

In the area south of the main site lies the old Ellif's Mill site which has been selected to locate a Surface Water Retention Basin as part of the developments sustainable drainage scheme as shown on plan dwg. Ref: 91483/2001 rev. C. The site has been identified in the Guidelines for the selection of Local Wildlife Sites (October 2011) in the Tees valley as suitable for a non-statutory designated Local Wildlife Site (LWS), which is due to the presence of a known population of Great Crested Newts.

The site is covered by a variety of habitats including semi improved neutral grass land to the north and a band of dense hawthorn scrub with limited groundcover across the middle of the site This gives way to woodland in the south of the site containing native Ash, Hawthorn and Willow alongside Nelly Burdon's Beck which forms the southern limits of the site. This woodland contains a reasonably diverse ground flora.

The actual Surface Water Retention Basin and associated pond S1 and S2 mainly cover the area of hawthorn scrub with the woodland to the south remaining although any approved outfall pipe to the beck coming through this area of woodland would have to avoid major damage to tree roots. The actual construction of the basin including earthworks and grading and its associated drainage would have a major impact on the site and the developer should demonstrate how this can be minimised. A full tree survey should also be carried out across the site demonstrating the protection measures required to ensure all those trees worthy of retention are retained within the scheme. The design of the basin should allow for the prevention of trespass notably from children. There are several ponds on site that support Great Crested Newts and it is understood that a Wildlife report in this respect has been submitted and new areas of habitat for Newts will be created as part of this development.

It is understood that the design of the Surface Water Retention Basin could change, but in principle it could be acceptable from a landscape and visual viewpoint through good design and sensitive execution. Any negative impacts to the existing habitat such as the loss of hawthorn scrub and areas of semi native neutral grass land can be minimised and mitigated against by the provision of new habitats within the new scheme.

Environmental Policy

Regarding the use of renewables a comprehensive energy report has been provided including estimates of energy use and carbon emissions but no conclusions are drawn as to the approach to meeting CS3. The details of carbon footprint are only partial in that emissions associated with occupancy have been estimated. Details of the proposed means of achieving carbon reduction are required as part of a reserved matters application.

Flood Risk Management

A flood risk assessment (FRA), dated October 2012, has been prepared by Fairhurst. The FRA concludes the following:

- The development site is wholly within Flood Zone 1, low probability, and the development type is deemed appropriate;
- The development site is currently undeveloped;
- The greenfield flow rate for the site has been calculated using the method set out in Institute of Hydrology Report 214 (IH124);
- The equivalent greenfield run-off rates range from 10.3 l/s for the 1 in 1 year storm, to 25.3 l/s for the 1 in 100 year storm;
- The site is underlain by low permeability soils, and as such infiltration drainage techniques will not be appropriate;
- Surface water will be discharged to watercourse or sewer at the greenfield run-off rate;
- Storage for surplus flows will need to be provided within the surface water drainage system. This storage could be a combination of green roofs, pervious pavements, geo-cellular tanks, ponds, swales or oversized pipes.

The FRA details two options for the disposal of surface water.

Option 1 involves a new outfall to Nelly Burdon's Beck, with a detention basin located to the west of the existing allotment gardens. A maximum volume for the detention basin is quoted on the Option 1 Drainage Strategy drawing as 1700m³, with a maximum depth of 700mm. The drawing notes that flows should be restricted to 25 l/s for the 1 in 100 year storm.

Nelly Burdon's Beck is an ordinary watercourse which has significant flooding issues downstream of the development, including internal property flooding therefore should this option be perused in any reserved matters application then the discharge rate to Nelly Burdon's Beck should be restricted to 2l/s/ha to help mitigate against this property flooding and should therefore be conditioned.

Option 2 involves the discharge of surface water to the Northumbrian Water (NW) public surface water sewer, located to the east of the development site. A note on the Option 2 Drainage Strategy drawing states that 1650m³ of storage would need to be provided, using a combination of geo-cellular storage, oversized pipes or pond. The drawing notes that flows should be restricted to 25 l/s for the 1 in 100 year storm.

The FRA contains calculations in support of the volumes quoted on the strategy. The calculations suggest that the volume required to store the 1 in 100 year storm (including an allowance for potential climate change), is 1925m³, with a maximum depth of 1m, and a peak discharge rate of 11.9 l/s. This does not fit with the discharge rates quoted in the main body of the report, or with the volumes quoted on the drawings. However, required volumes will be reduced with higher flow rates.

Due to discrepancies in the volumes quoted, using Micro Drainage WinDes software reviewed volumes quoted in the FRA a model with a pond/tank with a maximum depth of 700mm as quoted on the strategy drawing has been used, with flow rates restricted in accordance with the calculated greenfield rates.

The volumes have been assessed to ensure that the equivalent greenfield rates are not exceeded for all return periods up to the 1 in 100 year storm (i.e., maximum 10.3 l/s for the 1 in 1 year storm, and 25.3 l/s for the 1 in 100 year storm). The model, although simplistic, suggests if this option is perused in any reserved matters application then 2040m³ of storage would be required to ensure that greenfield rates are not exceeded for all return periods and should therefore be conditioned. A summary of potential SUDS measures that may be incorporated into the drainage scheme by the developer are noted in the Informative Section.

A number of objections have been raised regarding this application and the issue of waterlogging and flooding at and around the development site, with particular reference to the extreme event that occurred on 25th September 2012. However, development of the site, and the provision of a drainage system designed in accordance with current standards, is likely to alleviate flooding currently experienced at and around the development site.

An assessment of overland flow routes should be undertaken by the developer, to ensure that exceedance flows that are unable to enter the drainage system do not exacerbate any existing local flooding issues. This would need to be demonstrated as part of any reserved matters application and should therefore be conditioned.

The requirement for pre commencement development conditions are in addition to the Environment Agency & Northumbria Water Ltd Conditions referred to in the informative section. The developer must submit a full maintenance regime for the SUDS scheme, including the future maintenance proposals.

It should be noted that if you own land adjoining a watercourse, you have certain rights and responsibilities. In legal terms you are a 'riparian owner'. The red line boundary for the proposed development site adjoins Nelly Burdon's Beck and therefore the developer will become a riparian owner and will have certain rights and responsibilities. If the developer rents the land, it should be agreed with the owner who will manage these rights and responsibilities.

With regards to the following additional drawings submitted;

Drawing no. 91483/2001 rev C

Drawing no. 91483/2003

Nelly Burdon's Beck is an ordinary watercourse which has significant flooding issues downstream of the development, including internal property flooding therefore should this option be perused the discharge rate to Nelly Burdon's Beck must be restricted to 2 l/s/ha to help mitigate against this property flooding and should therefore be conditioned. The drainage drawings need to be updated to reflect the restricted discharge rate of 2 l/s/ha. The allowable discharge rates for events in 1 in 1 year, 1 in 30 year and 1 in 100 year must be restricted to 6.66 l/s and this may result in a requirement for additional capacity within the SUDS scheme due to the restricted discharge rate. The developer will need to update the proposed SUDS Scheme to reflect this.

Nelly Burdon's Beck is an ordinary watercourse and therefore the consent to discharge into this watercourse will be required from the Local Authority.

Children, Education and Social Care

At present this proposed development will impact directly on the admission zone set for Durham Lane Primary which is a single form entry school (i.e. it only has 30 places in its reception intake each year).

This development for approximately 158 homes will increase the demand for an additional 41 school places (as calculated using the standard Government Department calculation for a Primary School of 158×0.26) at the school.

This would create a problem for the Council as at present this school has very low surplus places at present at just over 3% of its Net Capacity of 210 school places across all year groups.

The Council would seek an education contribution of £328,640 (as calculated using the standard Government Department calculation for a Primary School $158 \times £2,080$) based on this development. We would seek to spend the monies to provide the number places as detailed at the most appropriate location to the address the needs of the development, taking into account the necessary constraints of building on the current school site whilst considering other opportunities to increase places at another school.

The cost of developing a school to accommodate this increase will need to be considered alongside other developments already agreed in this part of the borough and the most appropriate programme of payment(s) to enable the Council to maximise its school building stock and need for total new school places.

Private Sector Housing

The Private Sector Housing Division has no comments to make on this application.

Head of Housing

The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) 2012 has identified an annual affordable housing need in the borough of 560 units, with the majority of need being for smaller properties.

Core strategy Policy 8 (CS8) - Housing Mix and Affordable Housing Provision states: Affordable housing provision within a target range of 15 - 20% will be required on schemes of 15 dwellings or more and on development sites of 0.5 hectares or more.

Off site provision or financial contributions instead of on site provision may be made where the Council considers that there is robust evidence that the achievement of mixed communities is better serviced by making provision elsewhere.

We note from the Supporting Planning Statement submitted as part of this application provision is made for 15% affordable housing on site and would therefore accept the proposed percentage of 15% as it is in line with Council policy.

Based on the residential market site scheme of up to 160 units, 15% affordable housing would equate to 24 affordable units. The affordable units should be provided on site unless the developer

can provide robust evidence that the achievement of mixed communities is better serviced by making provision elsewhere.

The mix of affordable housing currently required to be provided is 30% intermediate and 70% rented tenures, and based on the SHMA 2012 a high priority will be accorded to the delivery of smaller houses and bungalows. At a borough wide level this equates to a split of 91% smaller 1/2 bedroom properties and 9% larger 3+ bedroom properties. Affordable housing provision with a tenure mix different from the standard target will only be acceptable where robust justification is provided. This must demonstrate either that provision at the target would make the development economically unviable or that the resultant tenure mix would be detrimental to the achievement of sustainable, mixed communities.

The Supporting Planning Statement submitted with the application proposes a 50:50 split of 2 and 3 bedroom houses: - 12 x 2 bedroom and 12 x 3 bedroom affordable properties. This is not comparable with the split advocated in the SHMA 2012 (91%:9%) and would therefore not address the need identified.

Housing Services acknowledges that the proposed scheme is predominantly made up of 3 bedroom and 4 bedroom dwellings and would therefore accept a reduced percentage of 2 bedroom affordable properties and an increased percentage of 3 bedroom affordable properties as the 15% affordable element of the development (based on the information submitted in the Supporting Planning Statement). The split of 75% 2 bedroom properties, as a minimum, and 25% 3 bedroom properties would be considered acceptable for the affordable housing element on this development.

This will contribute to addressing the identified housing need in the borough and the issues arising from the impending Welfare Reform Act.

Tenure based on 75% 2 bedroom properties and 25% 3 bedroom properties would then be split as follows:

| No. of units | Size | Tenure |
|--------------|-------|-------------------------------------|
| 18 Units | 2 bed | 13 x Rented 5 x Intermediate Tenure |
| 6 units | 3 bed | 4 x Rented 2 x Intermediate Tenure |

Space standards - the Council would expect all affordable housing units to comply with Homes and Communities Agency space/quality standards.

Environmental Health Unit

The details are satisfactory and I have no objections in approving outline planning permission for the above development. Subject to the following points being addressed.

A preliminary risk assessment must be completed and submitted for review to identify:

- all previous uses*
- potential contaminants associated with those uses*
a conceptual model of the site indicating sources, pathways and receptors
- potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at the site.*

Conditions which shall remain in place until the development has been completed are as follows:

- 1) Due to the nature and potential of surface water runoff via the drainage system from the Elementis process area (that runs through the proposed development), we shall require testing of surface soils where infrastructure of the Elementis drainage system is near to surface (i.e. inspection chambers) to include testing for heavy metals, Cr6 and Chromium III Cr3. Testing should also be carried out in landscaped areas and residential gardens in close proximity to the drainage system. The developer must ensure that access is given at all times by means of the wayleave granted to Elementis on this land.*

Any changes to these components require the express consent of the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: Contamination from historical and adjacent land uses has been identified; we would therefore request that sampling includes Total Cr, Cr6, Cr3

2) If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted, and obtained written approval from the Local Planning Authority for, a remediation strategy detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: Unexpected contamination may exist at the site which may pose a risk to human health and controlled waters.

SBC - Spatial Plans Manager

The supply of deliverable housing land

The Council has produced a report entitled '5 Year Deliverable Housing Supply Final Assessment: 2012 2017'. The Report concludes that the Borough has a supply of deliverable housing land of 4.08 years. The Council is not therefore able to demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing land. This is a significant material consideration in relation to this application.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

The NPPF states (paragraph 14) that at the heart of the NPPF is the presumption in favour of sustainable development which is a 'golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking'. For plan-making this includes local planning authorities positively seeking 'opportunities to meet the development needs of their area'. For decision-making it means:

- approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, granting permission unless:

- Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this

Framework taken as a whole; or

- Specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.

The NPPF provides that Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites." (para. 49).

The Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land. The policies in the development plan that deal with housing supply are therefore to be considered out of date and the proposal must be assessed in relation to the presumption in favour of sustainable development and the tests set out in NPPF paragraph 14, namely that the application should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF as a whole. Other policies in the development plan that are relevant to the application remain up-to-date and are referenced in these comments.

Achieving sustainable development and core planning principles

The NPPF states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. There are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental.

The NPPF states that a set of core land-use planning principles should underpin both plan-making and decision-making. Included in these principles are that planning should 'take account of the different roles and character of different areas, promoting the vitality of our main urban areas, protecting the Green Belts around them, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving rural communities within it'. No specific environmental harm has been identified as likely to arise from the proposal.

Also included in the core land use principles is 'Every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and development needs of an area, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth'. The proposal would assist in addressing the identified need for housing and thus fulfil both a social and an economic role.

Relationship to the adopted Development Plan

The development plan currently comprises the North East Regional Spatial Strategy, the Stockton-On-Tees Core Strategy LDD (March 2010), the saved policies of the Stockton-On-Tees Local Plan 1997, and the Tees Valley Joint Minerals and Waste LDD (September 2011). It should be noted that the Government intends to abolish regional spatial strategies but pending the enactment of a revocation order the Regional Spatial Strategy remains part of the development plan.

Sustainable transport and travel

The proposal will need to be assessed in relation to Core Strategy Policy 2 (CS2) Sustainable Transport and Travel.

Sustainable living and climate change

The proposal will need to be assessed in relation to Core Strategy Policy 3 (CS3) Sustainable Living and Climate Change. The 1st bullet point of point 8 of Policy CS3 states that proposals will: 'Make a positive contribution to the local area, by protecting and enhancing important environmental assets, biodiversity and geodiversity, responding positively to existing features of natural, historic, archaeological or local character, including hedges and trees, and including the provision of high quality public open space'. Whilst it is appreciated that the layout is indicative given that it is an outline application I would recommend that you consider whether the number of dwellings can be achieved cognisant with the provision of high quality public space of the required quantity. I would further point out that one of the core planning principles of the NPPF is 'always seek to secure a high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings

It is also relevant in the context of residential amenity that the Council has resolved to grant planning permission, subject to the signing of a Section 106 agreement, for a Revised Outline application for an industrial estate comprising the erection of B2 and B8 use class units and associated means of access on land at Urlay Nook Road. It would appear unlikely that the Section 106 agreement will be signed. However, unless this is confirmed it remains a material consideration in relation to this application.

Housing mix and affordable housing provision

Point 5 of Core Strategy Policy 8 (CS8) states 'Affordable housing provision within a target range of 15-20% will be required on schemes of 15 dwellings or more and on development sites of 0.5 hectares or more'. The applicant has submitted a supporting planning statement that offers 15% affordable housing provision. Recent government advice to apply affordable housing targets with flexibility in order to facilitate delivery is also noted. The Council is committed to achieving housing delivery and Policy CS8 acknowledges this by allowing scope for provision at a rate lower than the standard target where robust justification is provided. The standard target is 'within a target range of 15 to 20%.'

In applying this policy the Council has pursued a pragmatic approach based on site characteristics. The site is a greenfield site with no known exceptional site development costs in an area attractive to the market. In these circumstances the relevant target within the target range is 20%. This is the

contribution recently agreed in relation to the Morley Carr Farm application (also a greenfield site in an area attractive to the market) and it is important to apply the policy consistently.

The applicant has not provided any justification as to why 20% affordable housing is not being offered. It is noted that the Council's Housing Strategy team have commented that 15% is in line with Council policy. However, this is a planning policy issue.

The 2012 Tees Valley Strategic Housing Market Assessment (TVSHMA) identifies an annual affordable housing requirement of 560 dwellings for the borough of Stockton-on-Tees. This includes an annual requirement for the Yarm, Preston and Eaglescliffe housing sub-division of 97 dwellings. Given that the average annual housing requirement for the borough for dwellings of all tenure types is 555 dwellings it is clearly not realistic to meet the TVSHMA requirement in full and this is recognised in the annual affordable housing targets set by Policy CS8. However, the policy also states that the targets are minimums. It will therefore be a significant contribution to the annual target if applicants for this type of site are consistently required to provide affordable housing provision at the higher end of the target rate of 20%. However, the applicant has yet to make a clear commitment to provide 20% affordable housing or provide justification for offering provision at a lower rate.

Open space provision

Point 3 of Core Strategy Policy 6 (CS6) states that the quantity and quality of open space, sport and recreation facilities throughout the Borough will be protected and enhanced. Guidance on standards will be set out as part of the

Open Space, Recreation and Landscaping SPD.

Open Space will be required on site in line with the provisions of the Open Space, Recreation and Landscaping SPD. This indicates that approx. 0.75 Ha of amenity green space should be provided on site, with an additional standard charge which will take into account this and any other open space provided on site.

Amenity Green space is considered to be integral to the design quality of new development and has a minimum acceptable size of 0.6Ha for a single area. The requirement for amenity space excludes land set aside purely to provide an attractive setting and/or landscape function, which would normally be provided in addition to the required amenity green space.

The application includes 1.3Ha of open space within the red boundary. However, the Design and Access report states the larger public open spaces retain existing Public Rights of Way, vegetation including hedges and trees and supplement these features with wildflower areas and native hedge, tree and woodland buffer planting. This type of space is considered to be Green Corridor, which is opportunity led due to the location of a watercourse or footpath. The open space provided as Green Corridors cannot be considered towards meeting the requirement of Amenity Green space on site, however, the additional open space provision can be considered when negotiating the additional standard charge for the development.

The design of development and any on site open space should follow the guidelines set out within the Open Space, Recreation and Landscaping SPD and the Sustainable Design Guide SPD.

Relationship to the Core Strategy Review of Housing Options process

The Council has recognised that because of changing economic circumstances and the reductions in the public funding available to support regeneration schemes, the housing strategy in the adopted Core Strategy will not deliver the housing requirement for the Borough. Although the Council retains very strong regeneration aspirations, it is firmly committed to achieving the housing requirement for the Borough to 2029. For this reason the Council decided to undertake a review of housing options. This review encompasses the housing spatial strategy and the housing distribution and phasing policy as well as aspects of the housing mix and affordable housing provision policy. This process formally began with the Core Strategy Review of Housing - Issues and Options, public consultation held over a 12 week period in summer 2011.

Draft Preferred Options Housing Allocations

The results of the Core Strategy Review of Housing have been incorporated into the Regeneration and Environment Local Development Document Preferred Options draft. This document was formally consulted on over an 8 week period in summer/autumn 2012. The application site is identified as a part of a draft allocation. It is therefore, supported as such by professional officer opinion. However, this does not reduce in any way the weight that the Council attaches to any significant policy or environmental constraints that are relevant to these sites. The Council attaches great weight to ensuring that the process of site allocation is an open, transparent and participatory one which allows full opportunity for comment to the wider public and other stakeholders. The preferred options stage cannot therefore, be legitimately viewed merely as a precursor to an automatic subsequent confirmation or endorsement of any draft policy including any draft site allocation policy.

There is clearly a tension between the site being released for housing development now and the core principle in the NPPF that states that planning should be genuinely plan-led. However, recent decisions by the Secretary of State suggest that this principle is being accorded less weight than the need to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites. This is notwithstanding the fact that the Core Strategy Review is housing-delivery led and the Council is seeking to put in place a five year supply of deliverable housing sites as quickly as possible through a plan-led approach. Housing Need and Demand

One of the NPPF core planning principles includes making every effort to 'identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth.' The 1st bullet point of NPPF paragraph 47 states that to boost significantly the supply of housing local plans should 'use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in this Framework, including identifying key sites which are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period'. As previously referenced the Council is not currently able to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites and the TVSHMA identifies an annual deficit in the provision of affordable housing of 560 homes. It is a benefit of this application that it would contribute to the provision of market and affordable housing. This is not withstanding the Council's preference for addressing these issues through a plan-led approach.

The quality of the agricultural land

Paragraph 112 of the NPPF states 'Local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality.'

Best and most versatile agricultural land is defined as land in grades 1, 2 and 3a of the Agricultural Land Classification (ALC). It needs to be taken into account alongside other sustainability considerations when assessing planning applications. Local site specific surveys were undertaken in 1988 and 1999 but did not include the application site.

The Natural England Strategic Map Information Sheet states that where post 1988 data is available, this is the most reliable source of information on land quality because it is based on field survey work. The Strategic Map Information Sheet goes on to state that site specific studies including new Agricultural Land Classification field surveys will be needed to obtain definitive information on ALC grades for individual sites.

The application site is provisionally grade 3 on the pre 1988 maps but this cannot be relied on as these maps are not sufficiently accurate for use in the assessment of individual development sites and should not be used other than as general guidance.

Summarising comments

The proposal needs to be assessed in relation to the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Relevant Core Strategy policies include Policy CS2 - Sustainable Transport and Travel, Policy CS3 - Sustainable Living and Climate Change, Policy CS6 - Community Facilities and Policy CS8 - Housing Mix and Affordable Housing Provision. Regarding Policy CS2, I would point out that one of the core planning principles of the NPPF is 'always seek a high quality design and good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings'. It is very important to assess whether the proposed quantum of development is consistent with this, particularly regarding the provision of high quality open space at the quantum line with the provisions of the Open Space, Recreation and Landscaping SPD. Also relevant will be whether or not the application meets the affordable housing requirements set out in Policy CS8 or provides robust justification if offering provision at a rate less than 20%. It is clearly a benefit of the proposal that it would boost significantly the supply of housing and responds positively to an opportunity for growth. However, it is important to balance this opportunity against the considerations referenced in these comments to consider whether the proposal represents sustainable development.

The Environment Agency

Revised comments.

We have no objections to the proposal as submitted, and consider the proposed development will be acceptable providing the following CONDITION is imposed on any grant of planning permission:

Development shall not begin until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed. The scheme shall also include:

A definitive strategy as outlined in section 4.3 of the submitted Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) (D/I/D/91483/01). This should focus on EITHER attenuation ponds at Eliffs Mill with discharge into the ordinary watercourse OR discharge into NWL sewer.

The discharge rates and volume of storage of the attenuation pond design at Eliffs Mill are as specified in drawing 91483/2001/C.

Reason: To prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage of/disposal of surface water from the site

Please note that the condition in relation to the FRA set out in our previous letter dated 19 September 2012 (ref: NA/108385/01-L1) is no longer applicable and has been replaced by the above condition. However, the advice in relation to biodiversity and the discharge of foul sewage still applies: detailed below;

Disposal of Foul Sewage

An acceptable method of foul drainage disposal would be connection to the foul sewer. The Sewerage Undertaker should be consulted by the Local Planning Authority and be requested to demonstrate that the sewerage and sewage disposal systems serving the development have sufficient capacity to accommodate the additional flows, generated as a result of the development, without causing pollution.

Biodiversity - Information/Advice to Applicant

The site may contain Great Crested Newts and/or Otters and/or their habitat. These or their habitat are formally protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, and Natural England approval will be required. We therefore recommend following the method statements outlined within the Extended Phase 1 Habitat Report provided by Eco-north October 2011.

Northumbrian Water Limited

I note the additional information submitted by the applicant shows the applicant's intention to dispose of surface water directly into a watercourse using a SUDS pond and no surface water will enter the public sewer. NWL has no issues to raise on this topic as long as the additional information plan- SUDS scheme is approved with the application detailing this information.

I also refer you to NWLs previous comments regarding the protection of the high pressure water main that crosses the site. NWL wish for these comments to still stand on this application and that any approval is given with the condition previously requested.

Previous comments re: water main;

The site is crossed by 15" (375mm) Trunk Water Main. Easement is shown and a condition is recommended as follows;

Condition

Development shall not commence until a detailed scheme for the accurate location, protection of and access to its apparatus during construction and afterwards of the development hereby approved has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Northumbrian Water. Thereafter the development shall take place in accordance with the approved details.

Reason

Northumbrian Water's apparatus is located in the development site. We require unrestricted access to this apparatus at all times and will not permit the erection of buildings or structures over or within 6m to it. Any proposed crossing, landscaping, parking areas or tree planting must comply with the standard Northumbrian Water guidelines. Diversion or relocation of the apparatus may be possible at the applicant's full cost. The Developer should contact Peter Heppell Advisor (tel. 0191 419 6613) to agree the detailed scheme for the accurate location, protection of and access to its apparatus in accordance with Northumbrian Water's standard easement conditions.

Tees Archaeology

Initial comments

The application is accompanied by an archaeological desk based assessment and field evaluation in the form of a geomagnetic survey. Both reports are well produced and I am happy to recommend them to the planning authority.

The geophysical survey identified a number of anomalies consistent with archaeological features. The nature and date of these features is currently unknown. I appreciate the effort which the developer has taken to examine the archaeological potential of the site but I would recommend that the results of the geomagnetic survey are tested by archaeological trial trenching to establish their significance and to allow the impact of the development on this significance to be properly assessed. This is in line with the advice given in the National Planning Policy Framework (para. 128).

Further comments following Trial Trenching

Thank you for the consultation on this planning application which now includes a report on archaeological trial trenching that took place earlier in the year. This confirms the results of the earlier interim report that an Iron Age and Romano-British settlement survives in a discrete area of the site.

I previously made a planning response dated 6th March 2013 (which are on the web-portal) which remain relevant and I would be grateful if these could be considered as the response to this re-consultation.

Natural England

The initial comments from Natural England were amended following the submission of further information (Great crested Newt – Risk Assessment and Protected Species Management Plan v2). Their latest response and remaining relevant comments from their initial response is summarised as follows;

This proposal does not appear to affect any statutorily protected sites or landscapes, or have significant impacts on the conservation of soils, nor is the proposal EIA development. It appears that Natural England has been consulted on this proposal to offer advice on the impact on a protected species.

Natural England have assessed the survey for badgers, barn owls and breeding birds, water voles, wide spread reptiles or white clawed crayfish. These are all species protected by domestic legislation and you should use our standing advice to assess the impact on these species.

The protected species survey has identified that Great crested Newts, a European protected species may be affected by this application. The application is not within / close to a SSSI or SAC notified for great crested newts, but is in close proximity to Ellif's Mill and Elementis Local Sites, which are notified for their populations of this species.

Natural England have followed their standing advice, based on the submission information, and consider that the scale of impact on Great Crested Newts is low and that mitigation will;

- Ensure no net loss of habitat in terms of quantity and quality,
- Maintain habitat links,
- Secure long term management of the site for the benefit of newts.

They determined that when the mitigation is taken into account, the proposals comply with Article 12(1) or would be licensable and as such permission may be granted subject to a condition requiring a detailed mitigation and monitoring strategy for Great Crested Newts.

Tees Valley Wildlife Trust

The Wildlife Trust is satisfied that the Assessment and Species Protection Plan addresses the issues that we raised in our letter of objection to the application made on 28th September 2012. It provides a full and fair assessment of existing populations of great crested newt in the vicinity of the development site and how these might interact with the land proposed for housing. It also addresses the legal and conservation management issues for the part of the application site which is proposed for a Sustainable Urban Drainage Scheme. On this basis the Trust wishes to withdraw its objection to the application.

Stockton Police Station - Eddie Lincoln

If the development is to proceed consideration should be given to applying Secured By Design principles. Good design must be the aim of all those involved in the development process and should be encouraged everywhere. Current government planning policy strongly supports this principle and makes clear that community safety is an integral part of the design agenda. Should you wish to apply for Secured by Design certification please complete an application and checklist form, which can be obtained from www.securedbydesign.com Secured by Design SBD New Homes Application Form. Please forward to me at the earliest opportunity

Sport England

Sport England do not wish to comment on this particular application.

Campaign To Protection Rural England - Stockton District

CPRE wish to object on the following grounds:-

- The loss of potentially vital agricultural land and open green space
- The failure to develop brownfield land before greenfield land
- Confusion and conflict over forecasted housing requirement
- The impact of new housing in this area on the surrounding highway infrastructure
- Cumulative increase in air pollution in the Yarm and Eaglescliffe area
- Potential ground pollution from already aged underground pipelines originating from nearby chemical plant
- Noise pollution
- Impact on protected species

1) Loss of green space: The continued loss of agricultural land and green space is a matter of considerable concern. The advent of climate change is already having an impact on the production of essential foodstuffs around the world. At some time in the future it is anticipated the United Kingdom will have to be self-sufficient in the production of its own essential foodstuffs. The present planning system is proclaiming the need for 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. The accepted definition of sustainability within the planning process is 'development which meets the need of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs'. The present profligate disposal of agricultural land and green space at the beck and call of developers is certainly in contravention of this definition. Once its gone, its gone!

2) Brownfield first preference: The NPPF (Core planning principles, para 17) has advised Local Planning Authorities to 'encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land) " . Stockton has considerable swathes of previously developed land available to fulfil a large proportion of the Council's housing forecast over the next 15 years. The Council also has a large number of extant planning permissions from which it will eventually attract a New Homes Bonus per completed and occupied home. In the absence of Government funding to assist the clearance and decontamination of brownfield land it is suggested the New Homes Bonus be used to kick-start the clean-up of these brownfield sites.

It would appear that Stockton Council is allowing developers to dictate their preferred location of building sites i.e. cheap to build on greenfield sites rather than 'troublesome' brownfield sites. Stockton Council should immediately commence adopting the NPPF advice to encourage development of the brownfield sites in preference to using greenfield sites.

3) Confusing and conflicting housing forecast figures: It has already been observed by CPRE (and reported directly to the Council Spatial Planning officers) that the projected housing forecast figures shown in the LDF Review Preferred Options do not conform with Stockton Council's own statement in 2011 - that there was a significant overall surplus of supply over demand for houses per se in the Yarm, Eaglescliffe and Preston area.

With such miscalculations arising it is possible that unnecessary house-building could take place, based on a knee-jerk reaction to the Government's imposition of a 'presumption to build' and the further unreasonable imposition of the need to include a 5% extra buffer on the Council's housing forecast figures. CPRE regard this Uraly Nook application and a potential Council approval as resultant from this undue Government pressure.

4) Cumulative impact on the highway infrastructure of Yarm, Eaglescliffe and Preston : The existing road system serving the above mentioned areas and roads into the nearby conurbations - offering employment, health facilities and education - is already fragile. The cumulative increase of further unnecessary housing estates in these areas could only exacerbate the present situation.

Until a new bridge is built over the River Tees near Yarm provided with improved supporting subsidiary roads the traffic problems are considered insoluble.

5) Cumulative impact of air pollution:

As in item 4) the overloaded road system serving these areas is already presently contributing to excess air pollution. Northumbrian Water in their report stated that the 159 houses would create an increase in traffic flow by 69.7% on the Urlay Nook Road (Section 4.2 Traffic Report). It is not an unfair assumption that motor vehicle-caused air pollution would increase by a similar amount. Also an increase in traffic caused by this estate and other new housing estates in Yarm and Eaglescliffe will considerably add to the air pollution already existing on the often-congested main roads through each township.

6) Ground Pollution and potential chemical contamination: The proposed site is adjacent to the Elementis Chromium factory which has an outlet pipe running under the A67 and into the Ellif's Mills area. There are also underground pipes from Allens West carrying hazardous waste. A pipe from Allens West recently collapsed, also causing the collapse of the Elementis Chromium outlet pipe, creating a degree of ground pollution. Investigation with cameras in the pipe showed considerable corrosion, placing into doubt the long-term integrity of such underground pipes. A future collapse of any of these pipelines could compromise the area of both the proposed housing estate and the natural surroundings adjacent to the Ellif's Mill pond which supports a number of Greater Crested Newts.

7) Noise pollution: Examining the site plan it would appear the nearby Police Training Centre is likely to be a source of noise pollution affecting the amenities of the proposed housing estate. The centre is the source of random controlled explosions and discharging firearms. It has also been noted helicopters have landed within the curtilage of the Centre during training exercises. Two issues arise from helicopter usage so near to housing'

a) Noise pollution and b) the safety of nearby residents in the event of an aircraft incident.

8) Impact on protected species: Greater Crested Newts have been observed on the land around the proposed site and in the nearby Ellif's Mills pond (a distance of 200 metres from the site). It is likely the Newts use the nearby pond for breeding purposes. Contrary to general public understanding Newts spend only a small amount of their life time actually in the water. Most of the time they are living within the open grass lands and vegetation around the pond area. The Newts have a mobility radius of up to half a kilometre from their breeding pond. The proposed housing estate will infringe upon this radius. A large colony of Greater Crested Newts has also been observed within the Elementis Ecology Park, a distance of just under half a kilometre from the Ellifs Park pond. The Council will be aware of the full protection awarded to Greater Crested Newts by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.

The Campaign for the Protection of Rural England request Stockton Borough Council to refuse this Outline application for the above reasons.

PUBLICITY

Neighbours were notified initially followed by a re-consultation due to the submission of revised details. A total of 381 communications were received, 378 objecting and 3 making comment. Due to the extent of correspondence the following summarises the comments made although full versions are available to view on line or in the planning office.

Comments have been received from the following;

Mrs B Clare, 48 Grisedale Crescent Egglecliffe
Mr Shane Sellers, 2 Egglecliffe Court Egglecliffe
Ms Sandra McLeay, 32 Carew Close Yarm
Mrs Y Smith, 4 Springfield Close Egglecliffe
Mr Joseph Darbyshire, 32 Carew Close Yarm

Simon Fletcher, 5 Grassholme Way Egglecliffe
T,J & Harry Ripley, 3 Middleton Close Egglecliffe
Mr I Johansson, 1 Grassholme Way Egglecliffe
Richard Foster, 2 Middleton Close Egglecliffe
Melissa Whyte, 14 Cotherstone Close Egglecliffe

Mr A Baines, 8 Cotherstone Close Eaglescliffe
Michael Dixon, 11 Middleton Close Eaglescliffe
Jonathan Danby, 18 Langdon Way Eaglescliffe
Mrs B Sowerby, 112 Meadowfield Dr Eaglescliffe
Mrs J Martin, Swaledale House Darlington Road
Long Newton
Mr David Raper, 10 Rushmere Heath Eaglescliffe
Mr Steven Peacock, 24 Langdon Way Eaglescliffe
Mrs Gillian Elgie, 1 Egglestone Drive Eaglescliffe
Mrs J Phillips, 20 Cotherstone Close Eaglescliffe
Mr D Howard, 10 Egglestone Drive Eaglescliffe
Mr J Mcmanus, 8 Egglestone Drive Eaglescliffe
Mrs J Woollaston, 5 Egglestone Drive Eaglescliffe
N Stirland, 11 Cotherstone Close Eaglescliffe
Mrs Judith Simpson, 3 Langdon Way Eaglescliffe
Dr A Kaabneh, 19 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe
Mr R Sawdon, 32 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe
Miss K Johnson, 28 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe
Mrs Liz Yule, 9 Middleton Close Eaglescliffe
Sara Pearson, 14 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe
Mr S Bedder, 10 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe
Mrs S Summerfield, 5 Middleton Ce Eaglescliffe
Mr Gary Hughes, 4 Middleton Close Eaglescliffe
Graham Midgley, 4 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe
Mr Peter Savage, 6 Middleton Close Eaglescliffe
Mrs Kathryn Kirby, 7 Newbiggin Close Eaglescliffe
George Kipling, 5 Newbiggin Close Eaglescliffe
A & J Ellis, 4 Newbiggin Close Eaglescliffe
A & K Sandys, 3 Newbiggin Close Eaglescliffe
John Graham, 1 Newbiggin Close Eaglescliffe,
Mrs H Blackett, 62 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe
Mr Robert Wilde, 58 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe
Mr DUnderwood, 54 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe
Ian Robinson, 44 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe
Mrs J Davison, 42 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe
Mr Ian Hunter, 31 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe
Mrs D Robinson, 10 Yeadon Walk Middleton St
George
Mrs L West, 27 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe
C And S McNiff, 6 Ettersgill Close Eaglescliffe
M Hodgekinson, 4 Langdon Way Eaglescliffe
Mike Farbridge, 6 Langdon Way Eaglescliffe
Mrs Audrey Carr, 11 Coatham Vale Eaglescliffe
Mr Shamas Sadieq, 51 Chaldron Way Eaglescliffe
Mr T Azad, Town End Farm Darlington Rd Elton
Mrs J Azad, Town End Farm Darlington Rd Elton
Mrs Shirley Miller, 26 Birchfield Drive Eaglescliffe
Mrs Judith White, 7 Diligence Way Eaglescliffe
Mr A Davey, 74 Greenfield Drive Eaglescliffe
Mrs J Watling, 37 Mayfield Crescent Eaglescliffe
Mr J topping, 39 Greenfield Drive Eaglescliffe
Mr Ian Smith, 4 Springfield Close Eaglescliffe
J Nichol, 19 Chillingham Drive, Chester le Street
S Robson, 36 Wisteria Gardens South Shields
Mr Chris Wilson, 29 Shearwater Lane Norton
Miss K Savage, 24 Burnmoor Drive Eaglescliffe
Mr A Weir, 7 Valley Gardens Eaglescliffe
Mrs K Thompson, 18 Valley Gardens Eaglescliffe
Mr T Charles Mackfall, 1 The Green Eggescliffe
Miss N Hartley, 3 Burn Wood Court Long Newton
Mr R Blackett, 7 Parkstone Place Eaglescliffe
Mr Gary Combes, 17 Jacklin Walk Eaglescliffe
Mr Bruce Merrick, 6 Rutherglen Walk Eaglescliffe

Ms M Atkinson, 11 Birchfield Drive Eaglescliffe
Miss J Lambert, 4 Swinburne Road Eaglescliffe
Mrs Maria Tyson, 1 Poplar Court Yarm
Mr D Mcmenamin, 18 Swinburne Rd Eaglescliffe
J and T Ripley, 3 Middleton Close Eaglescliffe
Mrs A Marshall, The Gables, Urlay Nook Road
Eaglescliffe
Miss Anqi Shen, 21 Wear Crescent Eaglescliffe
Mrs Claire Hardy, 63 Lingfield Drive Eaglescliffe
Mrs J A. Nichol, 19 Chillingham Drive Chester le
Street
Mrs P Neave, 5 Springfield Close Eaglescliffe
Mrs Carol Bowler, 12 Formby Walk Eaglescliffe
Mrs Sally Wake, 598 Yarm Road Eaglescliffe
Mrs A Smith, 89 Mayfield Crescent Eaglescliffe
Mr C Harrison, The Lodge Kirklevington Grange
Mr Ian Betts, 39 Grisedale Crescent Eggescliffe
Mrs E Heal-Betts, 39 Grisedale Cres Eggescliffe
Ms D Lunn, The Lodge Kirklevington Grange
Mr Robert Reeves, 12 Stevenson Close Yarm
Mr Swapan K Kole, 37 Coatham Vale Eaglescliffe
Matt Dunn, 42 Lingfield Drive Eaglescliffe
Mr David McCormack, 9 Troutsdale Close Yarm
Mr Alex Scott, 3 Emsworth Drive Eaglescliffe
T Priestman, 5 Castlereagh Close Longnewton
Mr Peter Charles Roy, 10 Manor Drive Hilton
Mrs M Simpson, 15 Mayes Walk Yarm
Mrs S Murphy, 23 Grisedale Crescent Eggescliffe
S Cronin-Hunter, 31 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe
Mr David Oakley, 35 Whinfell Avenue Eaglescliffe
Mrs Alex Wilde, 58 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe
Mrs K West, 92 Meadowfield Drive Eaglescliffe
Mr Brian Plumb, 4 Church Road Eggescliffe
Mr Stephen Reed, 12 Chaldron Way Eaglescliffe
Mrs D Sandford, 47 Dinsdale Drive Eaglescliffe
Mrs P Pappworth-McAllister, 4 Foxton Close Yarm
Mrs A Williams, 35 Coatham Vale Eaglescliffe
Mr David Page, 34 Carew Close Yarm
Mrs C Greenough, 680 Yarm Road Eaglescliffe
Mrs W Sheffield, 26 Clifton Avenue Eaglescliffe
Mr Peter Savage, 6 Middleton Close Eaglescliffe
G Ripley, 10 Thornborough Cl Stockton
Paul Brown, 15 Orchard Mews Eaglescliffe
C & G Meadows, 3 Troutsdale Close Yarm
Cynthia Latcham, 12, Dunbar Drive Eaglescliffe
B Atkinson, 19 Dunbar Drive, Eaglescliffe
Brian Trenholm, 12 Greenfield Drive Eaglescliffe
Mr Martin Brown, 78 Greenfield Drive Eaglescliffe
Guy Studholme, 1 Alonby Court Long Newton
Mrs M Johnson, 10 Wentworth Way Eaglescliffe
Katie Fletcher, 5 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe
Mr David Jolly, 10 Skiddaw Close Eaglescliffe
Richard Martin, 3 Low Church Wynd Yarm
Richard Martin, 3 Low Church Wynd, Yarm
Barry Alexander, 21 Aberdovey Drive Eaglescliffe
E A Duffield, 8 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe
Mr harry Pinnegar, 6 Oakfield Close Eaglescliffe
Mrs V Robinson, 60 Mount Leven Road Yarm
Mr T Hodgson, 16 Valley Gardens Eaglescliffe
Mr D Johnson, 11 Holywell Green Eaglescliffe
Mr Douglas Black, 9 Atherton Way Yarm
Miss Janette Lyall, 9 Atherton Way Yarm

Mr P Veitch, Windlestone Urlay Nook Road Eaglescliffe
Mrs L Mcdonald, Field House Farm Worsall Rd
Mr Roger Marsden, 48 Greenfield Drive Eaglescliffe
Joe Cronin-Hunter, 31 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe
Mr Paul Andrews, 22 Mount Leven Road Yarm
Mrs Carolyn Casey, 9 Kingsdale Close Yarm
Mr Gy Mundy, 28 Crosswell Park Ingleby Barwick
Mrs Helen Page, 34 Carew Close Yarm
Miss J Connor, 30 Coatham Vale Eaglescliffe
G Jaques, 132 Roseberry Crescent Great Ayton
Mrs K Fishburn, 61 Mayfield Crescent Eaglescliffe
Mrs Cathy Roberts, 3 Hatfield Close Eaglescliffe
Mrs P Connor, 30 Coatham Vale Eaglescliffe
Ms G Lynas, 35 Myrtle Road, Eaglescliffe,
Mr George Snarey, 24 cedar way Basingstoke
Miss C Brown, 78 Greenfield Drive Eaglescliffe
Mr Stephen Dobson, 11 The Crescent Eaglescliffe
Mr R Blundell, The Briars Yarm Road, See Document
L Rosemary Douglas, Riversdale Grange 26 Ashville Avenue
Mrs C Andrews, 22 Mount Leven Road Yarm
Mrs Tracy Jones, 3 Urlay Nook Road Eaglescliffe
Mr M Neave, 5 Springfield Close Eaglescliffe
J Latimer, 1A Countisbury Road, Stockton
Katherine Williams, 35 Coatham Vale Eaglescliffe
Margaret Foster, 2 Middleton Close Eaglescliffe
Mr P Harrison, Hill Rise The Green Eggescliffe
Mrs Janet Smith, 18 Springfield Close Eaglescliffe
Mr C Lennon, 3 Butterfield Close Eaglescliffe
Mr & Mrs N Grainger, 40 St Nicholas Gds Yarm
D A Wilson, 21 Mount Leven Road Yarm
Mr R Alexander, 18 Church Road Eggescliffe
Tom Ripley, 3 Middleton Close Eaglescliffe
Mr Peter Horner, 26 Carew Close Yarm
Mr Nicholas Miller, 26 Birchfield Drive Eaglescliffe
Mrs Jill Harrison, Hill Rise, The Green Eggescliffe
Helen Hollins, 35 Royal George Drive Kingsmead
Ms T Dowson, 49 Burnmoor Drive Eaglescliffe
Alan Vaughan, 31 Dinsdale Drive Eaglescliffe
Mrs Karen Evans, 17 Battersby Close Yarm
Mrs C Mundy, 28 Crosswell Park Ingleby Barwick
Mrs Moira Royal, 648 Yarm Road Eaglescliffe
Mr Robin Millman, 3 Church Close Eggescliffe
Mr P Dearlove, 44 Holme Land Ingleby Barwick
Alan Mounsey, 39 Urlay Nook Road Eaglescliffe
Mr Keith Fryett, 28 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe
Mrs Win Bell, 7 Butts Lane Eggescliffe
Mr A Gibbings, 16 Turnberry Avenue Eaglescliffe
Mr James Davis, 74 Mount Leven Road Yarm
Mrs A Dobson, 24 Strathaven Drive Eaglescliffe
Ms L Nicolson, 1 Holmdene, High Street Yarm.
Mr Colin Scott, 3 Mayfield Close Eaglescliffe
M Howard, 10 Egglestone Drive Eaglescliffe
Mr S Brown, 78 Greenfield Drive Eaglescliffe
Mr S Blackett, 62 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe
Mrs K Hanley, 92 Greenfield Drive Eaglescliffe
Mrs Karen Brown, 78 Greenfield Drive Eaglescliffe
Mr Andrew Mcdonald, 30 Atlas Wynd Yarm
Mrs Janice Graham, 10 Battersby Close Yarm
Mrs D Hull, 10 Grisedale Crescent Eggescliffe
Mr Mark Lawrence, 19 Coatham Vale Eaglescliffe
Mr Jonathan Birch, 3 Manor Gate Long Newton
Mrs M Kipling, 5 Newbiggin Close Eaglescliffe
Mrs H Stephens, 8 Nicklaus Drive Eaglescliffe
Mrs J Ramsey, 11 Brookwood Way Eaglescliffe
Mrs Suzanne Walton, 1C South View Eaglescliffe
Mr R Fenby, 16 Butterfield Grove Eaglescliffe
Craig Dean, 23 Coatham Vale Eaglescliffe
Candice Dean, 23 Coatham Vale Eaglescliffe
Muriel Lewis, 64 Limpton Gate Yarm
Mrs E Savage, 6 Middleton Close Eaglescliffe
Mr L Rosenberg, 1 Eggescliffe Court Eggescliffe
Ged Coulson, 6 Springfield Close Eaglescliffe
Mrs Valerie Hudson, 13 Dunbar Drive Eaglescliffe
Mr ross cousin, 14 Battersby Close Yarm
Mr M Williams, 35 Coatham Vale Eaglescliffe
Mr Simon Earley, 19 Whitfield Close Eaglescliffe
Mrs Anita Birch, 3 Manor Gate Long Newton
David Thompson, 4 Worsley Close Eaglescliffe
Helen Pickering, 19 Church Road Eggescliffe
Joan Trenholm, 12 Greenfield Drive Eaglescliffe
D & T Jefferson, 2 Wasdale Drive Eggescliffe
Mrs H Halsall, 7 Middleton Close Eaglescliffe,
A Walker, 10 Middleton Close Eaglescliffe
C Lynch , 2 Cotherstone Close Eaglescliffe
Mrs Gillian Scott, 1 Middleton Close Eaglescliffe
S Wallace, 22 Langdon Way Eaglescliffe
John Henderson, 10 Langdon Way Eaglescliffe
Nigel Billau, 2 Langdon Way Eaglescliffe
Sally Renwick, 9 Langdon Way Eaglescliffe
David Allaway, 12 Egglestone Drive Eaglescliffe
Dr Randhawa, 7 Ettersgill Close Eaglescliffe
Mrs M Day, Scargill Urlay Nook Road
Mr M Martinson, 4 Hatfield Close Eaglescliffe
Mrs R H Reynolds, 9 Heathfield Close Eaglescliffe
D G C Emerton, 21 Grisedale Cres Eggescliffe
R T Martinson, 4 Hatfield Close Eaglescliffe
Christine Toothill, 6 Cromer Court Eaglescliffe
James Riach, 6 Monmouth Drive Eaglescliffe
Alan Toothill, 6 Cromer Court Eaglescliffe
Mrs C Batchelor, 37 Urlay Nook Road Eaglescliffe
G C And P Veitch, 25 Emsworth Drive Eaglescliffe
Mr & Mrs J Burton, 2 Ettersgill Close Eaglescliffe
Kevin Smith, 6 Baliol Croft Long Newton
J Blackett, 7 Parkstone Place Eaglescliffe
L Adamson, 51 Seymour Grove Eaglescliffe
Rachel Peake, 1 Newbiggin Close Eaglescliffe
Nigel Douglas, 44 Meadowfield Drive Eaglescliffe
Mrs L Grierson, 31 Mayfield Crescent Eaglescliffe
M Grierson, 31 Mayfield Crescent Eaglescliffe
Mrs M Scott, 3 Seymour Avenue Eaglescliffe
Ian J Archibald, 6 Emsworth Drive Eaglescliffe
Mrs P English, 66 Mount Leven Road Yarm
Pauline Webb, 53 Chaldron Way Eaglescliffe
David Webb, 53 Chaldron Way Eaglescliffe
Iain Wilson, 9 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe
D Armstrong, North View Cottage, Darlington Rd
Joyce Longwill, 608 Yarm Road Eaglescliffe
S Ballantyne, 6 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe
Mrs A Ballantyne, 6 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe
Mrs C M Sherris, 18 Merlay Close Yarm

Mr J A L Sherris, 7 The Orchard High Church Wynd
 Mr R W A Sherris, 8 Scholars Court West Street
 Mr M J C Sherris, 15 Merryweather Court Central Street
 Mrs Ann Warren, 32 The Slayde Yarm,
 Mrs Smith, 11 Whitfield Close Eaglescliffe
 Mr J A Fletcher, 3 Holyoake Way Eaglescliffe
 WG And PM Jones, 2 Bankside Yarm
 David H Noble, 592 Yarm Road Eaglescliffe
 Mrs Wood, 26 Strathaven Drive Eaglescliffe
 Jackie Turton, 34 Mayfield Crescent Eaglescliffe
 M Carroll, 15 Birchfield Drive Eaglescliffe
 Brian Austin Smith, 12 Moor Park Eaglescliffe
 Jason Danby, 44 Lingfield Drive Eaglescliffe
 Alison Danby, 44 Lingfield Drive Eaglescliffe
 Jane Nicholls, 19 Valley Gardens Eaglescliffe
 David Copley, 21 Urlay Nook Road Eaglescliffe
 Miss R Copley, 21 Urlay Nook Road Eaglescliffe
 Mrs D Copley, 21 Urlay Nook Road Eaglescliffe
 Miss R Copley, 21 Urlay Nook Road Eaglescliffe
 E Dowie, 28 Mount Leven Road Yarm
 E Dowie, 28 Mount Leven Road Yarm
 V A Walmsley, 19 Mayfield Crescent Eaglescliffe
 E M Routledge, 19 Seymour Drive Eaglescliffe
 A Cronin-Hunter, 31 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe
 Mrs E Ripley, 10 Thornborough Close Stockton
 Catriona Britton, 12 Cromer Court Eaglescliffe
 Mrs Rita Clark, 66 Greenfield Drive Eaglescliffe
 G M McGarthy, 6 Newbiggin Close Eaglescliffe
 Mrs M Bulmer, 7 Heathfield Close Eaglescliffe
 G M McGarthy, 6 Newbiggin Close Eaglescliffe
 Gerald Helm, 22 Meadowfield Drive Eaglescliffe
 Peter Elliott, 48 Butterfield Drive Eaglescliffe
 Ivy Duffield, 8 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe
 Alfred James Duffield, 2 Springwell Ingleton
 Margaret Lau, 76 Forest Road Aberdeen
 C M Hanrahan, 25 Clifton Avenue Eaglescliffe,
 Mr M Howell, 1 Talisman Close Eaglescliffe
 Mrs L Howell, 1 Talisman Close Eaglescliffe
 Hanrahan, 25 Clifton Avenue Eaglescliffe
 Rachel Power, 15 Cotherstone Close Eaglescliffe
 Jill Simmons, 6 Egglestone Drive Eaglescliffe
 David Yule, 9 Middleton Close Eaglescliffe
 Aarun Simmons, 6 Egglestone Drive Eaglescliffe
 Kate Soley, 18 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe
 P & D Foster, 16 Langdon Way Eaglescliffe
 A Gallagher, 78 Meadowfield Drive Eaglescliffe
 B Gallagher, 78 Meadowfield Drive Eaglescliffe
 Sheila Carr, 46 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe
 Stuart Wilkinson, 11 Langdon Way Eaglescliffe
 Brian Sowerby, 7 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe
 Mrs N P Greenstreet, 7 Manor Gate Long Newton
 Mrs Richardson, 6 Parkside Long Newton
 Julie Boston, 26 Langdon Way Eaglescliffe
 Susan Heath, 23 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe
 Mrs Ella-Maria Lynch, 2 Cotherstone Close Eaglescliffe
 G Trueforth, Mountain Ash Cottage Darlington Rd
 A Power, 15 Cotherstone Close Eaglescliffe
 Cora Durham, 20 Langdon Way Eaglescliffe

Eileen Marsay, 7 Oakfield Avenue Eaglescliffe
 Mr & Mrs A Delderfield, 16 Cotherstone Close Eaglescliffe
 Mrs J Meadley, 18 Cotherstone Close Eaglescliffe
 Mrs C Billau, 2 Langdon Way Eaglescliffe
 C Henderson, 10 Langdon Way Eaglescliffe
 J Butterworth, 48 Whitehouse Croft Long Newton
 C Butterworth, 48 Whitehouse Croft Long Newton
 Ruth Blundell, The Briars Yarm Road
 Sylvia Jean Clift, The Mews Butts Lane
 Ann Smith, 4 Formby Walk Eaglescliffe
 Dr Alex Conradie, 4 Aberdovey Drive Eaglescliffe
 Mrs Lorraine Axon, 8 Ettersgill Close Eaglescliffe
 Dr Sean Axon, 8 Ettersgill Close Eaglescliffe
 Tim Renwick, 9 Langdon Way Eaglescliffe
 Mr Stewart, 21 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe,
 Mrs J Stewart, 21 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe
 Sandra Burns, 1 Ettersgill Close Eaglescliffe
 Sarah Williams, 6 Oakfield Avenue Eaglescliffe
 D & C Welsh, 13 Heathfield Close Eaglescliffe
 Mrs J Mahmood, 3 Springfield Close Eaglescliffe
 Mr And Mrs Best, 11 South View Eaglescliffe
 30 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe
 S Coverdale, 56 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe
 Mrs B Dyson, 9 Manor Gate Long Newton
 Mrs S M Jones, 2 Formby Walk Eaglescliffe
 Mr J Brand, 47 Butterfield Drive, Eaglescliffe
 A Donaldson, 41 Greenfield Dr, Eaglescliffe
 M Cherrett, 12 Holywell Green, Eaglescliffe
 H Rhodes, 47 Greenfield Dr, Eaglescliffe
 N Rosenberg, 1 Eaglescliffe Ct, Eaglescliffe
 T Hodgkinson, 4 Langdon Way, Eaglescliffe
 P Dawson, 1 Springfield Close, Eaglescliffe
 P Chadwick, 1 Seymour Grove, Eaglescliffe
 V Chadwick, 1 Seymour Grove, Eaglescliffe
 T Stafford, The Orchard, Urlay Nook Road
 S Maddy, 26 Grassholme Way, Eaglescliffe
 L Geddes, 30 Grassholme Way, Eaglescliffe
 A Peacock, 4 Egglestone Drive, Eaglescliffe
 A Gray, 24 Birchfield Dr, Eaglescliffe
 A Vickers, 13 Lingfield Dr, Eaglescliffe
 A Dennis, 9 Heathfield Close, Eaglescliffe
 C Hills, 82 Mayfield Crescent, Eaglescliffe
 Mr J Lobo, 46 Grassholme Way, Eaglescliffe
 J lightfoot, 13 Hatfield Close, Eaglescliffe
 L Farrow, 3 Highfield Close, Eaglescliffe
 M Farrow, 3 Highfield Close, Eaglescliffe
 D Shuttleworth,
 A & A Barber, Laneside, Eaglescliffe Low
 J Wallace, 21 Greenfield Dr, Eaglescliffe
 E Wallace, 22 Langdon Way, Eaglescliffe
 B & C Hurst, 5 Orchard Mews, Eaglescliffe
 J Rigg, 9 Arsiaig Close, Eaglescliffe
 R Haughton, 3 Lorraine Grove Norton
 M Duffield, 8 Grassholme Way
 Mr M Duffield 8 Grassholme Way
 K Killick, 10 Roedean Drive, Eaglescliffe
 P Brooks, 7 Portland Close, Eaglescliffe
 S Donachie, 19 Sledmore Drive, Acklam
 J Walker, 37 Grisedale Crescent, Egglecliffe

Objections / Comments made

Policy Based

Under The Localism Act and within The National Planning Policy Framework, decisions on planning have been devolved to a local level and as residents we have to be consulted on planning issues. The current public consultation finishes on 24th September 2012 and will then be reviewed, with a new policy not being implemented until 2014. However, all of the decisions currently being considered for planning applications in Yarm and Eaglescliffe will have been decided before our views have been taken in to consideration and the policy implemented. To that end, it may be perceived that Stockton Borough Council is in breach of both the Localism Act and the NPPF.

The Core Development Document is the current working document of Stockton Borough Council planners until the new policy is implemented in 2014 and as such, the policies set out in this document should be adhered to. Both The National Planning Policy Framework and the Core Strategy Development Document stipulate that priorities should be given to the development of Brownfield sites. As Urray Nook is a Greenfield site it should not be considered when other Brownfield sites are still available and just because 80% of previous developments in the Borough have been on brownfield sites this does not make it acceptable to residents and it infringes on greenfield sites.

The Core Development clearly states that should permission be granted for 500 houses on Allens West then this would significantly reduce the need for further housing provision. As permission for 843 houses has been granted, why do we need additional housing on Urray Nook? The land is not allocated for housing in the approved development plan and options for change to this plan are still undergoing public consultation.

The LDD document declares a requirement for 550 dwellings per annum for the next 15yrs in the Borough and worryingly adds a further 20% buffer on top of that instead of opting for the recommended 5%. These decisions are questionable in the light of the economic climate and slow housing market, particularly in the case of executive housing. Given the development at Urray Nook is approved, where is the evidence of large scale business investment to support the employment for this development and others around Yarm?

However, even without any adjustment the implementation of the 5% buffer results in 8662 dwellings for the Plan over the 2012-2017 period. The Plan also states that the commitment deliverable over the Plan period is 9760 houses, this being 118% of the stated housing requirement. Limiting this to 105% in line with a 5% buffer would result in the need for 1098 less dwellings planning permissions. This is the situation even before amending the housing requirement to a more justified basis. The forecasts in the plan are unreasonably optimistic and over-inflated and that the implementation of a 5% rather than the unnecessary 18% buffer would mean the housing requirement for the authority would be more realistic. Also, if my reading of the authority's own housing survey (2011) is correct, there is already a surplus of supply over demand of 23% in the Yarm, Eaglescliffe and Preston area. The future predicted demand for housing in the area will almost equal supply with the exception of just over 100 four + bed executive houses and a small number of bungalows.

The Council should reject the RSS targets and substitute forecasts which more correctly reflect current economic and demographic circumstances. Substituting objectively justified targets may well mean that there is no shortfall in potential housing delivery during the period 2012-2017. The assumption that housing demand will continue at 555 dwellings per year is not objectively justified and to continue with this false assumption brings the risk that more planning permissions on greenfield sites like Urray Nook will be unnecessarily granted. There is now evidence that other authorities are rejecting the RSS targets and downwardly adjusting their housing targets and I recommend that Stockton does the same.

Further phases are likely to increase the number of houses to 570.

The LDD Preferred Options plan clearly states that any new developments must be sustainable. Strategic Policy SPI - 'Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development' - Point 1 states 'Proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area'.

I would point out that this development does not fit this criteria, nor is it sustainable and therefore is in breach of the policies contained within the LDD. I base this on the following: there will be a greater volume of traffic on the local road network, increasing air and noise pollution. There are as yet no plans to improve the road infrastructure around Yarm and Eaglescliffe, nor is there evidence of any serious road traffic surveys done except those done by developers themselves which are questionable as to how thorough they are.

The reasons for a lack of new housing does not come from lack of available sites of which there is already an excess in Stockton (current Local Plan). To believe that an increased supply of greenfield sites automatically brings new housing development as implied in the new plan means that when this does not happen more sites will then have to be released. These will then additionally be stored by developers into ever larger land banks until large swathes of greenfield land with unnecessary planning permissions are simply taken out of use until the housing market recovers. When this happens massive urban sprawl will result with the authority facing the permanent loss of its environmentally high value and wildlife rich green areas. In short, a period of housing under-performance will be followed by over-performance. I contend a more realistic and evidence-based housing strategy should be incorporated into the new Local Plan by Stockton Council, and one more in the long term interest of Stockton and its different local residents.

Stockton Council's Core Strategy Document (which outlines current policy to the year 2026) states that:

- Policy 7(2) no additional sites will be allocated before 2016
- Policy 7(3) between 2016 and 2021 approximately 50 to 100 dwellings will be allocated to Yarm, Eaglescliffe and Preston.
- Policy 12.15 states that that should the Allens West site be approved for 500 dwellings, it would significantly reduce the need for new housing provision to meet the Regional Spatial Strategy requirement. 845 dwellings were approved.

The statement that the Council will open up opportunities for development in greenfield areas adjacent to the conurbation means developers will desert investing in the Core Area and move onto green field sites. There is considerable evidence that this is already happening, and spectacularly. The Council needs to recognise that a positive greenfield development strategy will simply condemn the Stockton Core Area population to living in an increasingly derelict and highly undesirable poverty stricken environment.

There is now significant national evidence that despite the large number of planning applications granted this does not necessarily result in the development of these sites for housing. As a result this strategy gives no help to the local authority to meet its more immediate local population needs and to deliver on local housing requirements. Indeed, another disastrous consequence is happening, developers are leaving many of their undeveloped green field sites, with or without planning permission, to increasing neglect and dereliction. For an authority like Stockton, the housing strategy in the new Local Plan will simply increase the abandonment of its town centre with the probability of replicating this dereliction in the outer areas leaving the whole town in a far worse environmental condition. Indeed, these planning policies could well be disastrous for both the economic and environmental sustainability of the whole borough and send large areas of it into catastrophic decline.

In the 1990's Stockton Council with the help of City Challenge grants pedestrianized Stockton High Street. Now some 15 or so years later more sums of money are being spent on the High Street. However by concentrating house building on places like Eaglescliffe and Yarm and the periphery of the Borough, the Council is not making it easier for residents to visit the High Street and the money will be wasted. The result is the so-called dough-nut effect ie a town centre without residents. If Stockton Council want a vibrant Town Centre, it must have people living in it.

Developers want to build on greenbelt land because it makes more money for them and the Council makes money from the new homes bonus and additional Council Tax revenue. It is clear then that this decision is not about what is best for Eaglescliffe and Yarm.

There remains a significant number of homes for sale in existing areas. This housing proposal, as all do, fails to put the proposal in context of the Teesside residential development map (the space that still remains for the Middlehaven project for example),

Our towns are being abandoned and left as ghost towns when lovely redevelopments could be made and the town (Stockton being a good example) revitalised and made pleasurable again. Surely it is a cheaper option to redevelop than start from scratch!
Come on Stockton Council - wise up and do the right thing, for the sake of our children and grandchildren who deserve to enjoy the Countryside as we have done.

If this is approved, what stops further development down the A67 corridor and up to the A66? As the baby boomer generation downsize, there will be more houses on the market offering the urban areas that this development proposes in the next 5 years. That need will be met. In terms of affordable housing; smaller, more energy efficient, as the economy slowly makes its way out of recession, that would be best achieved on brownfield sites around Stockton and the river, closer to existing amenities and public transport hubs.

The lessons of Ingleby Barwick have not been learned.

Chris Musgrave, Wynyard Park, reference 11/2482/EIS, stated, during committee 30 May 2012, that deliverability was crucial and that Wynyard Park had a strong record of delivery and that it was confident of bringing in three of the biggest house builders to the site. Taylor Wimpey are one of the biggest house builders whose interest may be being diverted by the prospect of Uraly Nook Phase 1?

I hope Stockton Council adhere to the National Planning Policy Framework and their own Core Development Policy of 2010 to redevelop brown field sites. I am not entirely convinced by the claim that due to the Government removing funding for remediation of brown field sites that there are no alternative means of funding available. What about the new homes bonus, can that not be utilised? Uraly Nook is a Green Field site in the form of agricultural land, why should this site be developed when there are brown field sites available in the area? This is unnecessary urban sprawl.

As regards demand, given the large number of approved developments still to be undertaken, the projected figures in the Preferred Options do not stack up. Stockton's own figures show that in 2011 there was a significant overall surplus of supply over demand in the Yarm, Eaglescliffe and Preston area. The extent and depth of the double dip recession was not taken into account in the Preferred Options. The most recent housing statistics show that the situation is getting worse not better.

If more housing is needed and I don't agree that it is, why is it being built on a greenfield site when the Elementis site and its old ecology park remain empty and derelict? Open spaces are disappearing all over the area, let's leave what Greenfield sites we have green.

Stockton Council's Core Strategy Document (which outlines current policy to the year 2026) states that:

- Policy 10(3) states the separation between settlements, together with the quality of the urban environment, will be maintained through the protection and enhancement of the openness and amenity value of:
 - i) Strategic gaps between the conurbation and the surrounding towns and villages, and between Eaglescliffe and Middleton St George.
 - ii) Green wedges within the conurbation, including River Tees Valley from Surtees Bridge to Yarm.....

Also the three new developments at Tesco round a about, behind the Cleveland Bay and the apartments next to the Blue Bell they struggle to sell them! so why do we need more housing?

Stockton Council has not listened to residents objections so now it becomes a truly undemocratic procedure of "who can shout the loudest", individual objections, petitions, residents meetings etc. none of which would be necessary if the Council made sensible decisions.

Highway Related

'Core Strategy Review Issues and Options Consultation Response Schedule':

"The preferred options document includes two sites in Yarm. It is anticipated that these sites will not detrimentally affect the strategic highway network Concerns regarding the local highway network are valid and will be explored before the document progresses to the 'publication stage' in 2013. At the publication stage the Council's evidence base will identify what additional infrastructure will be required to deliver the site allocations. If the highway, or any other issue, cannot be satisfactorily mitigated the sites will be removed from the publication version of the Regeneration and Environment Local Development Document".

The outline planning document concerning traffic surveys for this proposed development were conducted by a company called Fairhurst. On consulting Highways Agency submission documents to the planning process I observe that Fairhurst used an out of date database set and an incorrect statistical system. The Highways Agency accepted that the errors were small and it would make little difference to the outcome. Although this appears negligible it throws the survey into doubt. The survey was done by a company employed directly by the applicant and not doubting their impartiality this does not look good particularly since S.B.C are employing Arup's to do a new impartial traffic survey in Yarm.

With the addition of these dwellings, whatever design they may be, there is likely to be, on average, 2 cars per household. It is already recognised by the Council's Highways team, through the Draft Stockton Local Plan and the Regeneration and Environment Local Development Document (Preferred Options), that there are significant issues regarding the local road network and car parking in Yarm Town Centre. Due to the geographic position of Yarm and the limited ability of the local authority to mitigate these problems, the addition of 100's of new vehicles at this site would be an unmitigated disaster for the town. This adds to the potential for serious injury or death occurring through accidents as the road network is not up to the job of taking the additional vehicles on this and other potential developments.

Yarm already has a major parking problem, how are they going to cope with all the extra traffic?

As Yarm Town Council has requested a total community traffic survey to be carried out, I would hope that any planning decision should be at least deferred until these results are available.

The Traffic Surveys carried out on Hunters Green and included in the associated documents registered abnormally high traffic flow, due to its location on the outskirts of Eaglescliffe making its residents more reliant on the use of vehicles to travel. The proposed development is even further away and therefore suggests that there would be an even greater need for the use of vehicles creating additional journeys. This in turn, will result in even higher than anticipated levels of air and noise pollution.

Having moved to Eaglescliffe some 30years ago we were impressed with the small community and short distance to the historic town of Yarm. In the last 30 years the amount of houses and traffic has increased tremendously resulting in long tail backs in and out of Yarm. Has anyone monitored the traffic at Tesco's roundabout between the hours of 8.30 - 9.30am & 3pm- 6pm weekdays and all day Saturdays?

The road network around Hunters Green in particular is not suitable to cope with the increase in cars from this phased development of over up to 570 houses, thereby raising the risk of Highway safety considerably.

Journeys between Carew Close Yarm and Marshall's Durham Road a round trip of less than 6 miles.

- Thursday Morning left house 7.12 went for paper , dropped partner off at work 7.22 back in house at 7.34. 22 minutes including stop for paper
- Thursday evening left house at 4.32 arrived Marshall's 4.59pm. Partner in car 5.02 travelled down Durham road, notable traffic backing up. Problems of cars stationary in yellow box at Cleveland Bay Junction back home at 5.36. 64mins.

Examples given of other journeys

- 25 mins. to get from Aldi in Yarm through Yarm High Street to Urray Nook Road at 5pm). If there is a student event on at the Tall Trees the whole area is blocked for some considerable time.
- 20 minutes on Saturday morning to get 2 miles via Yarm High Street.
- It can take 20-30 minutes to get from the Hunters Green estate to the entrance of Sunningdale estate which is only a few miles and should take nowhere near this length of time.
- My journey from work over the last 12 years has been along that route & I am regularly stuck in traffic for over 45minutes trying to get to the Cleveland Bay just to turn left onto Yarm road.
- Over the last 2 years I have noticed a significant increase in the amount of traffic that now builds up at the Tesco roundabout particularly after 4pm and up to 6pm, a wait of anything up to 20 minutes is normal at these times.
- I had a call to request that I get my son from school. It took me 40 minutes due to traffic congestion to get from Hunters Green to Butts Lane, Egglecliffe.

"The attached document details the daily congestion already present around Yarm and Egglecliffe. Queues are present every single day into Yarm, at Durham Lane Tesco roundabout, along the A67 etc. and pose a risk to safety in terms of pedestrians, school pupils, access for emergency vehicles etc. and the increased traffic from the proposed development and other developments will only make this situation worse.

At the moment during early morning and late afternoon there are traffic jams on Urray Nook Road and Durham Lane with cars waiting to pass through Yarm. To consider increasing this congestion with more cars from a new development of up to 500 plus houses is ridiculous to say the least.

The Head of Technical Services said;

"I do accept that parts of Yarm and Egglecliffe at times suffer some delays. The council as highways and traffic authority do of course have obligations to keep the traffic moving and provide a safe highway network. With regard to new housing developments we work very closely with developers to ensure that their proposals take due regard for any impact they may cause. In every instance development must provide mitigation to ensure traffic is no worse than it was before the development would have been in place. In areas where we see some level of congestion, which are often caused by historical factors, developments must be mitigated back to immediately prior to the development existing. This can often include provision of junction improvements, widening or additional car parks. This is always fully funded by the developers and not the tax payer."

The main cause of traffic congestion in Yarm and Egglecliffe is the historical layout of the road network and the volume of traffic that already uses these roads, namely Yarm road, the A67 and Durham Lane. You cannot significantly alter the road layouts at the Cleveland Bay, Yarm road, Yarm High Street, Durham Lane and the A67 by Egglecliffe comprehensive school, you can alter the pinch points and junctions but you can do nothing about the remaining roads because of their historical layout. They contain level crossings, bus lanes, bus stops, pedestrian crossings, traffic

lights narrow road bridges and finally and most important the built environment adjacent to these roads which is not about to be demolished. All this is exacerbated by the traffic itself slowing down to look for parking places in Yarm. There is no solution to the traffic problem in our community other than very expensive new ring roads, which is not going to happen.

With the proposed development a Uraly Nook traffic will increase on Uraly Nook Road plus traffic entering Yarm from the south has a choice of Yarm Road, Durham Lane and the A67 to Uraly Nook which could become a preferred route to the A66 via Long Newton.

Traffic survey and other statistics which are dependent on human behaviour are extremely unreliable, statistics working well in fields such as engineering. Instead of relying on these statistics speaking to the electorate concerned and spending time observing the areas in detail may prove more reliable. Once the special character of Yarm/Eaglescliffe is lost there is no crown to put a jewel in.

The rapid (planned?) development of Ingleby Barwick resulted in intolerable traffic bottlenecks at the two access/egress points at peak times, a situation relieved at significant public expense with the construction of the 1825 road. At present, south Eaglescliffe and Yarm are suffering similar congestion patterns!

The current 30 mph speed limit past Hunters Green is often disregarded or treated with utter contempt. It may be necessary to close Uraly Nook level crossing if this development goes ahead.

The infrastructure of these areas are already under extreme pressure many areas gridlocked every day of the week, and this is without the controversial 800+ houses at Allens West, which could potentially put a further 1,600 cars commuting in and out of Eaglescliffe.

This is without consideration for the Doctors, Dentists, Primary/Secondary Schooling and all other facilities within the area that simply would not cope.

It is a well-known fact that Yarm is a 'bottle neck' for traffic and this proposed new development will only add to existing problems. There is currently huge congestion at the Tesco roundabout going into Yarm, backing up to Uraly Nook Road on a regular basis. Were more houses to be built on this site the traffic queues will be even worse than they already are. The quality of life for everyone living in the area will be affected - by traffic noise, air pollution and the inconvenience of being stuck in traffic. There is also the worry of more accidents on the roads - particularly as this road is well used by school children.

According to the environmental report regarding the Allens West development, funding for the necessary road alterations planned at Tesco roundabout will be met by the developer. This junction is already a bottleneck and the current traffic chaos needs to be addressed now. Has consideration been given to the fact that should Allens West be put on hold then this work will not be done? Will Taylor Wimpey pay these costs instead?

Regardless of any suggestions to mitigate the problem that already exists with traffic congestion in Yarm and Eaglescliffe, it is simply impossible to alter the road networks to overcome this problem.

There are pinch points at Tesco's roundabout, Cleveland Bay traffic lights and Yarm High Street. The three bridges -Yarm Bridge, the railway bridge on Green Lane and Leven Bridge, cannot be widened and Yarm Road, Durham Lane and Uraly Nook Road have further restrictions due to the fact that they are in a built up areas.

How do the emergency services get through increased traffic congestion? Any future development plans for Tees Valley Airport surely rest on accessibility. If the journey is severely hampered from the main access routes, it then becomes unviable and will fail to attract new business.

Has consideration seriously been given to the further impact on traffic of the existing permission for 143 new homes at the Tall Trees, 350 at Morley Carr, 845 at Allens West, together with this 160/570 proposed development, the proposed 350 Mount Leven Retirement Village homes / 100 bed Care Home and 735 homes on Yarm School playing fields? Building still continues at Ingleby Barwick.

I fail to see how the planned building of over 800 homes at Allens West and a further 500 at Uray Nook is going to result in anything other than total gridlock, chaos and misery for local residents.

Other comments;

- the existing road infrastructure is inadequate to serve the size of the proposed estate.
- the roads are already over-utilised and additional traffic caused by the proposed new development will cause gridlock at peak times.
- the additional traffic will also have a massive impact on the already problematic traffic congestion on nearby Durham Lane (library and Tesco roundabout area).
- the small roundabout at the bottom of Long Newton Lane / Uray Nook Road is too small and will not cope with the huge increase in traffic.
- how will the increased traffic to / from Yarm High Street be dealt with?
- at peak times traffic congestion is already a major problem to / from Yarm High Street.
- Concern that Long Newton village could become an easy short cut to the A66. This will increase traffic on narrow country roads and significantly increase a potential for traffic accidents.
- emergency services will struggle to get to and from locations in the area due to extra traffic and lives will be put at risk.
- In times of poor weather more traffic uses the local roads and the problem of the emergency services getting into Eaglescliffe quickly and safely was highlighted when an ambulance and police car had to go on the wrong side of the A67 which could have caused another accident but definitely slowed them down and that could be the difference between life and death.
- If roads can be altered to help with the traffic problems then this should be put in place before the housing to assure the problem of more traffic doesn't cause major problems.
- Any new residents are likely to work outside the area as Eaglescliffe/Yarm doesn't offer many job opportunities then the traffic is only going to get worse.
- The possible danger to any pedestrians walking Long Newton Lane, with increased traffic.
- Eaglescliffe already congested at key times of the day and Highways Department are unwilling to do anything about it.
- More cars/traffic will exacerbate problems.
- South View, Uray Nook Road etc are totally snarled up between 8.00am and 9.00am then 5.00pm onwards.
- More local traffic will add to an impossible situation.
- Children face increasing danger from traffic.
- The existing roads around the planned development and in Eaglescliffe and Yarm are not suitable for the potential increase in traffic and will make a bad situation unacceptable.
- I have seen nothing in this application that will alleviate further traffic congestion; in fact the extra number of houses will make the situation much worse.
- The concern is that new development and use of the existing infrastructure by the vehicles from the new development will become exacerbate the situation.
- We regularly help with child care, collecting 2 grandchildren, taking them to school, nursery etc. and any increase in traffic volumes will have a serious effect on our journeys.
- no safe place for pedestrians to cross the road from the new proposed development to the adjacent estate thus increasing the risk of accidents.
- Increase in traffic will impact on the railway level crossing, raising safety issues.
- Many people are likely to cut through to the A66 via Long Newton. This village will not welcome the increase in traffic flow either which will cause congestion.
- Delays in getting children to school,
- I walk my grandchildren to school at Durham Lane which takes 15 minutes which is OK when it is not raining, but I drive when it is wet. Some carers drive all the time, increasing the traffic problem.
- Durham Lane needs to be widened at the Tesco roundabout to allow traffic to form 2 lanes
- The A67 is already an accident black spot.

The Council should be taking into account future traffic from the Allen's West site you have given permission for as this is likely to add to the problem and you should be doing projections of how all this together will contribute to traffic in and around Eaglescliffe and Yarm.

It's alright telling us about the improvements that will be made to Allens West station or more cycle routes there's going to be etc. but there's never no mention about upgrading and expanding the road network to compensate for more traffic. That's because they can't as it would cost millions to sort that lot out and that's not going to happen.

Since the removal of the Bus service from Long Newton to Eaglescliffe, children do, on occasion, walk this road, to meet friends or return from school, after attending after school activities. There are no public footpaths along Long Newton Lane and any increase in traffic can only increase the danger for all its users.

The number of approved dwellings already granted permission are 845 on the MOD at Allen's West in Eaglescliffe and 143 on the Tall Trees site in Yarm. If validation is granted for the Morley Carr site the number of approved dwellings in the Yarm - Eaglescliffe surrounds will rise to 1,338. The proposals at Green Lane and Urlay Nook will further increase this number by between 895 and 1,305 more houses. That would be between 2,233 and 2,643 new dwellings in total.

I object to these housing proposals as they would inevitably generate an increase in traffic affecting both public and private transport. With households often relying on more than one car, at best we can expect more than 1,338 more vehicles in the area and at worst more than 2,643. These vehicles will have to be accommodated in an area that is geographically limited and unable to improve the infrastructure of its main thoroughfare.

We only have a small Tesco's which means that we will now have to travel to a larger supermarket for a week's shop therefore we will be increasing traffic movements

My main concern is the impact on the only secondary school in the immediate area which is already full, with a waiting list, and takes in students from Ingleby Barwick, which is just crazy! I live just round the corner from the school and had to fight to get a place for my son. It cannot cope with more students in the local area or would we have to see our students bussed out?!

Since 12 noon, Urlay Nook Road, to the front of Hunters Green, has been gridlocked with wall to wall HGVs and cars. This is nose to nose all along the road from the A67, past Elementis, down Urlay Nook Road, onto the roundabout, down to Tesco's, down past the comprehensive and into Yarm.

I got another call to say that the comprehensive was closing and I could not get out of our estate in the car to go and get my daughter. She therefore had to walk home, in the driving rain. Worst of all there were 45 artics (in spite of the weight limits) nose to nose on Urlay Nook Road. How can any child cross that busy road safely when the traffic is so busy?

I have witnessed motorists becoming angry and taking dangerous actions with their vehicles I have even reported a coach driving on the wrong side of the road and driving around a roundabout the wrong way(Tesco roundabout -A67) just to avoid the tail back of traffic going into Yarm when the driver needed to be right onto the A67. This was reported and can be verified. Motorist are becoming impatient and risks are being taken which i believe will in time cause a serious incident and will involve children as one of the main congestion areas is outside a school which 1400 children attend.

The proposed development is not within easy walking distance to any facilities there will therefore be a huge increase in road traffic which will increase air and noise pollution in the area.

There are currently 2400 houses proposed for the Yarm and Eaglescliffe area. There is an additional scoping for Yarm for a further 400 homes that has just been submitted and we are expecting a planning application in the very near future for Yarm Back Lane, Stockton for 945 homes. All of this traffic could and will, at certain points in time, utilise the road networks, both those under the Local Highways Authority and those under Highways Agency responsibility. Working on the fact that the majority of households in this area have two or more cars, this level of housing would generate potentially a further 7490 cars on Eaglescliffe and Yarm's roads. Of these houses, the proposed plan is for 845 homes at Allens West and 570 at Urlay Nook. The Traffic Assessment needs to consider all of the proposed development sites for this area and yet I feel that it fails to do so.

The Highways Agency indicate that Fairhurst have proposed further improvements so that the Urlay Nook development trips result in no detrimental effect on the operation of the roundabout - However the junction still operates above capacity during morning peak. We cannot simply look at Urlay Nook being a 159 home housing development. The whole site is 570. It is a phased development. The impact on the Highways therefore should not just consider the 845 homes on Allens West plus 159 at Urlay Nook but also the additional 411 homes on phase 2 of Urlay Nook. What is the point in considering mitigation if it does not take into account the full picture? Suggested mitigation for the dumbbell over the A66 at Elton/Hartburn needs further consideration because of this. Also it does not take into account the fact that the 945 homes on Yarm Back Lane will also use this road network. The whole area is going to grind to a halt unless both the Highways Agency and Stockton on Tees Borough Council work more closely together on this. We need to plan in order to prevent the inevitable chaos, not simply react to the traffic congestion issue after the event. It is the developer's responsibility to collectively fund the road improvements needed to ensure that the situation on the roads is no worse after a development is finished than it was before it was started. Who will pick up the cost of road improvements that will be needed once the developers have finished building and moved on? I would suggest no one. It will be left in grid lock with the excuse that there is no money in the Government coffers to make improvements.

The Highways Agency have indicated that submitted traffic assessments carried out by Fairhurst's were based on the incorrect trip generation and concerns are raised on the accuracy of Fairhurst's report and the methods used. There is a common theme where Fairhurst is concerned as they did exactly the same with respect to Morley Carr, Yarm. At what point are Fairhurst not considered a reliable source to conduct Traffic Reports?

Decisions on traffic movements cannot be made on inaccurate results as this has repercussions through all subsequent calculations and assessments.

The Traffic Assessment produced for the developer contains a number of errors. Reference is made to a shopping parade including post office within 900 meters of the site. The post office closed some years ago and the shops apart from Sainsbury were burnt down in April this year. The nearest post office is in Yarm, a 25 minute's walk or 30 minutes by car. Contrary to the Traffic Assessment report the Arriva X6 service no longer runs to Valley Drive and the Arriva 7 does not run every 10 minutes past Tesco but from Yarm to Stockton via Yarm Road which is a 20 minute walk from my home on Hunters Green. If there are basic error in information produced by the developer regarding the shops how many errors are there in more complex reports. The developer and council officers seem to think there is not a traffic problem in Yarm and Eaglescliffe. I have lived in Eaglescliffe since 1975 and there has always been a traffic problem in the form of a bottleneck on Yarm bridge and Yarm High Street. In recent years problems have spread to the Cleveland Bay junction, Tesco roundabout and Elton interchanges with the A66. This morning, Tuesday 25th September saw a sign of things to come. Because of the heavy rain, at 8.45am, there were more vehicles on the school run and traffic was backed up to the Hunters Green roundabout on the A67, and yes there was an ambulance with blue lights flashing, trying to negotiate through the traffic to Tesco's roundabout

Suggested mitigation for the dumbbell over the A66 at Elton/Hartburn needs further consideration because of this. Also it does not take into account the fact that the 945 homes on Yarm Back Lane will also use this road network.

It is the developer's responsibility to collectively fund the road improvements needed to ensure that the situation on the roads is no worse after a development is finished than it was before it was started. Who will pick up the cost of road improvements that will be needed once the developers have finished building and moved on? I would suggest no one. It will be left in grid lock with the excuse that there is no money in the Government coffers to make improvements.

A report 'Yarm Car Parking Research Report' commissioned by the Council in 2011 highlighted the following: "Yarm, with its cosmopolitan feel and variety of attractions makes it a very popular town with both locals and visitors alike. This popularity has resulted in a long history of traffic congestion and parking problems".

Decisions on traffic movements cannot be made on inaccurate results and I quote your comment:

"arithmetic errors have been found in the table which result in fewer development trips. This has repercussions through all subsequent calculations and assessments"

"During the scoping process the HA provided the Penelope distribution and compared it to Fairhurst's distribution using journey to work (JTW) data where they were asked to provide more justification for their distribution. What they have done however is state that they have used the JTW data for their distribution in the main body of the report (para. 7.4) but used the Penelope distribution in the traffic impact diagram in what presumably should be appendix G although it appears to be in the wrong order. We have extrapolated the information necessary for our review"

"Growth rates were previously agreed as part of the scoping process but the years have changed in the TA. Fairhurst is also using the obsolete TEMPRO dataset 6.1. Dataset 6.2 is the definitive version which should be used"

"as the assessments were based on incorrect trip rates, it would be prudent for these to be re-run to ensure the proposed mitigation is still appropriate. In addition, prior to the determination of the application, the proposed works would need to be subject to an independent road safety audit by Local Highway Authority"

As you can see, the common thread throughout Fairhurst's assessment is inaccuracy. To that end I would suggest that none of their findings should be deemed relevant nor reliable and that that should have been the more accurate comment that the HA should have made. In the case of Morley Carr they were re-run but by Bellway Homes (who have since submitted an application for 735 homes in Yarm). This is hardly an unbiased view or reliable second opinion.

I have also attached a document which shows the reality of road congestion in our area. I believe that Stockton Borough Council is in denial with regards to existing traffic congestion. Again, I appreciate that this is not the remit totally of the HA. However, all of this traffic eventually will travel onto the roads that are your remit. All journeys do start and stop in Eaglescliffe and Yarm. As residents, we do travel outside of our own community.

Therefore, any mitigation of the road networks in and around Eaglescliffe and Yarm have to take into account ALL of the proposed development sites and also include all phases of development for each site otherwise any mitigation that is carried out is pointless and flawed from the offset.

Objections have been made indicating existing journey times for residents as being a significant problem due to congestion. Objectors have advised of the following;

- During rush hours an average waiting time on a 2 mile road is 40 minutes minimum.
- Left Darlington at 12:30 arrived at Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe at 14: 30 (after being stuck on the flooded A67 / Urray Nook Road Area).

- 40 minutes to travel less than 2 miles two weeks ago from my residence in Valley Gardens, Eaglescliffe to Goose pastures, Yarm. The traffic was blocked for the entire journey, and it wasn't at a time when the children were at school, when you would expect more traffic to be on the roads.
- At peak times it can take 40 minutes to get from the Allens West Crossing to the Tesco roundabout. This is made worse by drivers cutting through Orchard Estate. Several lanes of traffic attempt to merge into one lane at the roundabout. Leading to a free for all.
- At peak times of the day and all day at weekends queues are backed up from the Cleveland Bay all the way up to Allen West station and also up Urray Nook road for hours at a time.
- You regularly have a 20 minute wait when negotiating the Tesco roundabout in Eaglescliffe during busy periods.
- During peak times it can take 20 minutes to get from Tesco Roundabout to the Cleveland Bay PH junction.
- It can take 20 minutes to get from Eaglescliffe Library to Yarm when its busy.
- As I have to pass the Tesco roundabout on my way home it regularly takes me 30 minutes just to travel from the Eagle pub past the roundabout. These roads can't be widened or changed as the bottlenecks of Durham Lane, Cleveland Bay, Yarm Road etc. are unable to be changed.
- I left Darlington by car at 1230 today and arrived home at Grassholme Way at 1430 after being stuck in the flooded A67/Urray Nook Road area. Appreciating this was an exceptional situation and curious to see how this compared with the rest of Teesside I set off to investigate, on foot. As I passed the Urray Nook area around the level crossing and all the way back to Teesside Airport it was totally gridlocked. Yarm High Street was backed up to Teesside Airport. Overall in the Yarm/Eaglescliffe/Urray Nook area I believe I made far quicker progress on foot than any emergency vehicle could have done, however skilled the driver. The rest of Teesside that I saw was relatively clear. The point of this is that in a situation that Local authorities have declared a state of emergency, when the chips were down, in terms of traffic congestion the arterial area around Urray Nook/A67/Long Newton was proven to be the weakest link. The traffic chaos around this area was (by a huge margin) greater than anywhere else I saw.

If ever there was a day which proved that Yarm and Eaglescliffe cannot cope with more housing and more vehicles on the roads in and around Yarm, it was Tuesday 25 September 2012. The absolute chaos and mayhem that ensued due to the roads flooding because the drains could not cope with the rainfall, was incredible. At one point Leven Bank was closed, the High Street was closed, and the gridlock at the Shell roundabout on Thirsk Road/Green Lane was horrendous. It even affected some of our schools in Yarm, in that they had to close early. Can any member of the Stockton Borough Council's Planning Committee now turn round and honestly say hand on heart, that Yarm and Eaglescliffe will not be affected by an extra 350 homes at Morley Carr Farm, an extra 735 homes at Green Lane, an extra 350 homes at Mount Leven Farm on Leven Bank and these extra 150+ new homes at Urray Nook with a potential for up to 2800+ more cars on the road?

The weather presenters keep talking about these weather phenomenon's of a month's worth of rain in one day, but soon these won't be phenomenon's anymore, they will be the norm as they are happening more and more frequently.

Over the last 15 years there have been numerous developments in Eaglescliffe in back gardens, petrol stations and on other brownfield sites. There is a limit to the amount of traffic that the existing road infrastructure can take.

No model exists, only as a fictional exercise to impress upon residents that all traffic problems can be overcome 6000 or more vehicles cannot be regarded as no worse than it is now no matter how many computer inputs are made.

No amount of money can solve the bottleneck of Yarm High Street. I understand that under planning regulations mitigation must take place to ensure that conditions are no worse than prior to the development. In the case of any development around Yarm this is not possible unless the plan is to tear up the cobbles in Yarm High Street, demolish the town hall and widen the bridge. Any additional traffic will cause longer queues through Yarm.

There are a limited number of jobs in the area, and therefore occupants of the proposed development must travel to other towns for work, and as public transport is limited to one bus every hour, cars will be the main form of transport in and out of the area.

Cycle Path comments

The suggestion is to create a cycle path through Hunters Green to link to Lartington Way and beyond into Eaglescliffe.

Cycle paths that we have now are all dangerous and should not be increased. Creation of footpaths is not the answer as our shopping will have to be carried home and we are not all capable of doing this. Bridle paths amaze us as we do not think residents will approve of wild-west rails for horses nor do we think the horses would be safe in today's environment

It is suggested that the cycle path be on-road. Neither Grassholme Way nor Langdon Way (which the comment fails to mention and along which the path would have to go) are wide enough to accommodate an on-road cycle path. There is only enough room for cars to pass as it is. The footpaths are too narrow to accommodate an additional cycle path also

We have speed bumps throughout Grassholme Way and Langdon Way so an on-road cycle path that would need to cross these speed bumps would create a danger for those using the path as they tried to go over the bumps (especially children)

Unlike the suggestion for the new estate which will have 3 car parking spaces/4 bed homes, on Hunters Green we do not have that luxury of space, with most drives only accommodating two cars. Therefore any visitors to these homes or houses who have more than two cars, park their additional vehicles on the road/footpath adjacent to their property. We also have to reverse off our drives. Creating a cycle path will only result in accidents. By installing a cycle path this would seriously restrict additional parking for the residents on Hunters Green and potentially create a hazard to cyclists using this path.

The creation of a cycle path through Hunters Green will increase noise pollution from the additional footfall created by the use of the cycle path. Hunters Green should not be perceived as a short cut for the new development to get to Eaglescliffe's facilities.

The comment mentions that children could cycle to school. This will only happen in fine weather.

Also what is the point of putting in a cycle path that stops on Lingfield Drive? To get anywhere the path would need to continue onto Mayfield Crescent towards Durham Lane. It would need to branch off down Amberley Way to Durham Lane Primary School. It would also need to continue down to Durham Lane. On meeting Durham Lane, it would need to extend down to the pedestrian crossing. It would also need to be extended down towards Tesco's roundabout, as the current cycle path stops prior to The Eagle Public House. No cycle path exists on the other side of Durham Lane. This would have therefore to be created to link the Pedestrian Crossing to Butterfield Drive and onto Junction Farm School

It is pointless creating a cycle path that stops and then starts. It has to take you from A to B otherwise what is the point in having it? Also would all this then be on-road paths because that is simply dangerous.

Concerns over the proposal of a cycle track along Grassholme Way/Langdon Way towards Lartington Way. Please view the attached drawing in conjunction with the following points. Assuming an on road cycleway is used this will narrow the road to 3.13m from 5.73m using measurements from nearby on road cycle paths, with the average width of a family saloon at 2010mm including mirrors this gives no facility for two cars to be side by side and still leave the cycle path clear. The proposed route would entail crossing Uray Nook Road into Grassholme Way for which a carefully positioned crossing would be required considering the proposed entrance to the new development and the layout both ways of Uray Nook Road and traffic speeds. Bearing in mind this cycle path is in part designed for use by primary school children once they have negotiated the crossing they then have to negotiate speed bumps and a right turn at the east end of Grassholme Way and then more speed bumps to the south, with a further road junction at the south end of Grassholme Way. On street parking with on road cycle paths on this narrow road would be impossible and dangerous.

A combined dual use pedestrian cycle way is not viable because of the too narrow width of the pavements and the loss of priority at every junction. These problems continue all the way to both primary schools and to the comprehensive school. It is notoriously difficult to back fit facilities such as these and exemplifies my previous comments of looking at the bigger picture at the earliest opportunity as appears to have been done at Ingelby Barwick where the cycle paths are well designed and integrated into the transport system. I speak as a keen cyclist who enjoys the use of well-designed and safe cycle paths. I would add that I am not against sustainable development and a safe and pleasant environment for all to live in and enjoy. Please find attached a sketch of the first part of the proposed cycle path area and dimensions, an explanation of which is given below.

The attached sketch shows part of Grassholme Way which is approximately 5.73 metres wide with speed bumps. An average saloon car is 2.10 metres wide including wing mirrors. Thus two saloons passing safely require about 4.7 metres leaving only a clearance of 1.03 metres. Now from local measurements taken on Yarm Road the cycle track is 1.3 metres wide showing the non-feasibility of back fitting a cycle track to this road since it is too narrow, full speed bumps providing an extra hazard to the proposed on road cycle path. On street parking would negate the safety of a cycle track on such a narrow road. A dual use cycle/pedestrian track is not feasible either since the pavement is at most 1.86 metres and a dual purpose cycle track is 1.4 metres wide as measured at Tesco roundabout. Any on pavement cycle track also loses priority at every junction. Similar problems apply on Uray Nook Road. I hope this explanation is helpful to you.

Our cycle tracks at present run from nowhere to nowhere and for this reason alone are not used for transport to work or shops. Furthermore people are unlikely to cycle to work in inclement weather, in the dark or in their office suit. The idea of cycle tracks is to make it safer for cyclists but at every traffic island cyclists are at major risk and on pavement cycling tracks lose their priority at every junction.

Ecology / Environment Based comments

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF paragraph 7) identifies an environmental role as being one of the three dimensions to a sustainable development, the other two dimensions being economic and social. For a proposed development to achieve an environmental role as a sustainable development it needs to contribute to protecting and enhancing the natural environment and, as part of this, help improve the biodiversity of the area and minimise pollution. This proposed development goes no way to protecting and enhancing the natural environment. If anything, it achieves the total opposite.

- The development would be extremely detrimental to the biodiversity of the area as it will destroy the habitat and migration routes of existing wildlife.
- Negative impact on nature and the environment e.g. removing hedgerows and natural habitats.

- Wildlife - This area contains Badgers, Foxes, Newts and other forms of protected species. It will destroy a natural habitat.
- It will cause irreversible damage to Flora and Fauna of the site.
- Hedgehogs, Great Crested Newts and other species are in the area including Badgers. The development will affect these and other species.
- The proposed development will have an adverse effect on the wildlife corridor.
- The rural nature and green belt feel of the area will be compromised due to the large size of the proposed development.

The Rt Hon Greg MP Minister of State to the House of Commons on 27th March 2012. (partial reproduction but verbatim) saidOur reforms to planning policy have 3 fundamental objectives:

- o To put unprecedented power in the hands of communities to shape the places in which they live;
- o To better support growth to give the next generation the chance that our generation has had to have a decent home, and to allow the jobs to be created on which our prosperity depends; and
- o To ensure that the places we cherish - our countryside, towns and cities - are bequeathed to the next generation in a better condition than they are now.

....Too many of our habitats have been degraded and nature driven out.

....The effect has been that much of the public have come to assume that any particular change to our built environment will be negative - that it will tend to impair beauty, damage the environment and make our lives worse.

.....In particular the final framework:

- o Makes it clear that relevant policies - such as those protecting the Green belt, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Parks and other areas - cannot be overridden by the presumption;
- o Recognises the intrinsic value and beauty of the countryside (whether specifically designated or not);
- o Makes explicit what was always implicit: that councils' policies must encourage brownfield sites to be brought back into use;

There is evidence there of many rare species of bird as well as Great Crested Newts. The Eco-north survey seems to have been flawed as only one study of water bodies within 100m of the site were examined during the day. As this creature is nocturnal, hibernates and can travel up to 800m it seems a more thorough investigation is called for.

Natural England objected on the grounds that:-

"Although a detailed newt survey has been carried out, it does not relate to the whole application site which makes mitigation unclear.

It is unclear from the application documents what work is to be done and which of the proposed mitigation measures will be included in the final development.

Survey work focussed on the section of site at Ellif's Mill (SUDS) and not the fields that are to be used for housing development.

Natural England is unclear if the mitigation proposals are sufficient to avoid adverse impacts on the local population of newts and therefore avoid affecting favourable conservation status."

It is Natural England's view that "granting permission would be likely to offend against article 12(1) of the Habitats Directive."

Tees Valley Wildlife Trust has objected on the grounds that:-

"This application will adversely affect populations of GCN. The development site proposes a direct impact on the newt breeding ponds and terrestrial habitat. The Extended Phase 1 survey has a number of key weaknesses....& found instances of GCN 500m to the West... and on this basis the report's conclusions regarding the development's ability to comply with legislation must be questioned."

It is Tees Valley Wildlife's view that a full assessment of the whole site should be completed, Hydrological studies should take place for Eliff's Mill & a Protected Species Management Plan should be prepared. They would expect the Planning Authority to require the above information in order to make its consideration.

Allowing the proposed site to be built on would affect many of the wildlife species associated with the site and, once again, contradicts the 'Safeguarding and improving sites of biodiversity...' mentioned in Core Development document (Appendix 1 - The Western Area).

Destruction of the local wildlife including the Admiralty Ecology Wildlife Site and the disruption of the colony of Great Crested Newts".

With regard to issues of protecting the environment and the protection and enhancement of biodiversity, in developing this site we would neither encourage nor enhance biodiversity. We would be simply destroying areas of natural beauty and habitat. This goes against the National Planning Policy Framework .THIS IS A GREENFIELD SITE and its development would constitute an undesired intrusion into open countryside and farmland, creating urban sprawl.

The site is currently home to a group of Great Crested Newts- a protected species which, as such, is afforded extra protection from having their breeding ground or shelter disturbed, obstructed or destroyed. As the newts travel some distance to feed and breed, the proposed drainage of the site will directly affect this and would contravene Natural Habitat Conservation Regulations 1994 Sch2. The destruction of ponds, woodland scrub and hedgerows, all of which are newt habitat, are also documented to support a diversity of rare wildlife, including Long Eared Owls, Cuckoos, Green Woodpeckers, Tree Sparrows, Deer, Badgers and the increasingly threatened Hedgehogs. Currently arable land, this site forms the feeding, breeding and hunting ground for other rarities including Redwing, Fieldfare, Bullfinch, Kestrel and Barn Owls in particular - currently a Schedule One protected species following a sharp decline in their numbers due to the recent harsh winters. Noise, light and air pollution would affect bordering habitats. Feeding ground would be lost. The increased populous would impinge upon wildlife and bring increased predatory threat from domestic pets. We have a duty to protect these habitats and their dependent wildlife.

I refer to the additional documentation regarding this planning application from Tees Valley Wildlife Trust dated 28/9/12. Comments in these documents indicate that the proposed development could be in breach of legislation protecting the Great Crested Newt.

The Trust calls for further studies to be conducted in order to protect the species. I trust the Planning Authority will be particularly, diligent, in ensuring that the requisite information as detailed is obtained in full before being able to consider the application.

That the surveys conducted, contained insufficient relevant information is also highlighted in Natural England's letter to SBC dated 26/9/12 who point out that the survey work carried out was at Eliff's Mill and not on the fields that are to be built on. Their view is that "granting permission for this would be likely to offend against Article 12(1) of the Habitats Directive" regarding the strict protection of animal species and query "whether the proposals would be likely to be granted a license".

I understand that should it in fact be deemed necessary to obtain an EPSM licence, then the developer will be required to determine if other, less sensitive land is available for the development. The application for the licence will need to show both the need for the scheme and that no satisfactory alternative is available. I do not believe this to be the case.

Destroying Countryside and wildlife - I find it difficult to understand why you want to destroy the green spaces we have as these are the reasons people want to live in this area and not in a

town/city centre. The land at Urlay Nook has a lot of wildlife with all the hedgerows, trees and marsh land. This land offers a home to many different species including crested newts and birds. Do you consult any experts on what damage you will cause and what will be lost due to development?

As a family man I am also extremely concerned about the impact on nature and the environment e.g. Great Crested Newt and the fact that the survey was carried out on the actual development site in September on behalf of Taylor Wimpey and you can only survey for newts between mid-April and mid-May. This development is neither protecting nor enhancing biodiversity. It is destroying it by removing hedgerows and natural habitats.

I object to this planning application. Surrounding Yarm from all corners with building sites and the potential number of extra cars and people once the properties are built, will ruin a lovely town, once credited as being the best in Britain and a National study recently put Yarm tenth in the country to be family friendly. Many of the towns in the top twenty are quiet, picturesque and often small towns that provide parents with a safe and peaceful environment to bring up their children. As a local resident I have experience of the effect of the heavy traffic going through Yarm. The fumes level is high, too high to be acceptable and to have the fumes level monitored by one builder and then again by another surely is suspect, see Morley Carr application. I had cause to walk from Butts lane to Yarm High Street, there and back, twice one Friday afternoon. The traffic was constant and the fumes unbearable. This will only worsen and I fear for my grandchildren who walk to and from school over Yarm Bridge. What will the long term effects be I wonder? The recent flooding due to heavy rainfall clearly shows the drains cannot cope and the whole infrastructure simply can hardly cope at present so the potential for major housing developments round the town will simply ruin it for all time.

Finally our green areas are an important asset not only for wildlife but the well-being of the community please don't destroy them.

There are over fifty species of wild life recorded on this proposed development area, most of which will lose their habitat if this goes ahead. Greater crested newts, E.E.C. protected species, have been found on and adjacent to this site and before planning permission is given the correct surveys and mitigation should be carried out. The national planning framework make it clear that policies protecting greenbelt, sites of special scientific interest ,national parks and other areas cannot be overridden by presumption.

The Council's policy is to protect wild life habitats. At Urlay Nook there are over 50 wildlife species including the protected Great Crested Newt. There is a wild life corridor from Longnewton to and across the A67. It has been reported that a pair of Barn Owls are at Coatham Wood. There are also foxes and deer in the area. As Minister Greg Clarke said "too many of our habitats have been degraded and nature driven out."

- The proposed development is right in the middle of known populations of GCN to the North, South and West which should be considered as one population and they are likely to be on site too.
- GCN have been found on site by residents, therefore the barriers of road and rail should not be considered impenetrable.
- The Phase 1 survey completed for Taylor Wimpey was seriously flawed.
- It is highly likely that the development will be illegal, offending a Habitat's Directive and any development would require a EPSM licence

Whilst the application was being considered the farmer was witnessed ploughing the two fields subject of the proposed development plus the area to the south where there is a public footpath (immediately adjacent to the potential development site). As this area has been identified as an area within a natural habitat for a meta population of Great Crested Newts, surely the farmer is in Breach of European Law as this activity i.e. ploughing will have destroyed a vast area of natural

habitat for the newts. It also, due to the time of the year, will have potentially killed a number of them as they will currently be on the land.

I read with interest Natural England's Interim Guidance August 2007 Document and I quote below parts of this document:

- *"Declines have been mainly due to the loss of breeding ponds, reduction in breeding pond suitability (notably through shading and fish introduction) and fragmentation of habitats."*
- *"Most great crested newt breeding ponds in England are field ponds in arable or pastoral settings... on land, great crested newts can be found in a range of habitats, with large numbers often found in ancient woodland, scrub and rough grassland where there are suitable ponds nearby. "*
- *"Great crested newts often inhabit ponds that are part of a 'pond cluster', and individuals move between ponds with varying frequency "*
- *"The great crested newt is strictly protected under the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and the Conservation (Natural Habitats &c.) Regulations 1994 (as amended).*
- *"Capturing, disturbing, injuring and killing newts is prohibited, as is damaging or destroying their breeding sites and resting places"*
- *" many farming activities will inevitably kill individual newts or damage resting places... so long as there is no large scale loss of high quality habitat and breeding ponds are kept intact"*
- *"If an activity is likely to result in an offence (such as disturbing newts), there are several options to allow the work to go ahead lawfully:*
 - Avoid carrying it out
 - Alter the methods or timing to reduce the chance of committing an offence
 - Obtain a licence to allow otherwise unlawful activities.

A licence application would need to demonstrate that (1) the authorised activities are for a specified purpose (most commonly over-riding public interest or conservation), (2) there is no satisfactory alternative, and (3) the activities would not compromise the conservation status of the species. Some activities would require habitat creation to offset damage or destruction, in order to meet the third test. "

"As general guidance, invasive works on breeding ponds are best done during November to January, as newts are unlikely to be present (most great crested newts hibernate on land).

Common activities that might involve offences include:

- Ploughing close to breeding ponds
- Removal of dense vegetation using methods that involve ground disturbance
- Removal of materials (dead wood, rubble etc.) piled on the ground
- Renovation of buildings where ground excavations are involved.

ES options and capital items, where careful timing and planning will be essential to minimise the risk of committing an offence where great crested newts occur, include the following:

- Maintenance and restoration of woodland and wood pasture (HC07, HC08, HC13)
- Maintenance and restoration of successional areas and scrub (HC15, HC16)
- Maintenance, restoration and creation of semi-improved or rough grassland (HK15, HK16, HK17)
- Restoration of forestry areas to lowland heathland (HO03)
- Maintenance and restoration of ponds (HQ01, HQ02, PR, PRP)

Until now, the fields have been left to grass and a crop of grass has been cut each year. The hedges had also been maintained. The land owner had therefore adhered to the points below.

Common activities that are very unlikely to result in offences include:

- Tree surgery, pollarding and coppicing
- Standard management of fish ponds, duck ponds and narrow ditches
- Standard hedge, fence and stone wall management
- mowing grassland that has minimal tussock or thatch structure
- mowing most grass swards to a height of c 15cm.

By ploughing this field all that the land owner has succeeded in doing is potentially fragmenting the habitats and the population of the Great Crested Newt. They will have also potentially destroyed many newts that are currently on land. Ploughing has been carried out too near to a Pond on Urlay Nook.

As previously stated, under the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and the Conservation (Natural Habitats &c.) Regulations 1994 (as amended) capturing, disturbing, injuring and killing newts is prohibited, as is damaging or destroying their breeding sites and resting places. Surely by ploughing the farmer is in breach of these protection Laws. There has been a large scale loss of high quality habitat and as such I believe that they have caused an offence. Ploughing should have been avoided at all costs. I believe that this further adds to the fact that the developer is paying no regard to Ecology, biodiversity or the protection rights that these amphibians hold. To that end, I felt it necessary to bring the land owners activities to your attention and trust that you will find it of interest.

The Urlay Nook site very much comes under this umbrella of concerns and is also a site of special interest due to the presence of Great Crested Newts. The line quoted in 8.29-LDD in relation to the Newts states that 'these issues can be overcome', suggests the low regard in which nature and wildlife is held. Even re-location of a species cannot be guaranteed to be 100% successful and flies in the face of the 'protected species' policy.

We strongly object to the new proposed development at Urlay Nook on the grounds of:-

- Local Rare Wildlife Ecology:- the land literally next door from the proposed development, is a local bird & wildlife sanctuary called 'Admiralty Ecology Wildlife Site'. This site is commonly used by the RSPB for ringing and bird studies. Rare species such as Long Eared Owl, Green Woodpecker and Tree Sparrow use this habitat for nesting. Other rare species use this habitat for breeding, feeding and hunting such as Redwing, Lapwing, Fieldfare, Bullfinch and Chiffchaff. As well as these rarer species, many birds of prey nest and hunt in these fields including Barn Owl and Kestrel. All these species have been ringed by the RSPB volunteers in the last year. Very rare visitors have also been seen on site such as Great Grey Shrike presumably because of the favourable conditions. All these species would be decimated if the development took this arable land away from the wildlife, being so close to the planned estate. The proposed development plans to take land literally up to the borders of this area. Only a road and rail track separates the two areas. Hunting and feeding ground would be lost forever with noise, light and air pollution affecting the remaining site. There are many other birds and wildlife not mentioned above reliant on this site too, all of which would be decimated with the proposed development.
- Great Crested Newts have been identified as living on the land immediately bordering both North & South of this proposed development and also have been spotted in gardens of Middleton Close and Grassholme Way. This means the newts travel some distance to feed and breed across the proposed development land. They are most likely to be living in ponds actually on the site itself too. All the proposed development will be within 200m of the breeding population of this newt destroying ponds, woodland, scrub and hedgerows, all of which are newt habitat. This Great Crested Newt is mentioned in Schedule 5 of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 & is fully protected under UK and European Legislation such as :-

- Bern Convention 1979: Appendix III
- Wildlife & Countryside Act (as Amended) 1981: Schedule 5
- EC Habitats Directive 1992: Annex II and IV
- Conservation (Natural Habitats etc.) Regulations 1994: Schedule 2
- Countryside Rights of Way Act 2000 (CRoW 2000)

It is an offence (section 9(4)) to intentionally damage, destroy, obstruct access to, any structure or place which Great Crested Newts use for shelter or protection. It is also an offence to intentionally disturb them while occupying a structure or place which it uses for that purpose i.e. their breeding ground and natural habitat. The proposed development will do this. Their inclusion on Schedule 2 of the Conservation Regulations 1994 affords great crested newts extra protection by also making it an offence under Regulation 39(1) to deliberately capture, kill or disturb Great Crested Newts or to deliberately take or destroy their eggs, or damage or destroy a breeding site or resting place. Regulation 39(2) makes it an offence to keep, or transport, or exchange Great Crested Newts or any part or thing derived from them. Paragraphs 39(1) and 39(2) apply to all stages of their life cycle.

In the SBC's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment of 2011 point 2.17 states that zero housing potential should be assigned to land on which there is a Great Crested Newt pond, or a local wildlife site or a flood risk zone. Urlay Nook proposed development could contravene all three of these factors.

A Great Crested Newt licence is required if any disturbance or damage to their habitat is likely to occur, issued only by a licensed ecological consultant after a minimum of six surveys at specifically between mid-March to mid-June (three should be between mid-April to mid-June). Only then, if any mitigation is required, a second licence application will be needed with detailed plans. These licences (EPSM) will only be granted by Natural England for reasons of overriding public interest if "no satisfactory alternative to the development is possible". This is not the case in the Urlay Nook proposal, being a Green Field site. Natural England have also stated that any mitigation undertaken for the site would have to be left for 18 months after the mitigation to ensure that it has worked ensuring lengthy delays in unfinished estates!

Eco North, on behalf of Taylor Wimpey have carried out the required six surveys in May 2012 on the Ellif's Mills site immediately adjacent to the proposed estate the results of which found a 'small population'. A large population of great crests newts are known to be present at the Elementis Nature Reserve located within 500 m to the north of Ellif's Mills.

As Great Crested Newts are known to travel up to 500m to feed & breed, and have been seen on gardens to the West of the proposed development, it is natural to assume that they are on site too. Due to the small distances between each of the ponds and the presence of ideal habitat across a wider area (both on- and off-site) it should be considered that an interchange of animals occurs between the water bodies and a single population exists (EcoNorth).

As drainage conditions will change after building work on the site adjacent to the population, Ellif's Mills' small population will no doubt be disturbed and the survey (without sight of detailed plans of SUDS) recommended:-

- There are clear issues relating to proposed development (SUDS) on the Ellif's Mills site with respect to the confirmed presence of a small population of European protected species.
- Construction activity on the site is likely to cause breaches of their protective legislation (e.g. injury, death, disturbance and destruction of breeding ponds and/or terrestrial resting or hibernation places).
- It is highly likely that in this case a (EPSM) licence will be required

- the developer should determine if other, less sensitive land is available for any proposed development works. Any ultimate application for an EPSM licence will need to show both the need for the scheme and that no satisfactory alternative is available. THIS IS NOT THE CASE!

In the developers Planning statement they state that a only a Phase 1 Habitat Survey was undertaken by Eco North on the 20th September 2011 which found no sign of the newt actually on site. September is the wrong month to survey (should be mid-March to June) and, as stated above, with newts present to the South & North, the population should be considered as one with newts travelling between the habitats.

With current commercial and parking issues already concerning businesses on Yarm High Street, this unique market town area, surrounded by farmland and countryside, risks no longer being an attractive place to visit or live through traffic gridlock.

Education

It has been reported that following the approval of the development at Allens West Junction Farm will be extended but the Urlay Nook development has not been accounted for. As a result children will have to be transported elsewhere for school places.

The primary schools are already at capacity and Egglecliffe secondary is over capacity so I have major concerns about where school places for all the extra housing will be created. It's ok saying that the funds have to be made available but actually producing the places and the physical classrooms before these houses are built is unlikely leaving schools over stretched then providing poorer schooling. If your past is anything to go by you will allow for the houses to be built and then have to ship kids outside of Egglecliffe for schooling, just like you did with Ingleby Barwick when they shipped children in to Egglecliffe.

Even at the present time, if you include the already approved application for 843 houses at Allens West there are insufficient primary school places.

the whole planning application fails to address the shortage in school places for the children. This comment would seem to suggest that the children from Urlay Nook will go to Durham Lane Primary, when actually the plan is to expand Junction Farm School to try to accommodate the new developments (although places will still not be sufficient to cover all the potential new children). This is dependent on funding from the Allens West development which is progressing slowly. So a question still needs to be asked, which school Urlay Nook children will attend? It cannot be Durham Lane Primary as they have no available places. Before building a cycle path, you need to understand where it needs to lead to.

I have just read the comments posted regarding the Educational requirement for the above development. This states the requirement will be $158 \times 0.26 = 41$ places from 159 dwellings not 158. The comment further infers that as Durham Lane School is currently 3% over net capacity, provision will be made at another school. If this other school is Junction Farm it will be already undergoing enlargement to cater for the Allens West development of 845 houses. ($0.26 \times 845 =$) 219 places required. Again if the full site at Urlay Nook is developed at 570 dwellings, the total requirement will be 148 plus Allens West gives a requirement of 367 places on completion. Clearly piecemeal extensions will not be enough.

The reference here meant to read that they currently only have 3% surplus places available against a total net Capacity of 210. This means that there are only 6/7 places available.

a) If the comment was "meant" to read that they currently have 3% surplus then this needs amending on the comments website as, as it stands, the information that has been provided is inaccurate

- b) you also did not address my comment that he has based his calculation on the wrong amount of houses for this development. There are 159 houses being proposed, not 158 houses as he has worked his calculation on. So in effect the developer needs to pay more than you have suggested. This also needs amending
- c) How can there be 6/7 places available at Durham Lane Primary. Surely there is either 6 or 7. Can I ask which it is?

The developer contribution of £300k from stage 1 of Urlay Nook will not be enough to contribute to the £3 million to Junction Farm if Allens West is further delayed.

- Increased pressure on existing primary and secondary schools.
- The distance from Urlay Nook to Junction Farm is 20-25 minute walk and too far for young children to walk
- Sending children from Urlay Nook to Junction Farm is socially divisive in that they do not live near the school.
- Surely they should go to the school whose catchment area they are in but that may displace other children.
- This will result in extra traffic travelling to Junction Farm which is already heavily congested at school times.
- The comments referred to only mention primary school places. Can you tell me what sums will be set aside to provide additional places at Egglecliffe as there will be a shortage of secondary places by the end of 2012/13?

a) Junction Farm Primary extension will only accommodate 210 extra primary children. Allens West alone needs 219 based on the above calculation. There will never be enough space for any additional children from Urlay Nook.

b) It is my understanding that additional development sites may be included in the next phase of the LDD consultation and two of these are potentially in Egglecliffe (South Preston and West Preston). The total housing potential here is 5290 houses. Junction Farm extension will not be able to accommodate this, Allens West and Urlay Nook (even just the phase 1. 159 homes).

c) If further expansion of housing i.e. phase 2 Urlay Nook, may result in a significant expansion of Durham Lane Primary, why is Junction Farm being expanded? Surely Durham Lane should be extended first? It would appear that we are extending the wrong school. The £328,000 should be spent on Durham Lane surely?

Some comments have been made in respect to officers answers to specific questions and officers comments are detailed below in order to provide reference for the neighbour comments.

Surely any money for Education from Taylor Wimpey/Urlay Nook needs to be spent in our own community when Egglecliffe (prior to any development) is in dire need of further Primary and secondary school places? Why address someone else's needs when we have our own need right here?

Surely the Admission Zone for Urlay Nook will be within that of Durham Lane's Admission Zone? Therefore how will Durham Lane decide who to turn away? There is no primary school to the West of Urlay Nook that children from Urlay Nook could attend. Urlay Nook children therefore should automatically take priority over the children who live nearer to Junction Farm e.g. those on Mayfield Crescent.

b) If parental choice is to go to Durham Lane on what grounds could Durham Lane refuse them?

c) Urlay Nook cannot be in the Admission Zone for Junction Farm Primary and not Durham Lane.

d) At the Planning Application review meeting held at Junction Farm we were informed that Junction Farm was only being expanded to take children from Allens West not Urlay Nook. They said that if Urlay Nook goes ahead then Egglecliffe will need a new primary school building. Who would pay for this once the developers have gone and you have spent the 106 agreement money elsewhere?

c) Surely they should go to the school whose catchment area they are in but that may displace other children

So you agree that it will be socially divisive as parents who wish their child to go to Durham Lane will not be guaranteed a place. They may be allocated Butts Lane or Junction Farm, both of which are 25 minute walk away. Not within their immediate dwelling place so this brings into question if this is socially sustainable?

b) Durham Lane currently has 6/7 places available, Urray Nook by your colleagues calculation needs 41 (at least). The expansion of Junction Farm will not be fully completed until late 2014 (confirmed at the aforementioned meeting). The priority is to the Lower School to expand first (by Easter next year) but the upper school will not be finished until late 2014. In their current year 5 they already have 33 pupils. Durham Lane has 30; Butts Lane has 30; The Links has 30. So where in the community would year 5 children go? Junction Farm would not currently be able to take any more children so what then?

c) the baby boom is already happening in Eaglescliffe. These children already exist and will require additional places as they enter into education. The numbers of children are increasing in Eaglescliffe without further development. We need to ensure that we accommodate the children that are already living in Eaglescliffe first before considering bringing in additional children from new developments.

d) By shoehorning children into these schools the standard of education will go down, facilities will be stretched and what were once considered good schools will no longer be a place where families want their children to attend. Who will want to buy houses in Eaglescliffe then as a current draw is the good level of education on offer.

e) Where do the children from West and South Preston go if those sites are to be reconsidered?

d) as a result of this policy there will be extra traffic travelling to Junction Farm which is already heavily congested at school times

You are suggesting that the only expansion currently under consideration is for Junction Farm. Whether a child goes in a taxi or a parent's car, this will generate more traffic. How can you say that the "future" traffic surveys would feature this? This is again a reaction to a situation after the horse has bolted. Who will fund the necessary road improvements then? Again if Durham Lane were the school to be extended then the children from Urray Nook could walk there more easily. What about the poor residents near to Junction Farm who will have to endure the increase in traffic. The education plan really has not been thought through at all. I give below a further objection to the above application.

If Junction Road is the only school in the area prepared to expand then families moving into the area will have no choice but to drive children to school, again adding to the congestion. But once the 850 houses will be built at Allens West of course there will be no places!!!! Where will they go then.

this would greatly affect the number of children against the number of school places. i searched for years for a house, and picked this one, built by George Wimpey, based on the location and Durham Lane/Egglescliffe school.

According to Stockton-on-Tees Children, Education and Social Care School Organisation plan 2011-16, there will be a shortage of secondary school places at Egglescliffe School by 2014 based on current statics, without additional housing. Again, should the proposed development at Allens West be delayed, the funding of £1.5m for the increased provision of primary school places at Junction Farm Primary School which is on phased release will not happen There are currently only 5 free primary places in Eaglescliffe. There will be no increased provision in infrastructure to mitigate the effects on the community. Increased school places need to be provided first before further development. Will Taylor Wimpey pay these costs instead?

Also, the additional housing and population will put huge pressure on the schools in the area which are already full and oversubscribed.

The free school at Ingleby Barwick for 150 places may or may not go ahead and the too slow gradual expansion of All Saints will put pressure on our schools since we may have to take excess pupils from Ingleby. At the moment there are only 5 spare places in our local primary schools ie they cannot accommodate new children from new developments, this will eventually put pressure on our secondary schools without any problems from Ingleby.

Even taking into consideration the free school at Ingleby Barwick, if it goes ahead, & the expansion of All Saints our schools are currently under pressure, our local primary & secondary schools cannot accommodate new children from new developments.

Service Provisions

Additional housing in Yarm and Eaglescliffe will have a further detrimental effect on dentist and doctors. There are already difficulties in getting appointments with existing population levels. New housing will create longer waiting times.

The area cannot take these constant building programmes. Various services will be at breaking point e.g. doctors surgeries, dental services and school places.

The proposed development does not provide accessible local services that can be used by all local residents and would in no way support community health, social and cultural well-being.

- The public open space is shown on land near to the A67 and on land that floods.
- Public Open Space must be securely fenced from the A67.
- There Should be an adequate provision for children to play.
- In view of the distance to services a bus service should be provided from Urray Nook Road.

There is limited parking available at the Health Centre. Demand for this will increase.

The council are duty bound to sustain a reasonable standard of living for current residents and home owners, through services and amenities provided. However, despite many previous local developments, all of which have contributed a significant increase in Council Tax revenue there has been no reinvestment of this income.

The roads and facilities provided by the council are barely able to cope with today's demands. Until I see evidence that these will be improved to cope with the additional strain I must wholly object to these plans.

This proposed development which is not within easy walking distance of any facilities

- The increased population would have a negative impact on the current facilities and infrastructure within Eaglescliffe including limited places at doctors, dentists, schools etc.
- How will local doctors/dentists take on additional patients when waiting times for appointments are already long and unacceptable?
- There are few amenities within walking distance of the site and only one hourly bus service to Stockton.
- The additional housing will stretch existing services, which are already stretched, such as the health centre.
- There is a lack of sports facilities such as swimming pool etc.

Lack of Amenities - can the local medical centre absorb the extra residents and still provide an excellent service like they do now. When Allens West development is complete that could be potentially another 2500 patients, before you even add on the amount from this development.

The provision of amenities for this site are, apart from a small play area non-existent, the nearest local shopping parade no longer exists since it was burnt down in May, the nearest post office is in Yarm and gets further away as development expands. This applies to the railway station, employment and social activities. There is no local employment being created to absorb new residents which is essential for sustainable development. New road crossing facilities would be required for public safety, adding to traffic congestion.

While I understand that development of green field sites that are attractive to developers and therefore lucrative to the council are an easy option it does little to address social inequalities. There is supposedly some provision of affordable housing but in reality how many people will be able to access this. So if you live in Eaglescliffe your kids will go to good schools and have a future and you live a few miles away in other parts of Stockton they don't.

There is by S.B.C.s own admission pressure on local school places which will increase with an increase in population.

Drainage / Flooding related Matters

- This site is regularly under water and seemed like bog land.
- Recent flooding has resulted in the A67 being closed and the flood waters came from the land associated with the application site.
- Flooding from the site also drained across Urray Nook Road and to the front of Hunters Green and onto people's gardens in Grassholme Way.
- The land that is proposed already floods what happens when it is covered with concrete and bricks where will the water run off go.
- Concern is that this situation will deteriorate as the clay sub soil is disturbed when building commences.
- I jog on the public right of way in the area and find the field are always flooded. There is nowhere for the water to drain. This will create flooding and drainage problems for Hunters Green.
- The proposed housing will increase surface water run off to the surrounding area / road.
- It is believed that the physical infrastructure such as public drainage and water systems do not have the capacity to take on yet another development.
- This does not bode well for the local drainage and water systems as eventually something has to give and it is the local community that suffer.
- The applicant's comments with regards to "Northumbrian Water's network to accommodate and treat the anticipated flows arising from the development", should form an integral part of any decision made by the planning authority.
- Given the apparent failure of the local authority and government agencies to prevent or adequately manage the effects of the recent heavy rainfall, we are very concerned about the potential consequences of unforeseen effects to changes to land drainage and water table. We are constantly being reminded that extreme meteoric phenomena are to become less infrequent. Does the proposed submitted design deal with this issue adequately? Or will the developer leave future problems to be addressed by the local authorities and private individuals.

I refer to the comment by the Environment Agency regarding the proposed drainage of the land. They state they will not recommend Nelly Burdon's Beck to be used for the draining of the land due to flood risk and it would be recommended to have a underground drainage system. Could the planning committee please refer back to the recent news of the flooding at Newburn Apartments where the foundations were washed away due to a collapse of an underground drainage/culvert system!!

The additional buildings will substantially reduce the rainfall run-off area. I understand from the Foul Water & Utilities Assessment Document that it is proposed to run surface water drainage into Nelly Burdon's Beck. Given recent record amounts of rainfall I am concerned that this will create the potential for flooding.

During the recent floods, nowhere did I see flooding like I did in the A67/Urlay Nook area. The Hartburn flooding made national news but was contained in a dip in a relatively small area. The flooding around A67 Urlay Nook, whilst not as deep, was much more widespread and disruptive (hence the traffic chaos). The building of more houses will only add to and channel this flooding into the Hunters Green area.

Pollution

- Many hundreds of cars will add to the pollution of the area, particularly as there will be more standing traffic due to increased traffic movements.
- The main combustion pollutants from standing traffic are N.oxide and pm10 and 2.5. These are known to be major lung irritants. N.oxide is heavier than air and will sit at pedestrian height thus resulting in inevitable risks to health.
- Whatever is said by S.B.C. we can see the congestion and smell the pollution and feel the heartbeat quicken in standing traffic. All these pollutants are at times within the E.E.C. limits but so was asbestos and turning your back on nuclear tests, so why exacerbate a situation which increases known carcinogens into the atmosphere. Our council would be better off pressing for a national debate into the use of clean transport fuels such as hydrogen since electric cars are only as green as the power station producing the electricity.
- In view of the proximity of Elementis Chromium I would expect a full environmental assessment to be carried out to determine the extent of any potential fall out of chromium compounds.
- Noise and Air Pollution - noise will increase during the long construction phase, and permanently due to the increased traffic from the development.
- It is close to the Police Training Centre at Urlay Nook and former Elementis Site which could mean possible contamination.
- The site is also close to the former Elementis site, which could mean possible contamination.
- The level of Air Pollution in Yarm High Street is already causing serious concern in the local community. This would only be exacerbated if this application were approved.

With this proposed development there could be up to 318 extra cars using Urlay Nook Road. (Northumbria Water Authority scientific services state that Urlay Nook road traffic will increase by 67.9% from this development alone) this is on top of other proposed developments in this area. Adding more traffic to our already congested and polluted roads will only make this situation worse. The pollution levels in Eaglescliffe from the aurn (monitoring station) at Eggescliffe school are generally within the prescribed safe limits for nitrous oxide of 40mgm/m³, but do on many occasions exceed these limits for short periods up to very high levels as high as for example on the 15th of June 2012 139mgm/m³ (the highest reading being on the 15/01/2012 at 583mgm/m³), as traffic increases this will increase pollution disproportionately from the increase in traffic since more congestion will result and this will result in increased standing time for new and present traffic. This standing of traffic is going to happen at peak times, ie school times and morning and evening busy times. this when most people including children are in the area. It would appear there is no problem if the annual pollution figures are below the E.E.C. recommendations but it is not ok if it is you or your child who receive the elevated dose on a daily basis.

The nitrous oxide pollution along with pm10 and pm2.5 particulate (extremely small particles which may be carcinogenic) may or may not become akin to the aforementioned examples but it would be wise to try and limit the exposure one way or the other. I see that Northumbria Water Authority

scientific services have done some work on pollution and its effects for the developer. For these models effects to be calculated they have used the met station at Loftus. I do not think this is reliable or usable data for the following reasons:-

Tesco Eaglescliffe is at an altitude of 90ft whilst the Loftus station is at an altitude of 518ft just to the south of Boulby Cliff which is at 660ft. Loftus station 20.2 miles from Tesco Eaglescliffe, hardly a close point to model the meteorology of the Tees Bay and inland from it. This tends to point to the need for an independent survey to be undertaken for S.B.C.

I have also been made aware that the air quality monitoring station that was previously housed at Yarm Town Hall was moved to Egglecliffe School in September 2008 because of the proposed developments within the Town Hall. The fact the air quality monitor was moved from Yarm High Street, where the impact of stationary and slow moving traffic is greater than at Egglecliffe School, is worrying in itself. I believe that the air quality in Yarm in 2008 showed high levels of NO₂ and that it is more prominent around the taller buildings in Yarm. Yarm is, in effect, in a basin and therefore harmful gases such as NO₂ will tend to linger around rather than disperse.

Northumbria Water Authority scientific services claim in the Traffic Report that the increase in air pollution would be negligible, but with a predicted increase in traffic flow by 69.7% from the 159 proposed houses on Uray Nook Road, air pollution must increase by the same percentage and cannot therefore be considered negligible.

Although an increase in noise pollution is identified, Northumbrian Water suggests that the increase generated by this new development will be imperceptible. However it is significant enough to recommend its solution in the form of improved double glazing and close boarded fencing to the new residents on Uray View, suggesting its significance will in fact be considerable. This will not overcome the negative impact on the local residents due to the prevailing wind being Westerly and therefore any additional air and noise pollution generated by the new development from traffic and people will travel towards Hunters Green.

It appears that as far as local land pollution is concerned only desk top studies have been done. To the north west of the site chemicals have been produced for almost 200 years. Now as far as I am aware the site fence does not stop any off site pollution, much of which may be completely unknown of, so would it not appear reasonable to do an in depth survey of land close to the chemical works for chemical compounds associated with hexavalent chromium products which are known carcinogens and were produced on site. Along with this no mention is made of the shallow drain from the factory which runs across the site and has fractured at least once to my knowledge along with collapse of the Allens West/M.O.D. site drain, which also runs under the site and is well known from video evidence to be in a bad state of repair. Both of these drains require investigation for pollution and functionality.

Northumbria Water Authority scientific services study suggests that noise pollution will increase and will be above tolerable levels for houses adjacent to the A67, mitigation will be by banking and close boarded fencing, what does this say for existing housing stock adjacent to the A67.

We object to this proposed development, we live adjacent to Uray Nook Road, and the increase in noise from even more traffic will be unbearable, we are already affected by noise pollution and I see from the documents issued for Taylor Wimpey they have stated that they will need to use additional acoustic barriers in some areas of this new development so they therefore are already predicting that noise will be a problem. There are already plans approved to develop Allen's West with over 800 houses and this alongside Uray Nook development will only exacerbate our already congested traffic system. There is no consideration given to residents now and the effect of increased traffic noise.

It is impossible to hold a normal conversation when walking along Yarm Rd, Uray Nook Rd or Darlington Back Lanes, because of the incessant noise levels. Pedestrians are constantly bombarded by levels of pollution which should have disappeared with the steam train and yet

these are the routes which our children must walk to school. Increased traffic means an increased risk to health.

The presence of the police firearms training centre on the north west of the site creates noise from automatic weapons fire, explosions and helicopter movements, all of which are expected from such an establishment but to build closer to this may create unbearable and sometimes frightening noise to new, more adjacent residents. There is also a security aspect in building close to such an establishment.

Urley Nook Road finally now has a weight limit which has reduced the pollution and noise from heavy vehicles, and now the Council are considering approval of an application which would reinstate this pollution and noise.

This increase in traffic and resultant queuing adjacent to Egglecliffe School raises the question of air pollution monitoring. The air intake of the monitoring equipment is 3 meters from the ground and as nitrous dioxide is heavier than air reading for the exhaust gas cannot be truly accurate. Our school children are bombarded with this chemical every time they go to and leave school. The developer's use of weather monitoring at Loftus (some 20 miles away) does not assist their case.

Renewables & Sustainable Building

In section 5.9 of Taylor Wimpey's energy submission they state that the application of on-site renewables will limit CO2 production from the site. They will not build a combined heat and power installation, all the houses will not be south facing for photovoltaic electricity generation, the average load factor of a wind turbine is about 27%, i.e. it does not work most of the time, and heat generation from ground based systems is too expensive to contemplate. On top of all this for when the sun does not shine and the wind does not blow we have to have install open circuit gas turbines or coal fired generation to pick up the load, at great expense, at other times these installations are at none or reduced load since clean nuclear power does not load follow.

It is hoped that all dwellings will have south facing roof's with PV panels on them.

Housing Provision

The Supporting Planning Statement made by the developer at paragraph 3.5 states the 15% of the properties will be "affordable" comprising 12 x 2 bed and 12 x 3 bed properties. This is in conflict with the requirement as stated by the Head of Housing which says that the "affordable" houses should be 18 x 2 bed and 6 x 3 bed.

Stockton has many brownfield sites in prime locations crying out to be developed. The area does not need any more expensive 3 and 4 bedroom homes that will not be sold, it needs 1 and 2 bedroom properties in the centre of towns, especially as social housing will soon be removing single people from there unpopulated homes due to the new bedroom rate been introduced in April13!! Hundreds of unused and derelict homes around Stockton can be bought and developed for social housing instead. As this is the future need where there is going to be a housing shortage NOT more expensive 3 or 4 bedrooms homes that people have no money to buy!!

If more houses are definitely needed in Stockton, I'm sure there must be several options closer to Stockton Centre which could be redeveloped, enabling people to have better access to the town's facilities.

The proposed numbers of housing for rental, whilst not excessive, are assumed to be social housing. I am concerned that Stockton Council have said that this will assist with the pressures faced from the welfare reform bill. Surely if this is social housing it should be subject to a Section 106, as provision of affordable rental options for people with a local connection to Egglecliffe and Yarm and not to assist with the fallout from welfare reforms such as the bedroom tax???

Stockton Council should promote the building of new affordable housing for first time buyers and those on low incomes on brownfield sites near to the town centre. To build here makes more

economic sense and this would help to regenerate the town centre. Surely this makes more sense rather than allow planners to build on green-field sites in out of town areas that haven't got the infrastructure to cope.

Stockton Council must look to redevelop the town centre where brownfield land is readily available. Cheaper land = cheaper housing for first time buyers and those on low incomes, not those on high salaries who can afford executive housing on out of town greenfield site.

Miscellaneous

I do not believe this proposed development would support a strong and vibrant community. It will not meet the housing needs of present and future generations and will only add to the overdevelopment of houses proposed for the Yarm area.

I know the mess up SBC made of not believing Taylor Wimpey's figures for Morley Carr Farm and got Bellway to check them but at least we are well under way with "Yarm for Yorkshire" campaign and are receiving backing from other Council's south of the river, it's a shame the river can't be moved so you can join us!

- The proposed development and its impacts will have a negative impact on house prices in the area.
- We sincerely hope that any decision taken by Stockton Borough council on this proposal shall not be politically or financially influenced and taken with due consideration of the community of Eaglescliffe.
- Is there a real need for this housing - the population of the area is falling so is the demand for these houses more imagined than real?
- I object strongly to the above proposed planning application, as a life-long resident of Eaglescliffe you are continually destroying the ethos of Eaglescliffe/Yarm and surrounding areas.
- I would wonder if the possibility of another 843 council tax bills has a bearing on any decision.
- Please respect the objections of 1000's.
- Our quality of life will diminish and the infrastructure will be decimated under this avalanche of housing development on Greenfield sites. Please stop this urban sprawl and sense-less over development of Eaglescliffe and Yarm.
- What we want as a community is not being considered.
- Nobody wants urban sprawl, it can never be reversed, especially when there are more brownfield sites which the developers refuse to develop as they will not achieve such high profit margins.
- I realise that more homes may be needed and obviously developers want to build in areas where they can command the highest prices for their homes, but Eaglescliffe is being overdeveloped.
- To help to preserve the quality of life for current residents and the nature of this unique and historic Market Town and rejecting Planning Application: Yarm School Playing Fields, Green Lane 12/1990/EIS and Planning Application: Uray Nook 12/2047/OUT
- The unique market town of Yarm will be totally ruined by this and other proposed developments to which I also object.
- Local businesses will suffer as people will be put off going into Yarm due to queuing traffic.
- The proposal is sub urban sprawl.
- The development will overlook existing properties affecting amenity and privacy.
- The development will result in the erosion of the strategic gap.
- The proposals will more than double the size of the Parish.

- This is another proposed development which will ruin the Historic town of Yarm.

The loss of open land is also a concern - Eaglescliffe and Yarm are great places to live and one of the reasons for that is that they are not overdeveloped areas and there's still open space and this development will have a big impact on that and reduce the open space in the area.

There's the added possibility of anti-social behaviour due to the increased population and increased housing.

I also feel very angry that you put developers before the residents of Eaglescliffe by publicly stating that green field sites will be used because the developers will develop there and not on brown field sites. So you put the profits of a developer before the residents and the impact on the area. I also find it strange that you are pressing through all these developments in such a short space of time and I feel it is because you don't want the impact of one development to effect the decision of any of the other developments so you push them all through now and spoil the area and in 15 years it will be too late as all the damage will have been done. If you phase these developments in gradually then we could see the effects and a better decision could be made on each development. With the Allen's West development alone Eaglescliffe is doing its bit and the population will increase massively and once the effects of this have been felt a review of traffic and school places would provide you with the information to make a correct decision on other developments.

Antisocial behaviour/noise levels - If Urray Nook is developed then Hunters Green will be used as a short cut through from Urray nook road through Langdon way and onto the proposed development and problems are likely to be caused to people living on Langdon Way late at night.

What will the kids have to do? Where are the parks and play areas? The existing levels of antisocial behaviour are bound to increase as the kids trawl the streets. An increase in crime rates is bound to follow.

What worries me is that I understand that the wish is to make the development have a "village feel". Firstly an open space does not constitute a village. A village has facilities such as a church, post office, shop, public house. Secondly, what concerns me even more is that the "village concept" takes into consideration Phase 2 of this "potential" development. Thirdly, it would therefore suggest that the employment status on Phase 2 has been converted to potential housing land and I was not aware that this had been consulted on by anyone? Therefore do we assume that Phase 1 is going to be passed?

It is my understanding that it is up to the developer to put forward their own "vision"? Surely this makes the whole public consultation farcical?

Overdevelopment in Yarm and Eaglescliffe will have a detrimental effect on property prices and for those people with mortgages there is a danger of negative equity which will have a stifling effect on the housing market. It is clear from the above that in order to approve the application, local and national planning policies will be ignored.

The impact and reduced quality of life of current residents of Eaglescliffe and Yarm has not been considered.

Open spaces are disappearing at an alarming rate around the village, turning an area with a distinct identity and pleasant environment in to yet another clonal, dormitory, suburb without green spaces, amenities (none of the new developments have any shops and it doesn't look as if the Durham Lane shops will be rebuilt any time soon) or good school places who will want to stay in Eaglescliffe if this and the other proposed developments go ahead? Will the houses even sell?

There are a number of houses which have been on the market for a long time within Eaglescliffe due to current market conditions. Building more homes will not change that, it will make it harder for current homeowners to retain equity within their homes. Long term, more homes in the area

will become private rentals rather than owner-occupier leading to a breakdown in the community as the population becomes more transient. This has been proven to lead to an increase in crime and anti-social behaviour.

Yarm is one of the success stories of the area and these proposals will affect parking, house prices, and desirability to live here - the High St is currently enjoying resurgence with the opening of new top end restaurants, clothes shops, ice cream parlours etc. and any additional congestion will create parking problems and affect the businesses in Yarm

There has been limited consultation with the residents and this is un-acceptable as most people in Yarm cannot attend debates at short notice and at obscure times due to work commitments

I understand one recent planning application was outvoted 7 votes to 6 by the planning committee yet the chairman overruled to approve - how is this democratic?

The plethora of other planning consents granted and/or within the planning process in Yarm is completely excessive and appears to be out of control having no strategy and a complete and utter disregard for the views and opinions of current residents, voters and tax payers , i.e. Morley Carr Farm (300+ houses), Uray Nook (800 + houses), High Leven, Eaglescliffe playing fields etc.

Erosion of "Green Belt" land.... Surely there are more suitable "Brown" sites, within the Stockton On Tees area... or is this another example of NIMBYism by a labour controlled council.

If the Uray Nook site is developed in its entirety the way will be open to sprawl to Middleton St George.

It will fill in what the same developer aggressively sold as open fields when it marketed Hunters Green estate.

Yarm and Eaglescliffe is an area of outstanding historical character and culture. It is in fact Teesside's jewel in the crown, known nationally for its character. This over development is going to turn such an attractive area in to a bland mass housing estate like Ingleby Barwick.

As a nation we are not self-sufficient now, and rely on many imports. This is a risky and irresponsible attitude to have towards good productive farm land, if countries we import from have a catastrophe whereby they cannot or will not honour that export then we are very much up a creek without a paddle. It has come to the point of lines need to be drawn not lines need to be continually crossed in the over use of greenfield sites, local planning authorities do have it in their power to ensure that the countryside is protected for future generations in its beauty, diversity, heritage and wildlife preservation. That also includes making sure that we have reliable food sources well into the future. I would add to that that the farming industry needs those assurances as well.

We need productive agricultural land now and will increasingly need to be able to import less food as global warming and world population and demand grow.

It will seriously adversely affect the quality of life for current residents and the nature of this unique town for visitors by overcrowding the historic Market Town of Yarm and its surrounds.

There are no benefits for the local community in respect of this proposed development and it should therefore be refused.

PLANNING POLICY

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 Plan is the Core Strategy Development Plan Document and saved policies of the Stockton on Tees Local Plan

Section 143 of the Localism Act came into force on the 15 Jan 2012 and requires the Local Planning Authority to take local finance considerations into account, this section s70(2) Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended requires in dealing with such an application [planning application] the authority shall have regard to a) the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application, b) any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application and c) any other material considerations

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

National Planning Policy Framework

Paragraph 14. At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking;

For decision-taking this means:

approving development proposals that accord with the development without delay; and where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless:

- any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or-
- specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.

Policy EN13

Development outside the limits to development may be permitted where:

- (i) It is necessary for a farming or forestry operation; or
 - (ii) It falls within policies EN20 (reuse of buildings) or Tour 4 (Hotel conversions); or
- In all the remaining cases and provided that it does not harm the character or appearance of the countryside; where:
- (iii) It contributes to the diversification of the rural economy; or
 - (iv) It is for sport or recreation; or
 - (v) It is a small scale facility for tourism.

Stockton on Tees Local Plan 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.

Stockton on Tees Core Strategy Policy 2 (CS2) - Sustainable Transport and Travel

1. Accessibility will be improved and transport choice widened, by ensuring that all new development is well serviced by an attractive choice of transport modes, including public transport, footpaths and cycle routes, fully integrated into existing networks, to provide alternatives to the use of all private vehicles and promote healthier lifestyles.

2. All major development proposals that are likely to generate significant additional journeys will be accompanied by a Transport Assessment in accordance with the 'Guidance on Transport Assessment' (Department for Transport 2007) and the provisions of DfT Circular 02/2007, 'Planning and the Strategic Road Network', and a Travel Plan, in accordance with the Council's

'Travel Plan Frameworks: Guidance for Developers'. The Transport Assessment will need to demonstrate that the strategic road network will be no worse off as a result of development. Where the measures proposed in the Travel Plan will be insufficient to fully mitigate the impact of increased trip generation on the secondary highway network, infrastructure improvements will be required.

3. The number of parking spaces provided in new developments will be in accordance with standards set out in the Tees Valley Highway Design Guide. Further guidance will be set out in a new Supplementary Planning Document.

4. Initiatives related to the improvement of public transport both within the Borough and within the Tees Valley sub-region will be promoted, including proposals for:

- i) The Tees Valley Metro;
- ii) The Core Route Corridors proposed within the Tees Valley Bus Network Improvement Scheme;
- iii) Improved interchange facilities at the existing stations of Thornaby and Eaglescliffe, including the introduction or expansion of park and ride facilities on adjacent sites; and
- iv) Pedestrian and cycle routes linking the communities in the south of the Borough, together with other necessary sustainable transport infrastructure.

5. Improvements to the road network will be required, as follows:

- i) In the vicinity of Stockton, Billingham and Thornaby town centres, to support the regeneration of these areas;
- ii) To the east of Billingham (the East Billingham Transport Corridor) to remove heavy goods vehicles from residential areas;
- iii) Across the Borough, to support regeneration proposals, including the Stockton Middlesbrough Initiative and to improve access within and beyond the City Region; and
- iv) To support sustainable development in Ingleby Barwick.

6. The Tees Valley Demand Management Framework will be supported through the restriction of long stay parking provision in town centres.

7. The retention of essential infrastructure that will facilitate sustainable passenger and freight movements by rail and water will be supported.

8. This transport strategy will be underpinned by partnership working with the Highways Agency, Network Rail, other public transport providers, the Port Authority, and neighbouring Local Authorities to improve accessibility within and beyond the Borough, to develop a sustainable

Core Strategy Policy 3 (CS3) - Sustainable Living and Climate Change

1. All new residential developments will achieve a minimum of Level 3 of the Code for Sustainable Homes up to 2013, and thereafter a minimum of Code Level 4.

3. The minimum carbon reduction targets will remain in line with Part L of the Building Regulations, achieving carbon neutral domestic properties by 2016, and non-domestic properties by 2019, although it is expected that developers will aspire to meet targets prior to these dates.

4. To meet carbon reduction targets, energy efficiency measures should be embedded in all new buildings. If this is not possible, or the targets are not met, then on-site district renewable and low carbon energy schemes will be used. Where it can be demonstrated that neither of these options is suitable, micro renewable, micro carbon energy technologies or a contribution towards an off-site renewable energy scheme will be considered.

5. For all major developments, including residential developments comprising 10 or more units, and non-residential developments exceeding 1000 square metres gross floor space, at least 10% of total predicted energy requirements will be provided, on site, from renewable energy sources.

6. All major development proposals will be encouraged to make use of renewable and low carbon decentralised energy systems to support the sustainable development of major growth locations within the Borough.

7. Where suitable proposals come forward for medium to small scale renewable energy generation, which meet the criteria set out in Policy 40 of the Regional Spatial Strategy, these will be supported. Broad locations for renewable energy generation may be identified in the Regeneration Development Plan Document.

8. Additionally, in designing new development, proposals will:

- _ Make a positive contribution to the local area, by protecting and enhancing important environmental assets, biodiversity and geodiversity, responding positively to existing features of natural, historic, archaeological or local character, including hedges and trees, and including the provision of high quality public open space;
- _ Be designed with safety in mind, incorporating Secure by Design and Park Mark standards, as appropriate;
- _ Incorporate 'long life and loose fit' buildings, allowing buildings to be adaptable to changing needs. By 2013, all new homes will be built to Lifetime Homes Standards;
- _ Seek to safeguard the diverse cultural heritage of the Borough, including buildings, features, sites and areas of national importance and local significance. Opportunities will be taken to constructively and imaginatively incorporate heritage assets in redevelopment schemes, employing where appropriate contemporary design solutions.

9. The reduction, reuse, sorting, recovery and recycling of waste will be encouraged, and details will be set out in the Joint Tees Valley Minerals and Waste Development Plan Documents.

Core Strategy Policy 7 (CS7) - Housing Distribution and Phasing

1. The distribution and phasing of housing delivery to meet the Borough's housing needs will be managed through the release of land consistent with:

- i) Achieving the Regional Spatial Strategy requirement to 2024 of 11,140;
- ii) The maintenance of a 'rolling' 5-year supply of deliverable housing land as required by Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing;
- iii) The priority accorded to the Core Area;
- iv) Seeking to achieve the target of 75% of dwelling completions on previously developed land.

2. No additional housing sites will be allocated before 2016 as the Regional Spatial Strategy allocation has been met through existing housing permissions. This will be kept under review in accordance with the principles of 'plan, monitor and manage'. Planning applications that come forward for unallocated sites will be assessed in relation to the spatial strategy.

3. Areas where land will be allocated for housing in the period 2016 to 2021:

Housing Sub-Area Approximate number of dwellings (net)

Core Area 500 - 700

Stockton 300 - 400

Billingham 50 - 100

Yarm, Eaglescliffe and Preston 50 - 100

4. Areas where land will be allocated for housing in the period 2021 to 2024:

Housing Sub Area Approximate number of dwellings (net)

Core Area 450 - 550

Stockton 100 - 200

5. Funding has been secured for the Tees Valley Growth Point Programme of Development and consequently the delivery of housing may be accelerated.

6. Proposals for small sites will be assessed against the Plans spatial strategy.

7. There will be no site allocations in the rural parts of the Borough

Core Strategy Policy 8 (CS8) - Housing Mix and Affordable Housing Provision

1. Sustainable residential communities will be created by requiring developers to provide a mix and balance of good quality housing of all types and tenure in line with the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (incorporating the 2008 Local Housing Assessment update).

2. A more balanced mix of housing types will be required. In particular:

- _ Proposals for 2 and 3-bedroomed bungalows will be supported throughout the Borough;
- _ Executive housing will be supported as part of housing schemes offering a range of housing types, particularly in Eaglescliffe;
- _ In the Core Area, the focus will be on town houses and other high density properties.

3. Developers will be expected to achieve an average density range of 30 to 50 dwellings per hectare in the Core Area and in other locations with good transport links. In locations with a particularly high level of public transport accessibility, such as Stockton, Billingham and Thornaby town centres, higher densities may be appropriate subject to considerations of character. In other locations such as parts of Yarm, Eaglescliffe and Norton, which are characterised by mature dwellings and large gardens, a density lower than 30 dwellings per hectare may be appropriate. Higher density development will not be appropriate in Ingleby Barwick.

4. The average annual target for the delivery of affordable housing is 100 affordable homes per year to 2016, 90 affordable homes per year for the period 2016 to 2021 and 80 affordable homes per year for the period 2021 to 2024. These targets are minimums, not ceilings.

5. Affordable housing provision within a target range of 15-20% will be required on schemes of 15 dwellings or more and on development sites of 0.5 hectares or more. Affordable housing provision at a rate lower than the standard target will only be acceptable where robust justification is provided. This must demonstrate that provision at the standard target would make the development economically unviable.

6. Off-site provision or financial contributions instead of on-site provision may be made where the Council considers that there is robust evidence that the achievement of mixed communities is better served by making provision elsewhere.

7. The mix of affordable housing to be provided will be 20% intermediate and 80% social rented tenures with a high priority accorded to the delivery of two and three bedroom houses and bungalows. Affordable housing provision with a tenure mix different from the standard target will only be acceptable where robust justification is provided. This must demonstrate either that provision at the standard target would make the development economically unviable or that the resultant tenure mix would be detrimental to the achievement of sustainable, mixed communities.

8. Where a development site is sub-divided into separate development parcels below the affordable housing threshold, the developer will be required to make a proportionate affordable housing contribution.

9. The requirement for affordable housing in the rural parts of the Borough will be identified through detailed assessments of rural housing need. The requirement will be met through the delivery of a 'rural exception' site or sites for people in identified housing need with a local connection. These homes will be affordable in perpetuity.

Core Strategy Policy 10 (CS10) Environmental Protection and Enhancement

2. Development throughout the Borough and particularly in the Billingham, Saltholme and Seal Sands area, will be integrated with the protection and enhancement of biodiversity, geodiversity and landscape.

3. The separation between settlements, together with the quality of the urban environment, will be maintained through the protection and enhancement of the openness and amenity value of:

i) Strategic gaps between the conurbation and the surrounding towns and villages, and between Eaglescliffe and Middleton St George.

ii) Green wedges within the conurbation, including:

- _ River Tees Valley from Surtees Bridge, Stockton to Yarm;
- _ Leven Valley between Yarm and Ingleby Barwick;
- _ Bassleton Beck Valley between Ingleby Barwick and Thornaby;
- _ Stainsby Beck Valley, Thornaby;
- _ Billingham Beck Valley;
- _ Between North Billingham and Cowpen Lane Industrial Estate.

iii) Urban open space and play space.

4. The integrity of designated sites will be protected and enhanced, and the biodiversity and geodiversity of sites of local interest improved in accordance with Planning Policy Statement 9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation, ODPM Circular 06/2005 (also known as DEFRA Circular 01/2005) and the Habitats Regulations.

5. Habitats will be created and managed in line with objectives of the Tees Valley Biodiversity Action Plan as part of development, and linked to existing wildlife corridors wherever possible.

6. Joint working with partners and developers will ensure the successful creation of an integrated network of green infrastructure.

7. Initiatives to improve the quality of the environment in key areas where this may contribute towards strengthening habitat networks, the robustness of designated wildlife sites, the tourism offer and biodiversity will be supported, including:

i) Haverton Hill and Seal Sands corridor, as an important gateway to the Tees-mouth National Nature Reserve and Saltholme RSPB Nature Reserve;

ii) Tees Heritage Park.

8. The enhancement of forestry and increase of tree cover will be supported where appropriate in line with the Tees Valley Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP).

9. New development will be directed towards areas of low flood risk, that is Flood Zone 1, as identified by the Borough's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). In considering sites elsewhere, the sequential and exceptions tests will be applied, as set out in Planning Policy Statement 25: Development and Flood Risk, and applicants will be expected to carry out a flood risk assessment.

10. When redevelopment of previously developed land is proposed, assessments will be required to establish:

- _ the risks associated with previous contaminative uses;
- _ the biodiversity and geological conservation value; and
- _ the advantages of bringing land back into more beneficial use.

Core Strategy Policy 11 (CS11) - Planning Obligations

1. All new development will be required to contribute towards the cost of providing additional infrastructure and meeting social and environmental requirements.

2. When seeking contributions, the priorities for the Borough are the provision of:

- _ highways and transport infrastructure;
- _ affordable housing;
- _ open space, sport and recreation facilities, with particular emphasis on the needs of young people.

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The scheme is an outline application with only the principle of residential development on the site being sought at this stage. All other matters are reserved for consideration via further submissions, these being applications for the 'Reserved Matters' of Access, Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale. Notwithstanding elements of the scheme being reserved for future applications, indicative and detailed information has been submitted relative to the site layout, drainage, tree reports, archaeological survey work, transport assessment etc. It is appropriate to consider these in some detail at this stage in order to demonstrate that the development is likely to be achievable subject to the further consideration of detailed matters. At outline stage it is also necessary to control by condition or via a Section 106 Agreement all relevant matters which would not otherwise be covered by the reserved matters applications as those applications cannot themselves seek to address / control new issues, being limited to their individual purposes (access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale).

The application needs to be considered against relevant national / local planning policy and guidance. The main policy documents in this regard are the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the Stockton on Tees Local Plan (STLP) and the Stockton on Tees Core Strategy Development Plan (CSDP). Consideration also needs to be given to other material planning considerations including matters raised through the consultation process.

The Development Plan for the area is the starting point for considerations. Both the Local Plan and Core Strategy Development Plan have policies relevant to this proposal.

The application is considered as follows;

Principle of Residential Development

The site is located within the limits of development as defined by saved Policy HO3 of the Stockton on Tees Local Plan (STLP), adjacent to a site which was allocated for industrial use within the local plan and which has the benefit of an industrial planning consent (subject to a S106 Agreement being signed). A number of objections have been received suggesting that the site is green wedge / countryside, however, there are no specific safeguarding designations for the site within the Local Plan or Core Strategy and the site is highlighted within the Core Strategy as being land which is within the Yarm, Eaglescliffe and Preston Housing sub division area and where General Employment uses are suitable.

Stockton Borough has recently been subject to a number of applications for residential development out-with the 'Limits to Development', however, the residential part of this proposal is within the defined Limits to Development. (appendix 4). Saved Local Plan Policy HO3 indicates that 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.*

In considering the criteria of Policy HO3 in relation to the northern site area, (where residential units are proposed) the land is not allocated for another use, it is not underneath electricity lines and it does not result in the loss of a recreational site as it retains the public footpath along the southern boundary. The proposal is therefore in accordance with criteria (i), (ii) & (iii) of Policy HO3. Criteria (iv), (v) & (vi) are subjective criteria and considered elsewhere within this report.

Objection has been raised to the scheme suggesting it is contrary to the Core Strategy Development Plan Policy CS10(3) which requires separation between settlements including

between Eaglescliffe and Middleton St George. In considering this policy, reference needs to be given to the Core Strategy Strategic Diagram (Appendix ref. 5) which shows the strategic gap lying to the west of this site and the site being within the Yarm, Eaglescliffe & Preston Housing sub division area.

The Council is currently going through the plan led approach of allocating housing land, currently being at the 'preferred options' stage and formal allocation of sites through this process is anticipated around 2014. CSDP Policy CS7 advises that no additional housing sites will be allocated before 2016 and that planning applications coming forward on unallocated sites will be assessed against the spatial strategy (Policy CS1) which itself indicates that priority will be given to sites that regenerate Stockton, Billingham and Yarm. At the current time the proposed development of the unallocated green field site is therefore contrary to policies CS1 and CS7 of the Core Strategy Development Plan.

Policy CS7 further advises that within the Yarm, Eaglescliffe and Preston areas (combined) land will be allocated for housing in the period 2016 to 2021 for approximately 50 – 100 houses. Approval has already been granted for 845 units at Allens West in Eaglescliffe and a further 350 at Morley Carr in Yarm, all of which are within the Eaglescliffe, Yarm and Preston housing sub division area and which have been approved since the adoption of the Core Strategy. Approval of the existing application at Green's Lane Yarm would further add to this (375 houses). In view of this, the current proposal would further exceed the indicative limit within the Core Strategy of 100 new units for the area up to 2021. A significant number of objections reflect on this situation, suggesting that the principle of development is generally contrary to the NPPF and to the Councils Core Strategy Development Plan in respect to the need for housing in this area. There is clearly a tension between an unallocated site being released for housing development and the core principle in the NPPF which states that planning should be genuinely plan-led. Many objectors have raised this point. Notwithstanding this, recent decisions by the Secretary of State suggest that this principle is being accorded less weight than the need to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites, which itself also a requirement of the NPPF.

The Council has recognised that because of changing economic circumstances and the reductions in the public funding available to support regeneration schemes, the housing strategy in the adopted Core Strategy will not deliver the housing requirement for the Borough. Although the Council retains very strong regeneration aspirations, it is firmly committed to achieving the housing requirement for the Borough to 2029. For this reason the Council decided to undertake a review of housing options. This review encompasses the housing spatial strategy and the housing distribution and phasing policy as well as aspects of the housing mix and affordable housing provision policy. This process formally began with the Core Strategy Review of Housing - Issues and Options, the results of which have been incorporated into the Regeneration and Environment Local Development Document Preferred Options (draft). The application site is identified as part of a draft allocation. It is therefore, supported as such by professional officer opinion, however, this does not reduce in any way the weight that the Council attaches to any significant policy or environmental constraints that are relevant to these sites. The Council attaches great weight to ensuring that the process of site allocation is an open, transparent and participatory one which allows full opportunity for comment to the wider public and other stakeholders. The preferred options stage cannot therefore, be legitimately viewed merely as a precursor to an automatic subsequent confirmation or endorsement of any draft policy including any draft site allocation policy.

The conflict with the existing Core Strategy Policy is detailed within residents objections which take account other schemes in Yarm and Eaglescliffe. Policy CS7 states that allocations for Yarm and Eaglescliffe and Preston are of a relatively modest scale to reflect the priority accorded to the Core Area. Objections expand into further detail which is reported within the Publicity section of this report.

Notwithstanding the conflict with the Core Strategy, consideration must be given to the National Planning Policy Framework. The NPPF advises that at its heart is a presumption in favour of

sustainable development and for decision-making it means approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay. It is further advised within the NPPF that relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites." (para. 49). The Councils Spatial Plans team have advised that based on the findings of the '5 Year Deliverable Housing Supply Final Assessment: 2012 - 2017', the council is only able to demonstrate a supply of deliverable housing land for 4.08 years which therefore indicates that, in accordance with the NPPF, this proposal for housing needs to be considered in relation to the presumption in favour of development.

Objection has been raised that the approval of the scheme would be contrary to the Localism Act and the NPPF as it pre-empts the process of site allocation which involves public consultation. Clearly the Councils preference is for housing to be provided via the plan led approach which is advocated by the NPPF, however, weight has to be given to the guidance within the NPPF and the evidence in respect to the lack of a 5 year housing supply.

As well as market housing there is a borough wide need for affordable housing, identified in the Tees Valley Strategic Housing Market Assessment which projects an annual deficit in the provision of affordable housing of 560 homes. It is a benefit of this application that it would contribute to the provision of market and affordable housing and thereby in part address the deficit highlighted. This adds some weight in favour of the proposal.

Included in the Core Planning principles of the NPPF (para.17) advises *'Every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and development needs of an area, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth'*. This proposal would assist in addressing the lack of a 5 year deliverable housing supply whilst provide affordable housing, thereby demonstrating its ability to fulfil both a social and an economic role.

Numerous objections advise that the site is green-field and whether the Council has met its targets for development on brown-field sites should not prevent the development of this site being unsuitable. The guidance of CSDP Policy CS7 is relevant to this point. Policy CS7 seeks to achieve the target of 75% of dwelling completions on previously developed land (Brownfield land). Brownfield completions for the 2 years since this policy was introduced are shown below and show that the target has generally been achieved.

| | |
|-----------|--------|
| 2010/2011 | 74.31% |
| 2011/2012 | 79.58% |

Notwithstanding this, since 2010, issues with the deliverability of brownfield sites has become apparent. A number of the brownfield sites with approval have either not been started or developed out at a very slow rate, having to deal with flood related issues and land contamination which are costly to rectify. Importantly, Policy CS7 does not preclude development on green field sites. Consideration is given to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) which is a technical background paper which forms the evidence base for the Development Plan and which identifies potential housing sites. The sites are then assessed within a framework of their suitability, availability and achievability for housing development. The SHLAA shows that the Council does not have sufficient brownfield land that is or will be suitable, available or achievable in the period up to 2029 to meet the Borough's housing requirement and it is therefore necessary to identify greenfield sites to meet the housing requirement. Taking into account the two material factors, that the council has effectively achieved the target of development on brownfield sites for the last two years and the current assessment indicating there is insufficient brownfield sites to provide for the foreseeable provision of housing, greenfield development is inevitable.

A Ward Councillor has indicated that the site is currently designated as employment land in support of Teesside Airport and that it is vitally important to keep this option available so future sustainable industries be allowed to develop. This point is noted and the principle of industry is supported by Policy. Notwithstanding this, the airport has its own business park approved which would be able to accommodate notable airport related business.

In view of the NPPF seeking to significantly boost housing supply (para. 47), Core Strategy Development Plan Policy CS7 being out of date (by definition of the NPPF), the lack of a 5 year deliverable housing supply within Stockton, the site being both within the Limits of Development and within a housing sub division area as detailed within the development plan, it is considered that the principle of the proposed development accords with national planning guidance and the local development plans where they remain to be relevant.

Principle of scale of housing in Yarm, Eaglescliffe and Preston

Significant objection is made against the projected need for housing within the area referring to targets within the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) which is now abolished, and in the Local Development Document (LDD) which suggests borough wide, 550/year for 15 years with a +20% buffer. Objectors consider such figures to be questionable in view of the state of the current housing market and suggest reduced buffers would be more appropriate. The concern over figures and buffers to these figures is noted as is the current state of the housing market, however, the guidance of the NPPF is clear on the matter of housing provision and there is no evidence which suggests a view other than to approve the development should be taken, this is notwithstanding residents comments indicating the country is in a recession.

Residents are concerned that the site will expand with further phases being put forward and that the number of houses could therefore increase up to 570. The site is a preferred option within the Regeneration and Environment DPD and is represented within the SHLAA. Notwithstanding these points, it is within the defined limits to development and within the Yarm, Eaglescliffe and Preston Housing Sub Division Area. Any future application would need to be considered on its own merits at the time of submission and any relevant material planning considerations.

Residents are concerned that approving such a scheme will not increase housing delivery but instead allow developers to land bank and would therefore be an unnecessary permission. The council do not control developers build out rates which are more market led, but the decision making process is a precursor to development and without permissions housing will not be built. The lack of a 5 year supply is therefore considered to outweigh this matter. The developer has indicated that the site would be built out at a rate of 40 – 50 units per year.

Residents consider that building on green field land will result in brown-field core sites being deserted. Again, the council do not control which sites get developed in which order and different sites provide for different house types and a wide range of provision is needed to meet a 5 year supply and for it to be balanced. Delivery of solely core brownfield sites may not achieve this balance. In addition, sites such as Mandale, Hardwick and Parkfield continue to move forward providing core brown-field redevelopment although others have stalled.

Objectors cite developers making more money from sites such as this and the council benefitting from the New Home Bonus. These are considered to be irrelevant to the determination of this application which needs to be based on current guidance, policy and evidence relative to the scheme.

Objectors request a stop to the urban sprawl as it can never be reversed and consider Eaglescliffe is being over developed. Whilst this is noted there are other areas of the Borough which have recently faced similar proposals to expand housing provision out-with the Development Plan site allocation process such as at Yarm and Wynyard. Further to this there are several core sites which are being developed and several others with permission for housing yet which are stalled such as Boat House Lane, Queens Park North etc. These sites provide a wide spread of housing sites throughout the Borough which will spread the loads placed on local services. Notwithstanding these matters, the site relative to this application is within the defined limits to development and within a housing sub division area where development would normally be expected to be focussed.

Provision of the SUDS scheme out-with the Limits of Development

The proposed Sustainable Urban Drainage Scheme (SUDS) for the site is proposed on land out-with the defined limits to development, out-with the housing sub division area and within the area defined as strategic gap (see appendix. Ref 6). If the SUDS scheme were to take place it is likely that this would take the form of a man made earth bowl with connecting pipes. The SUDS scheme would have the opportunity to provide for wildlife / ecology in the future and for it to have a more natural appearance than the area of the site where the housing is proposed.

Saved Policy EN13 of the Local Plan advises that development out-with the limits will only be allowed for purposes relating to farming, forestry, tourism or recreation. Whilst the SUDS scheme would be contrary to this policy due to it not relating to such uses, in view of its form, appearance and purpose, it is considered that it would not unduly harm the principle reasoning behind the policy.

Core Strategy Development Plan Policy CS10(3) advises that the separation between settlements will be maintained through the protection and enhancement of the openness and amenity value of strategic gaps between the conurbation and the surrounding towns and villages, and between Eaglescliffe and Middleton St. George. The SUDS pond would not compromise the openness of the strategic gap and can be designed to retain amenity value. The proposal is considered to accord with the requirements of this policy.

Indicative Site Layout & Landscape Assessment / Masterplan

The proposed site is split by the A67 with the northern part of the site being for residential use and the southern section being intended to provide a Sustainable Urban Drainage Scheme (SUDS scheme) which would serve to retain surface water from the site prior to discharge into the beck, being connected under the A67 via pipes. The indicative layout has been revised since its initial submission and now shows 145 properties, an area of open space and landscape areas to the periphery of the site which in part reflect the presence of existing easements.

For the residential part of the site there is a single point of vehicular access off Urray Nook Road with an internal spine road and cul-de-sac's off. Houses are indicatively laid out to be generally inward facing around the perimeter of the site. As it is an indicative plan only, this layout shows one way in which the development could be undertaken.

The revised site layout is welcomed as it now demonstrates that a suitably sized area of open space which is buffered from the A67 can be achieved along with an extent of residential development which itself has private parking / private garden areas etc. It must be noted however that the site layout is only an indicative demonstration of what can be achieved rather than a final layout. Notwithstanding the layout being indicative consideration has been given to it and comments made against it. These considerations are not exhaustive as were the application to be approved a detailed layout would still need to be agreed.

The Head of Technical Services (HoTS) accepts that the site is a presently undeveloped agricultural pasture land with a generally flat open character having an established hedge fringing the eastern and northern boundaries, a western boundary formed by a species poor remnant hedge of low visual quality which is broken up by many gaps and a southern boundary bordering the A67 which includes a tree belt. Since this assessment it is noted, and detailed within objections that the field/s have been ploughed. There is a public footpath in the southern part of the site which runs from east to west. Two hedges cross the site from east to west. The first crosses the centre of the site and is considered to be species poor (gapped hawthorn), the second is located near the southern site boundary and is again gapped hawthorn with a mature tree at its eastern end and which is considered to be a strong visual feature when viewed from Urray Nook Road.

A tree report has been submitted in support of the application and the Head of Technical Services accepts the information provided which suggests no trees or hedges of high quality need to be removed, 5 trees with substantial decay would be felled along with another tree towards the centre of the site being felled which is considered to have a low visual quality. The HoTS advises that all trees that are required to be felled should be replaced within the open space as large forest species such as Ash, Lime and Oak. These matters would be dealt with at Reserved Matters stage.

The Head of Technical Services has indicated that the tree belt and associated planting along the northern side of the A67 forms a dense group and provides an important role in being able to reduce potential noise and visual intrusion into the site from the highway. Notwithstanding this, the tree belt could benefit from thinning works. It is further advised that the hedge forming the northern and eastern site boundaries should be retained as an important visual feature to the character of the area. Whilst all other hedges are considered to be species poor and contain numerous and sometimes lengthy gaps, their retention and improvement would be welcomed where the development layout allows.

Officers consider that the indicative site layout would benefit from the following being incorporated;

- Provide a cycle / footpath link through the development in appropriate places to prevent gates being placed in rear garden boundaries where they abut Uray Nook Road etc.
- Buffer area of planting and open space should be provided to screen the adjacent site where an industrial development has been approved subject to a S106 Agreement. The buffer could also be used to provide a footpath, thereby achieving a circular route around the development.
- A more open site access with a greater landscape setting.
- The main highway through the site should be opened out to allow specimen tree planting and front gardens thereby providing visual quality to the internal road layout.
- Consider outward facing houses in key areas and adjacent to open space.
- New native woodland planting to the southern area of open space to improve screening from the A67 and the visual and landscape quality of the space as well as the potential to improve the public footpath corridor.
- Tree planting can be used to screen Uray Nook Road on the northern area of open space.
- Hedge planting and fencing in appropriate places adjacent to the A67 boundary.

A landscape design concept for the estate was submitted and this will need to change to accommodate the above matters and to be relative to the final layout. The trees and hedges within the site which could be valuable assets to the final layout / overall scheme would normally be protected by condition, however, this is not appropriate to do at outline stage as existing landscaping could be removed prior to commencement of the development. In view of this and the considered value of the existing landscaping, an informative has been recommended advising of the expectation that landscaping will remain to be a key consideration of the final layout.

The submission explains about a hierarchy of buildings within the site in terms of height and suggests 12 different house types would be used within the site with the inclusion of 2, 3 & 4 bed properties over 2 and 3 stories and being a mix of terrace, semi-detached and detached. The submission indicates that the layout is based around the need to retain a 19.5m distance between main elevations of properties and 11.5m between a main elevation and a side elevation and rear garden lengths of 9m. These are generally considered to be suitable characteristics for a modern housing development in such a location subject to the 3 storey properties being provided by the rooms in the roof rather than having a 3 storey elevation with roof above as this is not a common feature of the immediate surroundings. Objectors have suggested that the development has a poor mix of properties and should include provision for bungalows. A wide mix of property types is proposed and adding bungalows would further improve this, however, it is not considered to be essential.

The existing public right of way (PROW) is shown as being retained at the southern side of the proposed residential area which could link into the residential estate at several points and creating permeability through the site and encouraging recreational use of the surrounding area and better links with the existing urban area. The footpaths retention is welcomed.

Comments from residents / objectors have been received which suggest sufficient space for children to play should be achieved and that the public open space should be securely fenced from the A67. These are noted and would be given due consideration at Reserved Matters Stage.

In view of all of the above, and subject to changes to the indicative layout, it is considered that a suitably laid out site can be achieved for residential development whilst providing for the needs of future residents, thereby being in accordance with the principles of saved Local Plan Policy HO3 and Core Strategy Development Plan Policy CS3 in these regards.

Highway related matters

The submission initially sought detailed approval for the access into the site and the internal spine road which is no longer the case. The applicant has indicated that these details will form part of the reserved matters submissions. Considerations in this report are therefore given to the general principle of the highway related impacts of the development.

The NPPF supports sustainable transport and travel indicating all new developments that generate significant amounts of traffic movements should be supported by a Transport Assessment / Statement and that planning decisions should take account of whether opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken depending on the nature and location of the site in order to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure. The NPPF further requires safe and suitable access to sites for all people and advises that improvements can be undertaken to the highway network to limit the significant impacts and therefore development should only be refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe. This is key guidance along with the Core Strategy Development Plan Policy 2 (CS2) *Sustainable Transport and Travel* which advises that accessibility will be improved and transport choice widened by ensuring that all new development is well serviced by an attractive choice of transport modes, including public transport, footpaths and cycle routes to provide alternatives to the private car. It further advises that;

“the Transport Assessment will need to demonstrate that the strategic road network will be no worse off as a result of development. Where the measures proposed in the Travel Plan will be insufficient to fully mitigate the impact of increased trip generation on the secondary highway network, infrastructure improvements will be required”.

The Highways Agency (HA) reviewed the Transport Assessment and Framework Travel Plan and considered that it used a more locally accurate trip rate to that initially agreed which is positive although found there to be many errors within the Transport Assessment itself, a point which has been raised by many objectors. Notwithstanding this, the HA have been able to consider the impact of the development by extrapolating information as necessary and they have advised that subject to mitigation works at Elton Interchange (increasing the width of approach flares), the proposed development is unlikely to have a detrimental effect on the Strategic Road Network (which is their remit to consider). The required works form part of the Section 106 Agreement as detailed within the Heads of Terms. Residents have raised significant objections on traffic related matters including congestion, notwithstanding this, in view of the HA's comments it is considered that it is possible to mitigate the impact of the scheme on the Strategic Road Network.

Notwithstanding the above, the HA suggested that as the traffic assessments were based on incorrect trip rates, it would be prudent to redo these to ensure that the proposed mitigation is still appropriate. They further advise that prior to determination of the application, the proposed works would need to be subject to an independent road safety audit although advise that this is not part of the HA network and would therefore be a matter for the local authority. These points have been

picked up by the Head of Technical Services and revised details were submitted. In addition to this, the Council has undertaken its own traffic modelling exercise in respect to this and several other developments affecting traffic loading and impacts within the southern part of the borough. The requirement of a road safety audit may be deemed necessary although this would be relative to the final scheme layout and would need to be undertaken therefore at the appropriate time.

The Head of Technical Services has reviewed the initial and additional information submitted by the applicant and has no objection to the development subject to relevant mitigation and provisions being made. A review of their findings of the submissions is contained within the consultations section of this report.

The HoTS has considered the impact on the local road network. It is indicated that local trip rates have been used within the TA following traffic surveys having been undertaken at the housing estate opposite the access which is considered to be appropriate. Trip forecasts within the initial TA were incorrect and these have now been amended by the applicant. The HoTS has considered the predicted traffic levels, the assignment of traffic movements to particular sections of roads / junctions, taking into account the predictions and the indications derived from actual data. The Head of Technical Services considers that some of the traffic movements suggested such as the % of traffic moving between the A67 / Urray Nook roundabout and the Tesco roundabout are unrealistic.

It appeared to the HoTS that the predicted impacts on the A67 / Durham Lane / Tesco roundabout appear to be low for a junction which is generally known to be busy in the peak periods. Given the concerns raised with the traffic distributions and the known localised congestion which is a point of objection for residents, the applicant was asked to undertake additional testing at this junction to fully consider the different scenarios and to provide a robust assessment of the impact of development traffic on this part of the highway network. The testing included for all committed developments within the area and any associated highway related works which would occur were the committed development to be completed.

The first test indicated that the development would impact on the junction but the impact is minimal and does not appear to significantly worsen the capacity issues. The second test removed the Allen's West development and associated infrastructure improvements from the model which demonstrated that the junction would operate within capacity. The results of both sensitivity tests therefore show that the roundabout junction would operate within theoretical capacity in future years with both the development traffic and the traffic from other nearby developments.

There is significant objection to the impact of new traffic in this area due to existing congestion levels. The comments received indicate significant delays on a daily basis when navigating the highway network around the site / Tesco roundabout / Cleveland Bay roundabout / Yarm High Street. Residents consider this scheme will make it worse, thereby being detrimental to highway safety, causing risk to users of the highway / footpaths which are used by school children etc. on a daily basis. It is suggested that due to existing school places limited children will need to be driven to school and this will be an additional traffic burden. (See extensive summarised list of objectors comments in Comments section of this report)

The impacts on the Durham Lane / A66 Elton interchange junction are considered taking into account traffic numbers / route assignments and the assessment indicates that the interchange operates over-capacity with and without the development. The applicant proposes measures to mitigate the impact but some arms of this junction would still operate over capacity although this is attributed to the Allen's West development rather than this proposed development. The proposed improvements to this junction to mitigate the impact of the traffic associated with this development would build upon committed improvements as part of the Allen's West development. The HoTS has advised that it would not be practical to bring forward the mitigation measures associated with this development before the committed improvements for the Allen's West development were implemented and should therefore be delivered in a coordinated approach. The Heads of Terms

and wording of the Section 106 address these matters to ensure adequate provision is made at the appropriate time. Whilst there is considerable objection to traffic impacts, in view of these assessments and associated testing, it is considered that, subject to mitigation, this scheme would not unduly impact on the surrounding highway network. In view of these matters it is considered that the proposal would not result in undue detrimental impact on the free flow of traffic thereby being in accordance with both Core Strategy Plan Policy CS2 (2) and the NPPF in this regard.

Notwithstanding officers requests, the Transport Assessment does not identify the impact of the development on Yarm High Street which is an area of great objection / concern to residents due to existing congestion levels and the nature of the highway network serving the High Street. Due to the location of the site it is considered that future residents of the proposed development would use the facilities in Yarm and due to the existing congestion / parking related problems in Yarm High Street , any impact would need to be mitigated. In order to address this the HoTS applied the ratio derived from the Allen's West development to determine a level of parking required within Yarm that the development would need to provide. This indicated a demand for an additional 7 spaces to be provided close to Yarm High Street as a fully operational long-stay spaces. This requirement is detailed within the Heads of Terms and included within the Section 106 Agreement. It is therefore considered to be sufficient to mitigate the impacts of the development in this regard.

The TA included the agreed list of committed developments within the analysis. However, since the TA scoping study, additional planning applications within the local area have come forward. Whilst these are not yet committed, it is imperative that Stockton Council review the impacts on the wider network of all these proposals. Technical Services therefore commissioned the development of a micro-simulation model to assess the traffic impacts of this development and others locally. This site is one of a number of proposed developments within the Eaglescliffe and Yarm area which, if granted planning approval, could create a cumulative impact within Eaglescliffe and Yarm. Developing a transport model helps to provide a greater understanding into the impact of this development on the wider network and the effectiveness of proposed mitigation measures.

The modelling exercise started with a review of existing traffic patterns using information from the existing Tees Valley TRIPS Model. An AIMSUN micro-simulation transport model was then developed and the base model validated using existing traffic counts and journey time data. Committed development traffic was added to the base model to allow the assessment to review what the traffic conditions would be like once traffic associated with committed developments is added to the network. The committed developments included within the model were the residential developments at Tall Trees, Morley Carr, Allen's West and The Rings (Ingleby Barwick). Once the base model was validated and agreed, the development traffic was added to the model.

The results from the model, with development traffic, show that in the morning peak journey times through Yarm High Street (on the A67) would increase by 14 seconds southbound and 48 seconds northbound. In the evening peak, journey time increases are of a similar magnitude with a journey time increase of on 9 seconds southbound and 46 seconds northbound. The results from the micro-simulation model show that this development would only marginally increase journey times through the network and there is a negligible deterioration due to the addition of traffic from the development. The HoTS therefore considers that there is no evidence to object to the development on highway capacity grounds as the changes in journey times are indicated to not be of a significant adverse impact.

For any development generating notable traffic it is considered good practice to reduce the need for vehicle journeys and this a specific requirement of Core Strategy Development Plan Policy CS2 "*Sustainable Transport and Travel*". This submission includes a Framework Travel Plan which is the document used to provide travel alternatives, incentives and other ways of influencing travel behaviour. The HoTS advised on the submitted document. The target for cycle trips appears to be low taking into account the existence of several employment opportunities within 5km distance from the site (Tesco, Yarm High Street, Durham Lane Industrial Estate, Nifco, Preston Farm Industrial Estate). Stockton Town Centre and Teesdale are also approximately 8km from this development, which is not beyond the distance travelled by cyclists to and from work. Residents

may also choose to cycle to other locations such as schools etc. To assist in the use of cycling as a sustainable mode of transport from this site the HoTS has highlighted areas for improvements to the highway network which include a new cycle link between Lartington Way and Lingfield Drive. (providing a connection from the promoted on-road cycle routes through Hunters Green and Lingfield Drive) to nearby schools and other community facilities. The S106 Agreement allows for this link in order to improve sustainable transport opportunities in line with the principles of Core Strategy Development Plan Policy CS2 and the NPPF. In addition to this provision the HoTS has advised that pedestrian crossing facilities should be improved on Urlay Nook Road to link the proposed development with the existing housing area. This is also included within the S106 Agreement. To further support sustainable travel and in accordance with other developments locally, the Heads of Terms of the S106 agreement has included for £100 per dwelling to be made available as a travel plan incentive payment to be used towards sustainable travel including the provision of discounted bus or rail passes and cycle vouchers. The mitigation provided by these proposals / requirements is considered to accord with the NPPF / CSDP principles of mitigating impacts of traffic.

Significant local objection is made in respect to the way in which footways / cycle routes are used, their safety and their effectiveness. A Ward Member has pointed out the problems of pinch points for cyclists at Yarm Bridge and the contours of land in and out of Yarm, considering these to prevent such routes being achievable for most cyclists. It is also suggested that such factors would reduce the figures used to predict cycle journeys. Whilst this is noted, the HoTS has to consider the overall provision of such, the associated safety for users and how they will assist the development in reducing dependency on the private motor car.

There has been significant local objection to the proposed scheme based on the increase in traffic that the development will result in. Residents strongly believe that the proposal will significantly worsen the existing traffic problems which residents consider to be already unacceptable due to waiting times, traffic queue lengths etc (extent of concerns detailed within publicity section). Residents journey times are detailed here and include several objections suggesting 40 minutes to travel 2 miles via Eaglescliffe / Yarm negotiating the Tesco roundabout, Cleveland Bay Junction and Yarm High Street is common. Residents consider that these cannot be mitigated by small scale piece meal works to the highway as the existing layout is already fixed and that the impact of this and other developments within the local area will have unacceptable impacts on travel within the area. These concerns are noted and it is clear from the photographs submitted and from experience of the site that traffic does back up along Urlay Nook Road and become congested within this area, particularly at the junction with Yarm Lane and through Yarm High Street. Notwithstanding these concerns, the Council have to consider the extent of the impacts of this development and allow mitigation of impacts where appropriate. Further to this, requiring a development to mitigate or improve existing traffic problems would not pass the tests of reasonableness which is required for all planning obligations, agreements and conditions. Although objections suggest human behaviour cannot be predicted in terms of journey's being made and cannot be readily influenced in terms of using sustainable travel modes, these have to be taken into account. With the above in mind, it is accepted that there is existing congestion, particularly at peak times, however, subject to the mitigation that is detailed within the Heads of Terms within this report and advanced via conditions, the impact of the development on the surrounding highway network can be adequately mitigated, thereby being in accordance with the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CS2 in these regards.

With regards to the indicative layout and access, the Head of Technical Services considers that the access is suitably located in respect to existing accesses, that the access and the A67 / Urlay Nook Road roundabout could accommodate the development traffic with both junctions operating with plentiful spare capacity in future years. The revised indicative plan showing a 30m buffer from the A67 and open space thereafter is considered to be a way to address risk to highway safety from ball games being played in close proximity to the A67. In addition to these considerations, the Head of Technical Services / officers consider that;

- No obstructions should be placed within the visibility splay of the access to ensure vehicles could emerge from the site safely.

- The internal layout should be designed in accordance with Manual for Streets guidance.
- The applicant would need to enter into a Section 38 (S38) Agreement for the highway and footpaths which are to become highway maintainable at the public expense.
- The existing Public Right of Way (PRoW) will be used to a greater extent and should be surfaced as an 'all weather path'.
- Additional pedestrian and cycle links should be incorporated into the development layout to provide attractive pedestrian and cycle links to the wider area and which reduce the need for pedestrians to divert off their desire line. Community facilities are located to the south-east of the development and therefore the layout should consider how it could reduce pedestrian journey lengths between the community facilities and the site to encourage pedestrian trips and discourage short distance car trips.
- An additional crossing point (dropped kerbs and tactile paving) on Urlay Nook Road would improve connections to the south-east and should be provided.
- The applicant is also asked to contribute towards cycleway improvements as outlined in the Travel Plan comments.
- A full Travel Plan should include targets for both an increase in sustainable modes of transport as well as a reduction in single occupancy car trips.

The site is located within reasonable close proximity to a wide range of services including education, employment, retail, leisure and there is scope for a lot of journeys to be made without reliance on the private motor car. The suggested requirements above will assist in the sites integration with the existing built area and reduce dependency on the private motor car.

Suitable levels of parking are generally demonstrated and would need to form part of a Reserved Matters submission to be considered in detail.

Objectors have advised that speed limits in the Hunters Green area are disregarded and whilst this is noted, it is a matter that would be dealt with separately were it to be an issue. The proposed development would access onto Urlay Nook Road where appropriate visibility splays are achievable and from there the majority of traffic would access onto the A67 at Hunters Green where traffic speeds have to be reduced to navigate the roundabout.

Objectors cite problems for emergency vehicles navigating the congested roads. Whilst this is noted, this is a common problem in any peak time traffic congestion and will already be a factor of these local roads. The journey times and traffic tail backs are not expected to vary significantly as a result of this development and therefore not considered to significantly alter the current situation in this regard.

Concern is raised that traffic to the airport may also struggle and therefore have its validity affected. This is considered similarly in that no notable impacts on traffic queue's / journey times are predicted as a result of this proposal. Objectors / concerns are similarly raised in respect to additional traffic through Long Newton, however, if journey times are not expected to change significantly then 'rat runs' are not anticipated to increase unproportionately, thereby being a marginal impact.

Concern is raised about safety for pedestrians and school children using local footpaths / highways. It is considered that pedestrian safety would not worsen as a result of this proposal as it would not significantly increase traffic numbers.

A suggestion has been made by an objector that there should be a 20mph speed limit past the school. This is a matter for Technical Services to consider generally although it is not considered

to be a requirement of this application due to the limited impact on traffic. It is also noted that there is a crossing already associated with the school which assists safe crossing.

A number of objectors have referred to the problems suffered during recent floods and the traffic chaos that ensued. Similar problems occurred throughout the country and although relevant, this is not a common occurrence and therefore needs to be dealt with as a freak weather event rather than a situation on which to base normal traffic assessments etc.

A number of objectors consider existing cycle paths are poorly linked to one another and do not provide good alternatives to the motor car. Whilst noted, improvements to cycle ways are considered beneficial and may be likely to appeal on certain groups of users than to all.

Concern is raised suggesting that Hunters Green should not be seen as a short cut to Eaglescliffe due to the increased noise it will generate from being used. It is considered that this would not be a significant impact from such a small estate. It is suggested that increasing cycle traffic through Hunters green will increase risk to safety as reversing off drives and on street parking make vehicle manoeuvres difficult. These are noted, however, on street parking and the need to reverse off drives are requirements in many housing estates within which people walk / cycle. All highway users need to be aware of their surroundings to achieve highway safety and it is the responsibility of individuals to do so. .

Objection has been raised against the way in which the traffic modelling has been undertaken. Whilst this is noted, it has been done to the satisfaction of the Head of Technical Services and is therefore considered to be fit for purpose.

Open Space

In accordance with Core Strategy Policies CS3, CS6 and CS11 and the adopted Supporting Planning Document (SPD) on Open Space, Recreation and Landscaping, the development needs to provide a variety of open space to meet the future needs of the developments residents. Applicants have the ability to provide on / off site provision or contributions in lieu of provision where deemed appropriate.

Point 3 of CS6 states that the quantity and quality of open space, sport and recreation facilities throughout the Borough will be protected and enhanced and that guidance on standards will be set out as part of the Open Space, Recreation and Landscaping SPD. The Open Space, Recreation and Landscape SPD indicates that amenity green space should be provided on site with an additional standard charge being made for other open space provided off site.

The applicant initially indicated that the open space provisions for the site could be provided over the existing service corridors / easements around the site, however, as this area is informal green corridor containing a Public Right of Way and easements for services and is not of a shape and scale which would lend itself to active play, officers considered it to be unsuitable to meet the wider open space needs of the future residents. In view of the surrounding highway network and the sites location on the edge of the settlement it was also considered necessary to have the formal open space area on site rather than a contribution to an off-site provision.

Based on a lack of usable amenity space on the initial plan, the Head of Technical Services requested that the submission be made to demonstrate that an area of land for amenity green space can be suitably achieved, taking into account the need for this to be buffered from the A67 on safety grounds. A revised plan has now been submitted which provides a larger area of open space separate to the easement corridors and in addition to the informal open space and landscaping bordering the site. This indicative plan shows a 30m buffer between the open space and the A67 within which is a tree belt. This would allow for fencing and additional buffer planting to be provided as deemed necessary. The HoTS has also advised that the existing footpath could be realigned to segregate the active open space area from the buffer area, which could then be more clearly defined through additional planting etc.

One area of concern for residents was the sites proximity to the A67 and the provision of open space adjacent to the A67 which they considered would pose risk to children etc. Whilst the plan submitted is only indicative, the Head of Technical Services considers that sufficient demonstration has now been provided that adequate open space can be achieved on site, taking into account the need to build in buffers from the A67. Objectors suggest the open space should be fenced from the A67 and this is a matter for consideration at reserved matters stage once a detailed layout is proposed.

In respect to the other areas of open space that would normally be required to support residential development sites, account is taken of the notable open space areas to the north, south and east of the site which are as a result of existing easements. Taking this into account it is considered that there is no need for further provision off site.

The final provision, nature, layout, quality, future maintenance and responsibilities for the open space are matters which would require control and conditions are recommended to address these matters in order to ensure space is provided and maintained for the future residents. The HoTS has advised that landscaping works would also be required to open space areas and that houses could be orientated to outlook onto them rather than being inward looking, thereby giving a better degree of surveillance.

Sport England have advised that they do not wish to comment on the application.

In view of all of the above it is considered that a suitable scale, type and quality of open space can be achieved, thereby being in accordance with Core Strategy Policy. Control of final provisions and management of such areas is required and conditions are imposed to deal with this.

Affordable Housing

Core Strategy Policy CS8 (5) requires new major housing development of 15 dwellings or more to provide affordable housing within a target range of 15-20%. The Councils Spatial Plans team have advised that the 2012 Tees Valley Strategic Housing Market Assessment (TVSHMA) identifies an annual affordable housing requirement of 560 dwellings for the borough, 97 of which are for the Yarm, Preston and Eaglescliffe housing sub-division. They have further advised that it is not realistic to meet these requirements in full which is recognised in the annual affordable housing targets set by Core Strategy Policy CS8. However, the policy also states that the targets are minimums and significant contributions to the annual target will be achieved if applicants for this type of site are consistently required to provide affordable housing provision at the higher end of the target rate of 20%. A site such as this could potentially provide up to 29 units (depending on final numbers).

The Head of Housing advised that the majority of need for affordable housing is for smaller properties and that they would accept a 15% provision of affordable housing. Notwithstanding this, the requirement for housing is a planning policy matter and consideration needs to be given to the 15-20% range detailed in Core Strategy Development Plan Policy CS8. The applicant initially advised of an intention to provide 15% affordable housing for the site which would generally accord with the policy, however, it is considered that the level of provision within the 15 – 20% range needs to reflect the extent to which it is achievable or otherwise and the variation with sites, taking a flexible approach. Development of brownfield sites which have notable constraints and associated costs often justify providing affordable housing at the lower end of this scale or indeed below the 15%. However, in this instance, the development is on a greenfield site where there should be limited abnormal costs. In view of this, officers requested a 20% provision be made and the applicant has agreed to this which would be achieved through the Section 106 Agreement as detailed in the Heads of Terms. This is consistent with the recent decision on the green field site at Morley Carr Farm on the south side of Yarm.

The applicants submission initially detailed a 50/50 split of affordable houses which is not comparable to the 91/9 split advocated in the SHMA 2012 and would therefore not appropriately

address the need. As the proposed site is intended to be based more around 3 and 4 bed properties rather than 2 bed units, the Head of Housing has indicated a relaxation of the 91% 2 bed and 9% 3 bed split down to a 75/25 split. This is reflected in the S106 Agreement.

A number of objections have been received relating to the scale of the 'offered' affordable housing which is addressed as detailed above. Other objections suggest that affordable housing should be located on brown field sites closer to Stockton Town Centre where people have better access to the towns facilities and which would regenerate brownfield areas, and where objectors consider land is cheap which should equate to cheap housing. Officers accept the importance of providing affordable housing in suitable locations and schemes are already underway in areas such as Parkfield, Mandale and Hardwick along with others having been granted approval but which are stalled due to the current market conditions. It is not appropriate to provide all affordable housing in such locations with the intention to mix market and affordable properties throughout schemes in order to allow the market to provide such houses and prevent large scale affordable estates being created. The proposed site is considered to be in close proximity to a number of services such as schools, shops, jobs and public transport. As such, the site is generally considered to be sustainable and a suitable position for affordable housing.

Flood Risk and Proposed Drainage

In order to consider drainage constraints and solutions for the site a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and Drainage Assessment has been undertaken. Policy guidance relative to flooding generally seeks development to be located in areas at lowest risk of flooding (Flood Zone 1) unless reasons dictate otherwise and seeks drainage for new developments to not increase the risk of flooding to surrounding areas and to drain a development as sustainably as possible with the provision of Sustainable Urban Drainage (infiltration to ground) being preferable followed by discharge to water course, with connections to sewer being the last option.

The proposed residential part of the site is located within Flood Zone 1 and as such meets this aim of Core Strategy Plan Policy CS10. The proposal further seeks to meet the requirements of policy through the forming of a detention basin at Eliff's Mill (area of the site to the south of the A67). The applicant considers this could provide at least half of the attenuation required for the site with the remainder of attenuation being provided within the housing estate. Should discharge to water course be unsuitable then the applicant is advising that all surface water will be attenuated on site with several available options. Operation of such a pond would only normally result in standing water in the basin during times of heavy rainfall when it is not appropriate to discharge the heavy flows into a nearby watercourse as this would be likely to result in flooding.

This part of the site lies immediately adjacent to Nelly Burdon's Beck which is within Flood Zone 3, being an active watercourse which has significant flooding issues downstream of the development, including internal property flooding. The Head of Technical Services has advised that should this option be pursued in any reserved matters application then the discharge rate to Nelly Burdon's Beck should be restricted to help mitigate against properties flooding. The detention basin would seek to restrict outflow from the site to the existing greenfield run off rate and thereby not increase the risk of flooding as a result of the development.

The Head of Technical Services has noted the detention basin being unable to deal with all the capacity required and the developer will therefore need to provide an overall surface water drainage scheme to suitably attenuate flows. A condition is recommended to achieve this, the scheme of which will need to be based on the final layout and extent of hard surfacing.

The submission indicates that should the discharge of all surface water to SUDS schemes prove unsuitable then the existing Northumbrian Water sewer could be utilised. Northumbrian Water advised that they have not agreed to a surface water connection to the public sewer and in view of this they have also advised a condition be imposed requiring a detailed scheme of surface water drainage for the site. The Environment Agency has raised no objections to the proposed

development but advised that the FRA submitted with the application is inconclusive as to where the surface water drainage from the proposed site is to be discharged; either Northumbrian Water sewers or Nelly Burdon's Beck. If the discharge is to the Northumbrian Water sewers then the Environment Agency have no comments to make (as Northumbrian Water will deal with it), however, if the discharge is to be directed to Nelly Burdon's Beck then the Environment Agency have advised that the proposed development will only meet the requirements of the NPPF if the measures as detailed in the Flood Risk Assessment are implemented (SUDS). The recommended condition will address these points.

The applicant has advised that foul sewerage would be disposed of via the existing foul sewer arrangement. The Environment Agency advised that Northumbrian Water should be consulted in this regard whilst the submission indicates that Northumbrian Water have confirmed the ability of the existing foul drainage system as being able to accept the anticipated flows (unrestricted). Northumbrian Water have not raised any objection to Foul Drainage associated with the development.

Notwithstanding the above, there has been significant objection from local and other residents with on drainage and flooding matters. During the recent floods and at other times, residents advise of areas of the existing field / scrub on the site being flooded and holding standing water and that the water flooded across the A67 causing its closure and significant disruption. It was further indicated that flood waters from the site have entered the gardens of properties on the adjacent Hunters Green Estate. Comments suggest that the site is regularly under water and seemed like a bog. Based on these situations residents question where water will go once the site is hard surfaced over. Concerns further question whether the existing drainage can take the additional flows and warn of the problems of underground drains bearing in mind the recent problems associated with the underground culvert at Newburn which washed away land beneath an apartment block.

The HoTS, Environment Agency and Northumbrian Water have all commented on surface water drainage provision and an indicative drainage scheme for water retention off site (during heavy rainfall) in a detention basin has been provided. The detention basin would be connected to the site via pipe which also has the ability to act as further attenuation to surface water if required. In the event of extreme rain fall water from the roofs of houses and other areas would discharge into the pipe network, under the A67 and into the detention basin. This would move the water away from both the A67 (at a lower level) and the nearby houses on the Hunters Green Estate. Subject to adequate capacity for storage in the pond, flow rates into the basin being suitable and the discharge rate from the basin to Nelly Burdon's Beck being limited, then the proposed scheme should not increase the risk of flooding, thereby mitigating the impacts of the development in this regard. The scheme required by condition can provide for this along with a full maintenance regime for the SUDS scheme. The HoTS has advised that a development with a calculated drainage scheme is likely to alleviate flooding rather than worsen it, however, the developer should still undertake an assessment of overland flow routes to ensure that exceedance flows that are unable to enter the drainage system do not exacerbate any existing local flooding issues (back up on site etc).

Northumbrian Water have advised that the site is crossed by a 15" (375mm) Trunk Water Main and they have recommended a condition be imposed requiring the precise location of the water main to be identified and a scheme for its protection during and after development to be imposed. Taking it into account that it is the applicants responsibility to undertake site operations in a suitable manner, it is considered appropriate to deal with this matter by providing an informative to the decision rather than a condition, with the informative advising the applicant of the presence of the water main.

Archaeology

The application was initially accompanied by an archaeological desk based assessment and field evaluation in the form of a geomagnetic survey. Tees Archaeology considered that both reports were well produced and were happy to recommend them to the planning authority. They indicated

that the geophysical survey identified a number of anomalies consistent with archaeological features, the nature and date of which was unknown. Notwithstanding the submitted work, Tees Archaeology recommended that the results of the geomagnetic survey should be tested by archaeological trial trenching to establish their significance and to allow the impact of the development on this significance to be properly assessed considering this to be in line with the advice given in the National Planning Policy Framework (para. 128). Officers supported this request and the applicant agreed to undertaking trial trenching works. The report on the trial trenching confirms the results of the earlier interim report that an Iron Age and Romano-British settlement survives in a discrete area of the site. In view of the findings within the reports Tees Archaeology have requested a condition be imposed requiring a record to be made of the heritage asset. This approach is supported by Core Strategy Development Plan Policy CS3(8) which requires development to make a positive contribution to the local area by responding positively to existing features of archaeological importance and taking into account the nature and significance of the asset. It is also in accordance with the guidance of the NPPF which seeks consideration of the significance of the asset and the impact of the development on the asset. A condition is recommended to complete these requirements.

Loss of Agricultural Land

The loss of agricultural land has been raised as an objection to the development, considering brownfield sites exist which would be more suitable. There is further concern that as a nation we are not self-sufficient and rely on many imports and development of the site is an irresponsible attitude to have towards good productive farmland and this site should be protected for future generations, making sure we have reliable food sources, particularly as global population rises and global warming occurs.

Paragraph 112 of the NPPF states 'Local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality.'

Best and most versatile agricultural land is defined as land in grades 1, 2 and 3a of the Agricultural Land Classification (ALC). It needs to be taken into account alongside other sustainability considerations when assessing planning applications. Local site specific surveys were undertaken in 1988 and 1999 but did not include the application site. The Natural England Strategic Map Information Sheet states that where post 1988 data is available, this is the most reliable source of information on land quality because it is based on field survey work. The Strategic Map Information Sheet goes on to state that site specific studies including new Agricultural Land Classification field surveys will be needed to obtain definitive information on ALC grades for individual sites. The application site is provisionally grade 3 on the pre 1988 maps but this cannot be relied on as these maps are not sufficiently accurate for use in the assessment of individual development sites and should not be used other than as general guidance.

Notwithstanding this circumstance, many objectors indicate that this land regularly floods which is likely to affect its ability to be actively farmed. Whilst retaining agricultural land is clearly beneficial, land for housing also needs to be provided and a balance needs to be reached between the two. This site is in close proximity to the existing urban area, is surrounded by roads on three sides and, were the permission for the industrial estate on the adjacent site to be developed out, the site would be land locked by development. In view of the limited scale of the site, surrounding constraints, the land being within the defined limits of development on land allocated for industrial use and part of a housing sub division area, whilst there is a loss of agricultural land, its loss is not considered to be contrary to policy and guidance in this regard.

Education Provision

The proposal will result in the increase in population within the Eaglescliffe area. Core Strategy Development Plan Policy CS11(1) requires all new development to contribute towards the cost of

providing additional infrastructure and meeting social and environmental requirements. The Councils Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 6 details this further and highlights a need for housing developments such as this to contribute towards the provision of school places, in circumstances where there is not sufficient capacity with existing schools at the time the development commences.

The SPD provides a standard formula for the financial contribution required at the appropriate time relevant to the number of children likely to be living within the development and available school places. The applicant has agreed to meeting this requirement.

The Councils Education Strategy Manager has advised that, at present this proposed development will impact directly on the admission zone set for Durham Lane Primary which is a single form entry school (i.e. it only has 30 places in its reception intake each year). A development for approximately 159 homes will increase the demand for an additional 41 school places which would create a problem for the Council as at present this school has very low surplus places at present at just over 3% of its Net Capacity of 210 school places across all year groups. The Education Strategy Manager has therefore recommended that the Council seek an education contribution and that the Council spend the monies to provide the number places as detailed at the most appropriate location to address the needs of the development. Allowing a flexible approach to where the monies are spent will allow the authority to take into account potential constraints of building on the current school site and consider other opportunities to increase places at another school. It is considered that the requirements detailed within the Heads of Terms and in the Section 106 agreement would address this matter.

There has been significant objection to the development based on the perceived existing capacity or lack of, within the nearby schools and suggestions that the provision of additional spaces needs to be made prior to the development occurring. Following specific questions being raised against the comments of the Councils Education Strategy Manager, further comment has been made.

Objections raised suggest that primary schools are already at capacity and Egglescliffe secondary school is over capacity and that the extension of Junction Farm School has been accounted for through the approval for the Allens West Development and children would therefore have to be transported elsewhere for school places required as a result of this scheme. Objectors suggest that there is a difference between stating funds will be made available for places and actually providing classrooms and the associated places. Residents are concerned that approving further housing development will leave schools over stretched which will in turn result in poorer schooling. Objections have indicated that the council has in the past approved housing and then had to 'ship' the children to schools further afield which have capacity.

In commenting on the education contribution the Councils Education Strategy Manager advised that the contribution would not necessarily be used for Junction Farm as a number of other primary school expansion works are going ahead subject to feasibility work. The council may look at a wider level of need as some school sites may not allow for any development work due to their site constraints and yet the demand would still need to be met. Therefore a flexible approach is necessary.

A resident questioned this, suggesting that any money for Education from this scheme should be spent within the local community and for it to be spent prior to development commencing in view of there being a dire need of further primary and secondary school places. The Councils Education Strategy Manager advised that the Urray Nook development falls within the 2 miles to Durham Lane, Junction Farm, Egglescliffe CE and The Links, all schools in Stockton Borough have an admission zone and parents in the Borough will live within an admission zone which determines the local school (primary, infant, junior or secondary). Parents who want their child/ren to attend their admission zone school will be provided with free transport according to distance from the school.

Relative to this scheme, the Councils Education Strategy Manager has advised that it is expected that most families would choose to have a place at Durham Lane School in the first instance which the council would try and accommodate. Ultimately families have parental choice and it's not always possible to meet their 1st preference especially if that school becomes oversubscribed (as many are becoming due to increases in pupil populations) but the Council would always offer them a school place elsewhere. Local concern was that this approach will be socially divisive as parents who wish their child to go to Durham Lane will not be guaranteed a place and they may be allocated Butts Lane or Junction Farm, both of which are 25 minute walk away which brings into question if this is socially sustainable. Concern is also raised in respect to a baby boom which is suggested as to be already happening in Eaglescliffe and which will require school places. It is suggested by residents that children that are already living in Eaglescliffe need to be accommodated with school places before considering bringing in additional children from new developments.

These comments are all noted and important to the future provision for school places and how children are accommodated locally, however, in determining applications for residential development, contributions are required to be defined at the time of determination and the formula method allows suitable flexibility and for a planned / strategic approach. This is considered to be appropriate and reasonable. The need for school places will fluctuate constantly, particularly where there are a number of schools and where there are several development within an area affecting them. The Council are aware of the developments within the 'planning arena', the capacity or lack of places at schools and the intention for school expansion projects etc. As such, although there is great concern about the capacity of existing schools to take additional pupils, based on the comments of the Councils Education Strategy Manager it is considered that adequate provisions will be made at the appropriate time.

Objectors are further concerned that by shoehorning children into these schools the standard of education will go down, facilities will be stretched and what were once considered good schools will no longer be a place where families want their children to attend. This is noted, however, there is no evidence submitted to support this chain of events whilst officer advise is that adequate spaces will be provided.

Ecology

National Guidance within the NPPF indicates the need to contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment by protecting valued landscapes, recognising the wider benefits of eco-systems, minimising impacts on bio-diversity and establish coherent ecological networks. It further indicates that local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. The NPPF advises that when determining planning applications, local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity by applying the principle that if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts) , adequately mitigated , or, as a last resort compensated for, then planning permission should be refused. Core Strategy Development Plan Policy CS3 similarly requires new development to make a positive contribution to the local area by protecting and enhancing important environmental assets, biodiversity and geo-diversity.

The initial submission was supported by an Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey and was later added to following objections from residents, Natural England and Tees Valley Wildlife Trust, all of whom considered it necessary for further work to be carried out in respect to Newt populations on the land to the northern part of the site.

The application site includes agricultural land / scrub land which has a semi natural appearance. Until recently the larger parts of the agricultural land to the northern part of the site appeared to be unused agricultural land and during the process of the applications considerations, the land has been ploughed.

Several comments were received indicating that the farmer was witnessed ploughing the two fields subject of the proposed development plus the area to the south where there is a public footpath (immediately adjacent to the potential development site). Residents were concerned that this had the potential to kill and injure protected species which in itself is a criminal offence as well as fragmenting populations of newts. This is not a planning matter although officers are aware that the Police wildlife crimes officer looked into this matter.

Assessment of impacts on Great Crested Newts

A Great Crested Newt – Risk Assessment and Protected Species and Management Plan (v2 Dec 2012) was submitted following initial concerns over the extent of the submission documentation. The report has taken in to account the findings of other reports detailing known populations of newts in the area. The submission indicates that the site has two distinct areas which are separated by the A67 which they consider to pose an impediment to movement of Great Crested Newts (GCN's). The study identifies ponds within 500m of the site, and it is indicated that a small breeding population of GCN's is supported across a close network of ponds at and immediately adjacent to the part of the site at Ellif's Mill and without mitigation, an offence would be highly likely to occur when undertaking the development of the SUDS scheme. Mitigation is proposed in respect to development of this area and it is suggested that the nature of the design of the SUDS basin will increase the feeding and breeding opportunities for GCN's. Trees immediately adjacent to the pond will be removed and maintained in that manner with grass being seeded on disturbed areas and pollution within the water will be largely removed through silt traps and interceptors. Two ponds / basins would be created and are intended to be built with GCN's in mind. The submission advises that there will be an overall loss of grassland, shrub and broadleaved woodland through the creation of the basin / pond and that this cannot be compensated for.

The submission indicates that the land to the north of the A67 which is intended to provide the area of housing is likely to have newts present, but not likely to be anything more than individual newts in small numbers, and that the works would not interfere with the GCN population such as dispersal between ponds etc. This is based on the ponds in the wider area being reasonable distances away and their being features such as roads, railways and sub-optimal habitat in between the northern site and these ponds. Following Natural England's standing advice on such matters, the submission indicates that a non-licensed mitigation approach is proposed for the northern part of the site.

There has been significant objection to the scheme based on the potential impacts to populations of Great Crested Newts, highlighting their importance, their protected status and the need to consider how they are affected by schemes, how their habitat is affected as well as their movements between sites. Objectors have referenced Natural England's Interim Guidance issued in August 2007 relating to declines in newt population due to loss of ponds, most ponds being in arable / pastoral land, the movement of newts between several ponds within pond clusters and that many farming activities will kill individual newts. Objectors point out that an Ecological Survey carried out on behalf of the developers will not consider seasonal variations but instead will capture information at one set point in time, nor does it take into consideration a wide enough survey area. Therefore detection or accurate reporting of the presence of Great Crested Newts will not be reported or documented.

Objectors point out that due as Great Crested Newts are known to travel up to 500m to feed & breed, and have been seen on gardens to the West of the proposed development, it is natural to assume that they are on site too. They suggest that due to the small distances between each of the ponds and the presence of ideal habitat across a wider area (both on- and off-site) it should be considered that an interchange of animals occurs between the water bodies and a single population exists. A Ward Member has advised that several ponds were on or around the site historically which have been filled and are starting to re-establish themselves and which are holding large populations of newts. The Ward Member has requested that an independent newt survey is undertaken.

Residents raise concern that as drainage conditions will change after building work on the site adjacent to the population, Ellif's Mills' small population will no doubt be disturbed due to construction activity as well as through disturbance.

With these points in mind objectors have indicated that within the SBC's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment of 2011 point 2.17 states that zero housing potential should be assigned to land on which there is a Great Crested Newt pond, or a local wildlife site or a flood risk zone and they feel that the proposed development at Urlay Nook could contravene all three of these factors.

Natural England note that the application site is not within / close to a SSSI or SAC notified for great crested newts, but is in close proximity to Ellif's Mill and Elementis Local Sites, which are notified for their populations of this species. Natural England consider that the scale of impact on Great Crested Newts is low and that mitigation will;

- Ensure no net loss of habitat in terms of quantity and quality,
- Maintain habitat links,
- Secure long term management of the site for the benefit of newts.

Based on these findings, Natural England have advised that permission may be granted subject to a condition requiring a detailed mitigation and monitoring strategy for Great Crested Newts.

Having initially objected, Tees Valley Wildlife Trust were satisfied that the further submission of the Assessment and Species Protection Plan addressed their initial objections and that it provides a full and fair assessment of existing populations of great crested newt in the vicinity of the development site and how these might interact with the land proposed for housing. It also addresses the legal and conservation management issues for the part of the application site which is proposed for a Sustainable Urban Drainage Scheme and on this basis the Trust have withdrawn its objection.

In view of the specialist advice given from Natural England and Tees Valley Wildlife Trust, and the ability to mitigate impact, it is considered that the proposal would be in accordance with the relevant guidance of the NPPF and the Core Strategy in respect to its impacts on GCN's.

The Environment Agency advised that the site may contain Great Crested Newts and/or Otters and/or their habitat. These or their habitat are formally protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, and Natural England approval will be required. The Environment Agency therefore recommend that the applicant would need to follow the method statements outlined within the Extended Phase 1 Habitat Report provided by Eco-north October 2011.

Assessment of impacts of wildlife – excluding Great crested Newts

The submission was supported by an Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey for the site which covered the northern part of the site where the housing development is being proposed. The survey findings suggest that there are no protected species found on site that would be likely to constrain the proposed development, indicating there being 5 main habitat types, the most abundant being fields of improved grassland managed as a hay crop and which was suggested as having a low conservation value owing to a limited range of species and dominance and lack of discernable field margins. The survey recognised relatively extensive hedgerows on the sites boundaries, and that these are included within the Tees Valley Local Biodiversity Action Plan as a priority habitat. The survey indicated two trees as providing potential roosting opportunity for bats. The survey sought for evidence for breeding birds, badger and reptiles. The survey took into account existing known wildlife in terms of designated sites (newts, dingy skipper, rare lichen, otter, water vole, bats, lizard, brown hare etc) and the locations of these.

The report indicates that a number of bird species were observed including blackbird, great tit, goldfinch, house sparrow and wood pigeon and that the hedgerow and trees would provide

suitable nesting habitat for such birds. A buzzard was heard but not seen. Evidence was seen of foxes although there was no evidence of badger or reptiles with limited foraging / habitat for these species.

Objectors have raised concerns over the impact on wildlife on and using the site, citing there as being over fifty species of wild life recorded on the proposed development area, most of which will lose their habitat as a result of this proposal. Species witnessed are indicated as including Foxes and Deer as well as many birds due to its proximity to the local bird & wildlife sanctuary called 'Admiralty Ecology Wildlife Site'. Residents have suggested that the site is used for nesting, hunting and feeding ground for birds including rare species such as Long Eared Owl, Green Woodpecker, Tree Sparrow, Redwing, Lapwing, Fieldfare, Bullfinch, Chiffchaff, Barn Owl, Kestrel and Great Grey Shrike. Residents presume this is due to the habitat offering favourable conditions. Objectors consider that all these species would be decimated if the development took this arable land away from the wildlife.

Based on the findings of the Phase 1 Habitat Survey, recommendations have been made in order to mitigate and compensate the likely impact of the development on wildlife. The report recommended that;

- Efforts should be made to retain hedgerows during the sites development where possible especially where they are in-tact and / or could be restored.
- If safe to do so, retain the two mature ash trees located at the south east of the site as these have features suitable for roosting bats.
- Leaving escape planks for excavations during the construction phase,
- Ensuring safe storage of materials during the construction phase,
- Clearance works to avoid bird breeding surveys,
- Maintain bird breeding habitat where possible,
- Incorporate space for wildlife, habitat connectivity,
- Landscaping should consist of native species,
- Install bird and bat boxes,

The survey findings appear to be at odds with the comments given by residents about the wildlife in the area and the indication that the habitat is therefore particularly favourable for these birds, however, it is noted that the extent of survey work is limited and that residents will have experiences of wildlife over a prolonged period. This local advice is given weight.

Natural England advised the Local Planning Authority to use their standing advice to assess the impact on species. Officers have considered the findings and recommendations of the Phase 1 Habitat Survey in the context of Natural England's Standing Advice. Considering this leads to a view being taken that there is limited potential for species due to the habitat of the site and there being the ability to provide the recommended mitigation as part of a detailed scheme. Taking into account the residents advice in respect to additional wildlife / bird use of the site, consideration is given to the site as existing and the site as proposed. The site has recently been ploughed and therefore consists of the ploughed fields along with landscape corridors (hedgerows & trees) along the boundaries. These can in the main be retained or where not being retained, replaced with native species landscaping. Subject to the final site layout, notable provision could be made to allow the site to retain habitat. In view of this, subject to an appropriate scheme of mitigation being agreed, it is considered that there would not be an impact on wildlife which would be significantly detrimental, thereby being in accordance with the principles of relevant policy and guidance.

The Environment

Objection has been raised that the proposed development would be contrary to the NPPF as it neither protects or enhances the natural environment and does not therefore fulfil the environmental role as required. It is suggested by objectors that the scheme would;

- be extremely detrimental to the biodiversity of the area as it will destroy the habitat and migration routes of existing wildlife.
- have a negative impact on nature and the environment e.g. removing hedgerows and natural habitats.
- destroy the natural habitat which is home to Badgers, Foxes, Newts and other forms of protected species.
- Cause irreversible damage to Flora and Fauna of the site.
- adversely effect on the wildlife corridor.
- Compromise the rural nature and green belt feel of the area due to the large size of the proposed development.
- destroy areas of natural beauty and habitat.
- Noise, light and air pollution would affect bordering habitats.
- Feeding ground would be lost.
- The increased populous would impinge upon wildlife and bring increased predatory threat from domestic pets.

Residents consider that too many of our habitats have been degraded and nature driven out and suggests that the NPPF makes it clear that relevant planning policies such as those protecting the Green belt, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Parks and other areas - cannot be overridden by the presumption. It is cited that the NPPF further recognises the intrinsic value and beauty of the countryside (whether specifically designated or not);

The concerns over the loss of the land in its current form are appreciated, however, it is important to recognise that the site is not green wedge, is not within a National Park, is not part of a SSSI or any other similar designation. Therefore, such policy designations and associated guidance do not affect the consideration of this development. The site is within the limits of development and within the Yarm, Eaglescliffe and Preston housing sub division area and needs to be viewed as suitable for development in principle. Notwithstanding this, any detailed layout needs to demonstrate how impacts can be minimised and how green corridors, landscaping and other such provisions can be incorporated to result in a scheme which is a suitable intervention into the area.

Heritage and the Environment

A number of objections have been raised against the proposed scheme on the grounds that development sites in and around Eaglescliffe and Yarm are continually eroding / destroying the ethos and character of these areas with Yarm being a historic market town with a unique feel. They indicate that Yarm was once credited as being the best in Britain and a National study recently put Yarm tenth in the country to be family friendly. Many of the towns in the top twenty are quiet, picturesque and often small towns that provide parents with a safe and peaceful environment to bring up their children. Objectors wish the Council to help preserve the nature of the unique and historic market town. Such concerns are noted although this particular site is of a relatively modest overall number, is on the western periphery of Eaglescliffe and is served off the A67/ Urray Nook Road. As such, it is considered that the proposed development would have a particularly limited impact on the centres of Eaglescliffe or Yarm other than through the provision of some additional traffic (which as detailed within the highways section of the report is expected to be limited) and through some additional footfall. Arguably, additional footfall is a positive attribute for centres as it improves their vitality and viability. As people travel into Yarm from the Darlington area they would drive past the site and the site will therefore contribute to the feel of the area perceived by people passing the site. There is an existing landscape buffer to the northern side of the A67 and the area

where properties are intended to be built would lie beyond this. Although some existing landscaping would be removed, it is anticipated that the position of the green buffer would remain and be added to through the provision of a new landscaping scheme. As such, whilst the approach along the A67 will clearly change character, it is considered that this will not be a significant change and it will be able to retain a green corridor to the A67.

Local Provisions / Amenities

The proposed site is located within relative close proximity to the Orchard Parade neighbourhood centre on Durham Lane Eaglescliffe (900m by road). This centre unfortunately suffered loss of units to fire in May 2012 and at the current time there is a significantly reduced provision within the centre which has been subject of many objections in that this proposed housing development will not be well served by amenities. Further objections indicate that many of the service provisions such as doctor's surgeries, dental services the health centre will be stretched further and waiting times will deteriorate as a result. Whilst these concerns are noted, housing needs to be placed in relative close proximity to services in order to be sustainable in such regards. A housing development of this scale does not in itself warrant the provision of a new centre. The council is currently considering an application to re-provide units at the centre. Beyond these considerations, if existing services are stretched then these would need to adapt to the changing circumstances rather than the matter result in no new population being able to be supported.

Objection from residents has been made in respect to the lack of a reasonable bus serving this end of Eaglescliffe rendering the site as being unsustainable and resulting in increased car journeys. Technical Services has advised that the bus service in this area changed in July 2012 due to low patronage, operating a loop to serve Urray Nook Road up to the roundabout at Valley Gardens. The no.87 service that ran along Durham Lane was also lost when Tees Valley Coaches ceased trading late in 2012. Currently, the X6 service operates between Middlesbrough and Yarm (via Ingleby). This travels along Durham Lane to the Tesco Roundabout and then through Yarm. This is a regular service although it does not run late into the evening. The nearest bus stop to the application site is the bus stops at the Durham Lane Tesco Roundabout. Technical Services have advised that the proposed housing would therefore be located well over the 400 metre guideline distance for access to the nearest public transport stop. It is indicated that there has been some pressure from residents in the Hunter's Green area for the restoration of bus services. At the present time, due to the low patronage associated with the withdrawal of previous services up to the Hunters Green estate it is not envisaged at this point in time that providers will extend the route. Future patronage and funding circumstances may affect these matters. In view of the above, although the site is not well served by public transport, there is a regular service available and it is within walking distance of the site. This affords the site with a degree of sustainability in this regard.

Objectors raised objection over the lack of a swimming pool and other sports facilities. These are considered to be significant strategic provisions and not something which is justified by a development of this scale. Open space is discussed in more detail within the *Materials Considerations- open space* section of this report. A Ward Member has advised that consideration should be given to the provision of facilities for older children and teenagers to avoid the problems of anti-social behaviour with the lack of hanging out space. This is noted and some provision may be achieved through the final layout and provision for the site, however, due to the scale of the site and the extent of open space on the site, it is considered that notable formal play provision would not be proportionate to the impacts of demand from the development.

Objectors consider employment and social activities all lie too far away to serve the development. Employment exists on Durham Lane, along with shops, public house, community centre, library etc. Schools also exist within this vicinity. As such, the site is considered to be relatively well served by provisions.

Pollution

Significant objection is raised regarding the pollution arising from the additional traffic related to the development and the increase in standing traffic due to the additional traffic on the highway network. Comments indicate the type of toxins / pollutants that would occur, advising that these are heavier than air and therefore sit at pedestrian level thereby resulting in inevitable risks to human health. Concern is raised that this will affect children on their route to the nearby schools as standing traffic will line the highway network in this area. Objectors point out that whilst levels may be within EEC limits, so was asbestos previously, therefore suggesting the development creating the additional pollutants should not go ahead. It is further indicated that although the levels of nitrous oxide are generally within prescribed safe levels of 40mgm/mm³, it has been recorded much higher at 139 and 583mgm/mm³. Again, objectors highlight that the highest levels will be when there is queuing traffic which is generally at school opening and closing times, thereby affecting the child pedestrians the worst. Objectors are concerned about the submission which includes an assessment carried out by Northumbrian Water Scientific Services, suggesting the Met station used for this work was Loftus which is 20 miles away and at a notably different altitude, thereby suggesting this work should be redone. Concern is also raised that the air quality monitoring station was moved from the area where air quality is likely to be worst (Yarm High Street) to Eaglescliffe School. Whilst these concerns are noted, as detailed within the highways section of the report, the additional traffic as a result of this development would not have any undue impacts on journey times / waiting traffic and as such, it is considered pollution associated with vehicles would not increase by any significant amount. A Ward Member has suggested that if steps are not taken to reduce them, it will lead to the authority missing several key targets set nationally to improve the health of residents.

Objection has been raised with concerns over a figure within the supporting documentation to the application (Northumbrian Water Scientific Services Air Quality Assessment), specifically with respect to the reported increase in traffic on Urray Nook Road of 69.7% as a result of the development. The objector considers this must increase air pollution by the same amount and cannot therefore be considered negligible. The findings of the Northumbrian Water report is that no mitigation is required in relation to traffic emissions, however, construction activities have the potential to generate dust and mitigation for this should be included. A condition is recommended to address this.

Further objections from residents and others including the CPRE have been raised in respect to the proximity of the site to the Allens West and Elementis Chromium sites to the north, and the presence of trade outflow drains running near to / through the site with an indication that these have cracked in the past and are known to be in a poor state of repair. The suggestion from objectors is that the level of survey work undertaken in relation to ground contamination is insufficient. As noted by objectors, the application has been supported by a Geo-Environmental Desk Study Report which considers the potential for land contamination. The Councils Environmental Health Officer is aware of the importance of the surrounding drains from former industries and the associated outputs from these. Following consideration of the submitted details the Environmental Health Officer has advised that there is no objection to the proposed scheme subject to the imposition of conditions relating to a preliminary risk assessment, soil testing and previously unidentified contamination occurring. Whilst resident objections on these matters are noted, in view of the comments from the Councils EHO, it is considered that this matter can be adequately dealt with by conditions as recommended.

Impacts on Amenity

Concern is raised that there will be increased noise pollution from the development as a result of construction traffic, general traffic and the movement of more pedestrians. Concern is also raised about the level of amenity future residents will achieve being in such close proximity to the A67. Officers noted that there is the ability to subdue noise from the A67 through increased landscaping, spacing of houses, boundary enclosures, land form and glazing type, all of which would be detailed at reserved matters stage or as part of any building regulations submissions. It is perceived that noise from the A67 would not be a significant issue when balanced with these available methods of

reducing the overall impact. Objections to increased noise for existing residents at Hunters Green is considered would be limited taking into account the existing presence of the highways including the A67. This proposal is simply adding a small increase of traffic to the highway network. Traffic noise from within the site is likely to be limited due to the low speed of internal highways. Construction traffic and their associated impacts are often a cause for concern and remain to be so for residents living near to this site. Construction noise is a temporary impact of new development and generally accepted as such. However, in instances where it has the potential to affect residential amenity control of working hours via condition is considered appropriate. In view of the proximity of the Hunters Green Estate to the site a condition is recommended in this regard.

Objectors have cited noise from the airport and vibration from trains as being likely to result in undue impacts on amenity. Neither the airport or railway line have significant movements of planes / trains and the site is not significantly closer to these sources of noise than the existing Hunters Green Estate. In view of these matters and the ability for buildings to be built to higher insulation standards than previously, it is considered that there would be no significant undue impacts in these regards.

Concern and objection is raised by residents and others including the CPRE regarding the presence of the Police firearms training centre on the north west of the site and the potential noise generated here from automatic weapons firing, explosions and helicopter movements which objectors suggest may be unbearable for future residents and which may also pose a security risk to such a use. Consultation has been undertaken with the Police and no objection has been raised in respect to the development. The development has the ability to design in features to mitigate impacts of noise (to a degree) whilst the regularity of loud noises needs to be taken into account along with the sites position approx. 330m away. In view of these matters it is considered that there would not be significant undue impact on the future residents for the site. The potential of security risk for the centre due to residential use of a nearby site is, taking into account no objection raised from the Police, is a matter for their own considerations.

Residents have raised concerns that the lack of places for children to play will result in anti-social behaviour due to increased population and more children wandering the streets and also suggest that there will be anti-social behaviour caused by additional pedestrians walking through the Hunters Green Estate and along Langdon Way. Objection is also raised due to the potential for overlooking from the site towards the Hunters Green Estate. Objectors believe that the impact and reduced quality of life for current residents of Eaglescliffe and Yarm has not been considered and wish the Council to help preserve the quality of life for current residents.

Any new development into an area will inevitably change the feel, character and levels of amenity associated with that area. In respect to this proposal, the site is of a limited scale and on the opposing side of a highway and it is considered that the scheme would not result in significant amounts of pedestrian traffic through the adjoining estates. Notwithstanding this, pedestrian use of footpaths, cycle-ways etc. is supported as a more sustainable approach than travelling by car. Due to the nature of the sites position it has been considered necessary to have some open space on site and a sizeable area has been demonstrated as being achievable. As such, children would have somewhere to play. Beyond making such provisions and designing areas in a manner which reduces the opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour such as to have good natural surveillance, were anti-social behaviour to occur it would become a social matter which would need to be dealt with separately to the planning application.

Concerns regarding overlooking from the site carry little weight at this stage as the plan detailed is indicative only. Notwithstanding this, due to their being a highway in between the proposed housing and the existing Hunter Green estate it is expected that ample spacing between properties can be achieved to prevent an undue overbearing impact.

A condition is recommended to prevent open burning of waste on the site in order to ensure amenity is not affected by such occurrences in view of the sites proximity to the Hunters green Estate.

In order to prevent site related vehicles parking within the highway adjacent to the site a condition is recommended which requires a temporary car park to be provided for workers.

Other Matters

Objection has been raised to the developers indications that they will limit CO2 production from the site although note that there will be no combined heat and power plant on the site, that all houses are not shown to be south facing, for solar gain, that wind is ineffective and ground source heat is too expensive. Comments indicate that it is hoped that properties will be south facing to include Photo Voltaic panels (electricity generated by the sun) and query is raised as to what Code level the developer would build to. The NPPF seeks proposals to achieve sustainable development principles including those relating to sustainable living and climate change. Core Strategy Policy CS3 '*Sustainable Living and Climate Change*' requires all new residential development to achieve a minimum of level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes and for all major developments to achieve 10% of total predicted energy requirements on site from renewable energy sources. With regards to generating 10% of energy requirements on site, it is generally accepted that reducing the actual demand through a higher build specification would achieve the same outcome. A Ward Member has requested that were permission to be approved then it should take full advantage of passive heating and solar power. Conditions are recommended to address the policy requirements of sustainable building and the developer will need to consider options available to achieve a suitable scheme.

Concern is raised by residents that the scheme will not support a strong and vibrant community. Contrary to this concern, it is considered that the provision of new housing which is well served by usable on site open space and landscaping and which results in the improvement to existing pedestrian and cycle links will create an opportunity for a strong and vibrant community to be created.

A number of the objections to the scheme raise concern over the development and its associated impacts on existing house prices; however, this is not a material planning consideration.

Residents have expressed their hope for the Council to determine the application appropriately with due consideration for the community of Eaglescliffe and without any political or financial influences. The officer recommendation is based on relevant planning policy and guidance and has taken in to account material planning considerations raised by consultees and other representations made.

Residents indicate that there are a number of houses which have been on the market for a long time within Eaglescliffe due to market conditions and that building more houses will make it harder for current homeowners to retain equity in their homes and long term result in more rental properties which will in turn lead to a break down in the community as the population becomes more transient. It is suggested that this has been proven to lead to an increase in crime and anti-social behaviour. Officers are basing their recommendations on the requirement to provide housing and for there to be a demonstrable 5 year supply. Whether new housing affects house prices in an area will be a factor for new housing in any location and is not considered to be a material planning consideration in its own right.

The NPPF seeks new development to be undertaken to a high quality and provide a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings'. It is considered that these principles will be achievable subject to the details put forward at reserved matters stages.

Objection has been raised that local businesses in Yarm will be adversely affected as people become discouraged from visiting the High Street due to the issue of queuing traffic, noise, traffic based pollution etc. There is no clear evidence that would support this claim and it is considered that additional housing within an area would normally increase vitality of nearby centres. Further to

this, the additional traffic loading at peak times is considered to be minimal as detailed within the highways section of the report.

Concern is raised over the concept of the development and the potential for a phase 2 and that were this to be the case the adjacent site intended for industrial purposes would actually become housing. This application is being considered on the basis of its content and should any future applications be submitted for further housing, these would need to be considered at that time, against relevant material planning considerations.

Durham Tees Valley Airport was consulted on the application in view of the proposal including the presence of a potential water body, its likelihood of attracting birds and the impact this could have for the airports operations. Durham Tees Valley Airport have not responded to the consultation. Consideration is given to the proposed SUDS scheme which consists of a holding basin for water and a small pond. As the holding basin is likely to be dry most of the year and the pond being proposed is particularly small, it is considered that there would be no significant increase in birds using the site as a result of these features and the proposed development would therefore not have any particular impact on the airports operation or its associated safety.

As the proposal is being justified based on the lack of a 5 year supply of housing and that this is a changing circumstance as other applications are determined, it is considered necessary ensure the application is not held in abeyance unable to contribute to the 5 year supply. As such, the recommendation includes a requirement for the S106 Agreement to be completed and signed within a 2 month period from the decision of committee.

Objection has been raised to the scheme based on there being pylons required for the new homes which are suggested as causing harm to health. In view of the limited scale of the development it is not anticipated that any pylons would be required to serve this site.

CONCLUSION

The proposed residential part of the development is within the defined limits of development and within the Yarm, Eaglescliffe and Preston housing sub division area as detailed within the Local Plan and Core Strategy development Plan. The principle of residential development on the site is therefore in general accordance with Development Plan Policy. Core Strategy Development Plan Policy CS7 does not support new residential development in the current period and only a limited provision thereafter which has arguably already been met and surpassed by other recent permissions. Notwithstanding this, the NPPF has guided that housing related policies within development plans should not be considered as being up to date if an authority cannot demonstrate a 5 year housing supply. Officers consider that Stockton Borough currently has a 4.08 year supply and as such the housing figures for the area as defined in CS7 are considered to be out of date when considering this and other housing applications. In view of these matters residential development of the site is accepted.

The scheme is in outline form only with all matters reserved, however, it has been demonstrated through survey work that the residential development of the site can be undertaken (subject to conditions) without having an undue impact on traffic, highway safety, ecology, archaeology, pollution, flooding and other matters. In order to meet the demands of future occupiers of the site and mitigate impacts such as on the highway network, on school places provisions, affordable housing and on parking in Yarm a Section 106 Agreement is required.

It is recommended that advertisement consent be granted with Conditions for the reasons specified above.

Corporate Director of Development and Neighbourhood Services
Contact Officer Mr Andrew Glossop Telephone No 01642 527796

WARD AND WARD COUNCILLORS

Ward Eaglescliffe
Ward Councillor Councillor A L Lewis, Councillor Mrs M. Rigg, Councillor Phillip Dennis

IMPLICATIONS

Financial Implications:

There are no known financial implications other than those detailed within the Heads of Terms relative to the provision of a Section 106 Agreement and any future title transfer of land or assets such as drainage features.

Legal Implications:

There are no known Legal Implications associated with the determination of this application.

Environmental Implications:

The application has been considered against its impacts on the environment. It is considered that there is no notable impacts for wildlife or their habitat, subject to mitigation, that pollution / contamination of the site can be dealt with through survey work, that additional native landscaping and areas of open space can be provided to enhance the sites environment and that matters of noise, traffic and the associated use of the site including during the construction phase, can be adequately dealt with, without undue impacts on the surrounding environment.

Human Rights Implications:

The provisions of the European Convention of Human Rights 1950 have been taken into account in the preparation of this report. The report has detailed and taken into account the matters raised through the consultation process. It is considered that suitable levels of amenity and privacy can be maintained for surrounding residents. Consideration has been given to the level of impact and mitigating circumstances with conditions being recommended to reduce the impacts of the scheme where considered necessary to do so.

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. Consideration has been given to the movement of pedestrians, the potential for anti-social behaviour, the increase of traffic on the highways and its associated impacts on pollution. It is considered that the development would not unduly affect community safety.

Background Papers:

Application Submission documents for 12/2047/OUT
National Planning Policy Framework
Stockton on Tees Local Plan
Stockton on Tees Core Strategy Development Plan