

**DELEGATED**

**AGENDA NO**

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**DATE 13 NOVEMBER 2013**

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

**13/2184/OUT**

**Field at Grid Reference 440817 514442, Urlay Nook Road, Eaglescliffe  
Revised Outline application for residential development (C3)**

**Expiry Date: 26 November 2013**

### **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 proposed to be provided with an ecological enhancement scheme. All matters are reserved with only the principle of development sought by this application although there remains to be a requirement to indicatively demonstrate the development is achievable. The indicative site layout plan shows up to 145 houses on the site, an area of open space, landscape areas, and a point of access off Urlay Nook Road.

This application has been submitted following the refusal of planning permission for a similar scheme in June 2013 and seeks to fully address the reasons for refusal.

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 adjacent to a site which has approval (subject to S106 being signed) for an industrial development. Existing housing lies to the opposite side of Urlay Nook Road and there is an approved housing site of Allens West to the north, beyond Urlay Nook Road and a railway line.

Significant objection has been raised against the application, including from Councillor Rigg, Egglecliffe & Eaglescliffe Parish Council and Longnewton Parish Council. The main thrust of objections 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 and Environmental Health. No objections are raised from these consultees subject to the imposition of conditions and agreements requiring mitigation and further investigative work to be undertaken at a later stage and subject to the final layout and design taking into account certain matters such as works to the highway to mitigate traffic impacts, ecological mitigation, demonstration of a suitable surface water drainage scheme and provisions / contributions to be made towards highway works / education places and affordable housing.

As the site is within the limits of development a residential development is in accordance with the principles of saved Local Plan Policy HO3. The proposal would be contrary to Core Strategy Development Plan Policy CS7 which indicates that no additional housing sites would be allocated before 2016 and land for only 50 – 100 dwellings (approximate) being allocated between 2016 and 2021 in this area, however, guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework

(NPPF) advises that adopted housing policies should be considered out of date where the authority cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land, thereby rendering the housing policy out of date and unable to be given weight in respect to allocating housing numbers. The Council has currently demonstrated a 4.23 year supply of housing land. In view of 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. The site is considered to be within reasonable distance of a range of services including education, retail, employment, leisure and a bus service exists near to the local centre, which this scheme proposes to extend the route of for a 5 year period, thereby bringing it closer to the development. The site is considered to represent a sustainable location for residential development.

In view of all of the above it is considered that although contrary to the housing policies within the Core Strategy as these cannot be given material weight. 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 13/2184/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 before the 26<sup>th</sup> November 2013 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 and the Core Strategy Development Plan.***

### **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>23<sup>rd</sup> August 2013</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.*

#### **08. 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.*

#### **09. 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).

#### **10. 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.

#### **11. 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.

#### **12. 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.

#### **13. 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.

#### **14. 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).*

### **15. 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).*

### **16. 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).*

### **17. Vegetation Clearance**

*Notwithstanding details hereby approved, no development hereby approved shall commence on site until a scheme of timing and methods of working practices relevant to vegetation clearance and site clearance has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved scheme.*

*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) and the NPPF.*

### **18. 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

### **19. 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*

### **20. Lighting**

*The development hereby approved shall not be commenced until details of the lighting columns, light colour and luminance and details of any external lighting to properties has been have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.*

*Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to control details of the proposed development and ensure both a quality development can be achieved and there is no undue detriment to the operation of the nearby Railway Line.*

### **21. Species mitigation scheme**

*Notwithstanding details hereby approved, prior to the commencement of any part of the development including site clearance works, a detailed scheme of mitigation for species shall have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include but not be restricted to the methods of mitigation, locations of mitigation within the site and timing for the implementation of mitigation.*

*The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved scheme of species mitigation.*

*Reason: In order to adequately mitigate impacts on species within the site.*

### **22. Construction Management Plan**

*The construction phase of the development hereby approved shall be undertaken in accordance with a Construction Management Plan (CMP) which has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CMP shall detail HGV Routes and trip profiles, staff parking areas during construction and any mitigation measures required.*

*Reason: In order to limit the impacts of construction activities for surrounding residents and the use of the surrounding area in general.*

### **23. Stage 1 Safety Audit**

For each phase of development a Road Safety Audit in line with national guidance should be undertaken in order to inform the Highway Authority on the safe operation of the proposed development, and shall be submitted to and agreed by the Local Planning Authority with each reserved matters application. The agreed findings will be implemented as approved.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

## **INFORMATIVES**

### **Informative – Compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework**

The Local Planning Authority has implemented the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

### **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 Gas Apparatus**

Northern Gas Networks have advised that there may be gas apparatus in the area and that the developer contact them to discuss this. Contact details given are as follows;

Sandra Collett  
Network Records Assistant  
0845 6340508 (option 6)

### **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 – Landscaping**

The Landscaping reserved matters for the site should take into account suitable species and their proximity to Network Rail infrastructure and existing wayleaves, the need to provide visibility splays and the benefits of continuous connections for wildlife.

### **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. 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.

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

Pay a contribution of £10,000 for improving cycle parking in Yarm Centre payable upon first occupation of the site.

Pay a Bus Stop improvement scheme contribution of £18,000 or an alternative costed figure for works to the Lartington Way south east bus stop. Payable within 12 months from the date of 1<sup>st</sup> occupation of the site.

Bus service contribution to be paid of £101,000 to provide for a 5 year extension to the existing bus service.

Elton Interchange Works. If the applicant has not entered into a S278 Agreement with the Council for the provision of the works prior to the occupation of the 20<sup>th</sup> dwelling, the applicant will pay a contribution towards works at Elton Interchange. This figure is yet to be confirmed.

Enter into a S278 Agreement for the following works;

- Provide the cycle link between Lartington Way and Lingfield Drive
- 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***

Contributions to primary and secondary school places will be based on the councils formula subject to index linked inflation. The wording of the Heads of Terms for Education is yet to be finalised and will be reported to committee by way of an update report.

### ***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.

If the POS is not transferred to the Council, to manage and maintain the Public Open Space in accordance with the Public Open Space Maintenance Plan in perpetuity.

### ***Ecological Enhancement Scheme***

Agree in writing with the LPA an ecological enhancement scheme prior to commencement of development and comply with the requirements of the approved plan thereafter.

## **BACKGROUND**

1. 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).
2. Land at Allens West to the north of this site gained permission for 843 dwellings. Development has not yet commenced.
3. 12/0372/SCO Screening opinion request for proposed residential development of land known as Uray view, Uray Nook, Eaglescliffe. Decision – EIA not required. 28th March 2012

4. 12/2113/SCO Extended Screening opinion request for proposed residential development of land known as Uraly view, Uraly Nook, Eaglescliffe. EIA not required. 8<sup>th</sup> October 2012
5. 12/2047/OUT Outline application for residential development. Refused on the 7th June 2013 for the reasons below. The applicant undertook a public consultation exercise in May 2012 prior to the submission of this application.

*Reason 1: Transport*

*In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, as a result of the limited nature of public transport serving the site and the cumulative impact of the additional traffic generated by the development, the impact of the development has not been satisfactorily mitigated. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Stockton on Tees Core Strategy Development Plan Policy CS2 'Sustainable Transport and Travel' which seeks to ensure that all new development is well serviced by an attractive choice of transport modes including public transport*

*Reason 2: School Places*

*In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, there is a significant degree of uncertainty in ensuring the provision of adequate places within local schools to support the anticipated demands from the proposed development.*

*Reason 3: Wildlife : Great crested Newts*

*Taking into account known populations of Great Crested Newts in the surrounding area, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, insufficient detailed information has been provided based on limited survey work, to satisfactorily detail the proposed impact on wildlife and therefore enable the Local Planning Authority to gain a proper understanding of the scale of impacts to Great Crested Newts, including impacts in terms of quantity and quality of habitat.*

6. An appeal has been submitted by the applicant in respect to application 12/2047/OUT. This is to be dealt with through the Inquiry process, to be held in February 2014.

### **SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

7. 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. The site to the north includes agricultural / scrub land which the submission indicates has been used as pastured grassland for a considerable length of time although this had been ploughed during the consideration of the earlier application (12/2047/OUT). The northern part of the site includes a tree / hedge lined corridor within which lies a public footpath.
8. 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 adjacent to the eastern boundary. The southern part of the site has the appearance of an overgrown paddock.
9. An existing residential development lies to the east of the northern part of the site, on the opposing side of Uraly Nook Road. The site and surroundings are illustrated at appendix.
  1. Surrounding built development includes;
    - Police tactical training centre to the west, beyond agricultural fields,
    - Small industrial premises to the west
    - Railway line bordering the northern side of Uraly Nook Road (Darlington to Teesside stations)
    - 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.

10. The northern part of the site is bounded to the north, east and south by a roadside hedge which includes sporadic trees.
11. The site includes a number of service easements which are detailed on the constraints plan (appendix. 2).

### **PROPOSAL**

12. Outline planning permission is sought for a residential development. Matters of access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale are to be reserved matters which would require further approval. 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 ecological enhancement works being proposed on the southern part. The previous application sought to provide a drainage pond on the southern part of the site and this is no longer the case.
13. The indicative site layout shows a single highway access into the site taken from Uraly 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 documents including;

Design and Access Statement

Ecological Assessments

Archaeological Assessment & Report

Road Traffic Noise Assessment

Energy Statement

Air Quality Impact Assessment (re: Road Traffic Pollution)

Geo Environmental Desk Study and Geophysical Survey & Report

Framework Travel Plan

Topographical Survey (existing levels plan)

Indicative Proposed Site Plan

Landscape Masterplan

Arboricultural Method Statement & Impact Assessment

Existing Tree Plan, Tree Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan

Flood Risk Assessment

Planning Statement

Foul Water and Utilities Assessment

### **CONSULTATIONS**

Consultees were notified and comments received are summarised below:-

#### **Councillor A L Lewis**

As a planning committee member I will decline commenting on this application.

#### **Councillor Mrs M Rigg**

I recognise that some changes have been made to the previous, refused application.

However, I still have concerns about this proposal:

Bus stops do not necessarily indicate the presence of a useful bus service. Services to this part of the ward have been reduced recently and there is no evidence that the bus companies would increase them on the basis of an extra 140-160 houses eventually being built.

The walking times to the primary schools (Durham Lane and Junction Farm) are obviously for a reasonably fit adult. They do not take account of the walking speed of a small child. I do not consider that a pedestrian refuge is sufficient to provide a safe pedestrian crossing point on this road where despite the 30mph speed limit there is a perception that traffic

approaching from the North often travels at more than this speed. Local primary schools encourage the children to walk to school but this is unlikely to happen if parents are worried about the safety of crossing Urray Nook Rd.

It is frankly laughable to suggest that improving cycle parking in Yarm will encourage a significant number of people to use that mode of transport for that journey. The return trip involves a hill which will deter all but the very fit cyclist. Has any survey been done of the number of people using bicycles to access Yarm from other housing in the area?

In summary, whilst I welcome the reduction in the number of houses from the original application and the fact that the applicant is indicating useable open spaces for recreation I am concerned that this proposal, situated on the edge of the built up area of Eaglescliffe, is not going to provide a sustainable community. It will provide housing for people who will feel obliged to use their cars in order to access shops, schools and leisure facilities because the time taken to walk and the perceived difficulty of crossing an often busy road will deter them from more sustainable travel.

#### Egglecliffe and Eaglescliffe Council

The parish council remains opposed to the proposals and reiterates its objections to the previous application remaining concerned on the sustainability of the site. The revised application does not address concerns regarding school places, traffic or transport and Network Rails recent proposal for closure of the Urray Nook level crossing also needs to be considered.

#### Longnewton Parish Council

The developers have not made any changes to the transport or travel plans concerning the impact on Long Newton, and the previous statements made by the Parish Council have not been addressed, therefore, the Parish Council's comments are the same as for application no 12/2047/OUT as follows: -

The previous response to this application highlighted the Parish Council's concerns that the applicant took no account and paid little regard into the traffic impact possibility on Long Newton Lane as a conduit through Long Newton to the A66.

The travel plans submitted clearly propose a primary route to the A66 along Durham Lane to the Hartburn Interchange. It is acknowledged by several traffic studies that this route and interchange is subject to frustrating congestion at peak periods. Additional frustrating congestion is prevalent at Tesco roundabout junction of A67 and Durham Lane. It is further recognised by Travel Plan Modelling that residential traffic has greatest impact at peak periods.

It is not therefore hard to speculate that residents from this development would quickly identify Long Newton Lane as the preferred congestion free route to the A66.

Long Newton Lane is, and has been acknowledged by the applicant as, a minor weight restricted road. Greater use of this road would likely carry a high accident risk. This application is the first phase of a larger residential development. Coupling the overall residential development with plans for industrial redevelopment of the Elementis site will inevitably result in greater traffic use of Long Newton Lane

Consideration should be given to dissuade use of Long Newton Lane. Emphasis should be given on the route plan to use A67 West to the Airport and the Airport Link Road to the Long Newton Interchange. Such a route plan emphasis would mitigate congestion at Tesco and Hartburn.

It is the view of the Parish Council that the wider development aspirations for this area of Urray Nook will have a traffic impact on Long Newton Lane and the village. The applicant should be encouraged to address this.

It is the view that measures to improve Long Newton Lane by way of alignment and road drainage should be conditioned on each and any approval of this development zone.

### The Head of Technical Services

#### General Summary

The Head of Technical Services has reviewed the information submitted by the applicant. Following the initial submission of information, the Head of Technical Services requested additional clarification of the model outputs at the A67/Durham Lane/Tesco roundabout prior to finalising the highway report. Having considered all information, the Head of Technical Services concludes that there is no highway objection to the development, subject to the mitigation measures being agreed and implemented. There are no landscape and visual objections to the development, subject to the comments outlined in the relevant section of this report.

#### Highways Comments

##### Overview

This application is a re-submission of a previous application (12/2047/OUT). The previous application was for 160 residential dwellings whereas this application estimates that the site would deliver approximately 145 dwellings. The Transport Assessment (TA) has however been undertaken on the basis that the site could deliver up to 160 dwellings and assesses the impact based on this quantum of development.

##### Development Layout

The application is in outline only with all matters reserved however an indicative development layout has been provided. One vehicular access into the development is proposed. This would take the form of a priority T-junction on Uray Nook Road. The access location is located between the two existing access points to the residential development opposite (Grassholme Way). This section of Uray Nook Road is subject to a 30mph speed limit and therefore unobstructed visibility from the site access should be provided for 43m (minimum stopping sight distance) in either direction. The applicant was asked to provide a plan confirming the visibility can be achieved. A plan provided demonstrates that a 56m visibility splay can be achieved. This distance is the stopping sight distance given in *Manual for Streets (DfT, 2007)* for a vehicle travelling at 37mph / 60km/hr. No obstructions should be permitted within the visibility splay of the access to ensure vehicles can emerge from the site safely. If the application is recommended for approval a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit should be conditioned and approved to confirm the proposed access junction is acceptable prior to development commencing on the site. The applicant would need to enter into a Section 278 Agreement for the proposed access works onto the adopted highway.

The internal layout should be designed in accordance with *Manual for Streets (DfT, 2007)* 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 Agreement for the highway and footpaths which would become highway maintainable at the public expense.

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 of 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 would 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 Uraly 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, the nearest bus stop 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 with all layout matters subject to a Reserved Matters application. However, the applicant should be advised that car and cycle parking must be provided for each dwelling in accordance with *Supplementary Planning Document 3: Parking Provision for New Developments, 2011*. 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.

Any Reserved Matters application for the detailed elements of the site would also need to be supported by information on refuse collection and storage along with auto-tracking of large vehicles around the site. A Construction Management Plan would be required in order to ensure that no construction works would have a detrimental impact on the highway.

#### Trip Generation

Vehicle 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. The trip rates forecast that the site, with 160 dwellings, would generate 137 two-way vehicle trips in the AM peak hour and 129 two-way trips in the PM peak hour.

#### Traffic Survey Data

Additional traffic surveys have been carried out at the A67/Durham Lane/Tesco roundabout junction to inform the 2013 TA. These are in addition to the traffic surveys carried out for the previous application (12/2047/OUT) in January 2012. Traffic data used in a TA should generally have been collected within the last three years and therefore for the purpose of the assessment, the data collected in 2012 would still be considered to be valid. However, the applicant collected additional data to further verify the baseline highway conditions.

The 2013 surveys were conducted in July, prior to the school holidays, and the flows are slightly lower than those collected in January 2012. The total number of vehicles travelling through the A67/Durham Lane/Tesco roundabout junction in the morning peak in July 2013 was 1557 compared with 1606 in January 2012, a difference of 3%. The difference in the PM peak is 1%. There have been some concerns raised over the validity of the July 2013 surveys as they were undertaken by Stockton Council's own traffic data officers. Undertaking highway surveys is one of the Council's highway duties and data is often collected on parts of the highways network for which the Council has responsibility. Traffic data officers work entirely independent of the planning process. As noted above, the counts are relatively comparable with negligible difference in the peak periods (3% in AM / 1% in PM) between the January 2012 surveys and July 2013 surveys.



Concerns have also been raised about whether all roads were open at the time of the 2013 surveys. The survey team have confirmed that all roads were open during the period of the survey, acknowledging that part of the A67 within the Darlington borough boundary was closed the week before the 2013 surveys were carried out.

The busiest links at the A67/Durham Lane/Tesco roundabout are the north/south approaches to the junction – Durham Lane to the north and Urray Nook Road to the south. The 2013 AM peak hour flows on the north / south approaches to the junction show (with 2012 data in brackets):

552 (506) vehicles approach the junction from Durham Lane and 392 (409) exit onto Durham Lane;

537 (596) vehicles approach the junction from Urray Nook Road and 700 (645) vehicles exit onto Urray Nook Road in the morning peak.

During the morning peak hour (08:00 – 09:00) the period between 08:30 – 08:45 is the busiest. During the evening peak hour (17:00 – 18:00) the period between 17:15 – 17:30 is the busiest.

The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges provides guidance on the maximum hourly vehicle capacity that urban roads can generally carry. For roads such as Durham Lane and Urray Nook Road the hourly flow capacity in each direction is 1300 vehicles. The peak hour flows show that the network links are operating within this capacity.

The TA includes the survey data from the 2013 survey as Appendix F. However the queue length data was not submitted and the applicant was asked by Technical Services to clarify why the data was not presented in the TA submission. Before finalising the assessment of the development it was necessary to have all information available.

A Technical Note was subsequently submitted on 7 October 2013 outlining in more detail the traffic and queue length surveys collected in 2013. The queue length surveys are important as they validate whether the queues shown in the junction analysis outputs correlate to the queues experienced on the network. They also provide an indication of how well a junction is performing in the baseline conditions.

The data submitted in the Technical Note records the maximum queue that was recorded in each 5 minute period at the junction. The data is presented across three days. The highest queue lengths are recorded on the Durham Lane southbound approach to the junction during a morning peak with the maximum queue recorded in a 5 minute period of 10, 12 and 15 vehicles on the three respective days that the surveys were undertaken.

#### Junction Analysis - A67 / Durham Lane / Tesco Roundabout

The junction analysis presented in the TA shows queue lengths much lower than those observed during the 2013 surveys (the Junctions 8 software model outputs have a base queue of 0.85 PCU on the Durham Lane approach). The Technical Note states that the worst case queues cannot be compared with the results of the junction capacity assessments as the queues are assessed on a different basis. The junction analysis is based on queues across a one hour period whereas the queue length surveys present the highest queue recorded in each 5 minute interval. However, the traffic survey data indicates that the junction has a distinct 15 minute peak period from 08:30 onwards. It would therefore be beneficial for the junction analysis to alter the model parameters and assess the junction based on the 15 minute interval when the network is operating at its peak rather than present an aggregated hourly output. This would provide a more realistic assessment of how the junction is currently performing during peak network conditions.

Concerns have been raised that the queue lengths are not representative of regular conditions. Technical Services are aware that the roundabout does get busy at peak periods and therefore asked for these additional tests to be carried out to ascertain what impact this development would have.

Additional junction analysis was subsequently undertaken and a revised Technical Note submitted to Technical Services on 17 October 2013. This additional analysis focussed on the A67/Durham Lane/Tesco roundabout using observed traffic flows during the 15 minute peak rather than traffic flows averaged across an hour. The model outputs for the 2013 base show that the model is still not replicating highway conditions as the queues are lower on all arms than observed. The Technical Note confirms that the analysis cannot be expected to account for short term spikes in queuing that occur on the Durham Lane approach. The results do however show the proportionate impact the development traffic would have. On Durham Lane the Ratio of Flow to Capacity (RFC), based on 2013 counts, would increase from 0.700 between 08:30–08:45 to 0.720 with development (an RFC value of less than 1 is considered to be operating within capacity). Similarly, Urray Nook Road northbound would increase from 0.414 to 0.417. The increase as a result of additional development traffic is shown to be slight with minimal increase above baseline conditions.

Averaged across the hour, the results of the junction analysis in the TA (based on the 2012 counts) show an RFC on Durham Lane during the morning peak of 0.46. In the future year scenarios, the RFC at the Durham Lane arm of the Tesco roundabout increases to 0.84 with the average 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. It can therefore be seen that based on both the 2013 peak period test and the results of the future year assessment this proposed development does not appear to significantly worsen the situation at the junction with committed developments accounting for a greater proportion of future impact.

The applicant also undertook additional sensitivity tests as part of the 2012 assessment (based on the January 2012 counts). One of which considered the impact if all traffic from this development travelled through the junction in the AM peak. 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 (11/2842/EIS)). The results for this test indicate that the RFC on Durham Lane would increase to 0.86. The queue of PCU's would be 5.89. This is compared with a 2022 base forecast (without Urray 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.

An additional 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 the junction analysis show that the roundabout would operate within theoretical capacity in future years with both the development traffic and the traffic from other nearby developments. Assessments with and without development traffic illustrate that the traffic generated by this development has a negligible proportionate impact on the operation of the junction. Traffic data has been collected across two periods (January 2012 and July 2013) to inform the assessments. The traffic count data collected during both survey periods show the link flows are well within the guidelines for urban roads.

Whilst acknowledging that this junction does experience notable peaks, the peaks are short term and the evidence provided (both in terms of link flows and junction assessments) do not suggest that this development would have such a severe impact on this junction to warrant a highway objection.

#### Junction Analysis - Durham Lane / A66 Elton Interchange

The TA concludes that the Durham Lane/A66 Elton interchange would operate 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:

Northern dumbbell

Durham Lane – increase approach flare by 3m

Darlington Road – increase approach flare by 2m

Southern dumbbell

Increase approach flare by 3m

Junction Analysis - A67 / Urray Nook Road and Site Access junction

The A67/Urray Nook Road roundabout and site access junction are forecast to operate with spare capacity in future years.

Traffic on Minor Roads

As part of the 2013 data collection period, the applicant commissioned traffic surveys to explore if any rat-running occurs on the residential roads to the rear of the Tesco supermarket to avoid the A67/Tesco roundabout. The results show that there are very few vehicles using the routes to the rear of Tesco - the highest count is on Marion Avenue where approximately 20 two-way vehicle trips are recorded during the peak hours.

Micro-simulation Model

In addition to the junction assessments within the TA, Technical Services commissioned the development of a micro-simulation model to assess the traffic impacts of this development and others locally. Developing a transport model helps to provide a greater understanding into the impact of this development, and others, on the wider network and the effectiveness of proposed mitigation measures. 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 in journey time due to the addition of traffic from this development.

Yarm High Street – Impact on Parking Demand

The TA does not identify the impact of the development on Yarm High Street. The applicant was advised that any increase in traffic would be considered material and would require mitigation. 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, a ratio of parking demand based on housing units 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.

Traffic Impact Summary

The impact of this development on the local highway network has been assessed using different scenarios and different assessment tools. Following additional data collection in 2013, the applicant was asked to provide supplementary analysis of the A67/Durham Lane/Tesco roundabout to confirm whether the previous conclusion, that no mitigation over and above the

committed improvements is required at the junction to accommodate this development, was still appropriate. The results of the assessment show there is no justification to object to the development on highway grounds. The link flows are within capacity, junction improvements are proposed where necessary and the impact on journey times as a result of development traffic is expected to be negligible.

#### Potential Closure of Level Crossing

Technical Services are aware that Network Rail is consulting on the closure of the Urray Nook level crossing which would restrict access on Urray Nook Road to the north of the site. If Network Rail do decide to close the crossing, they have been informed that they would need to undertake a full transport assessment to review the impact of the closure and this should cover the implications with respect to any extant and considered planning applications in the area. They have also been advised that the highway authority would seek mitigation to accommodate the closure if required.

With regards to this application, the development is forecast to generate a total of 18 trips to/from north of the site access (via the existing crossing) in the AM peak and 17 trips to/from the north in the PM peak. The survey data shows that during the morning peak there are 134 vehicles approaching the A67 / Urray Nook Road roundabout in a southbound direction and 55 vehicles travelling northbound on Urray Nook Road. The surveys undertaken at Grassholme Way (both north and south) show very few vehicles travel north onto Urray Nook Road, with the vast majority exiting south towards the Urray Nook Road / A67 roundabout.

Redistributing the amount of traffic that currently travels north on Urray Nook Road, via the level crossing, should not have a significant impact on the local highway network. The traffic surveys indicate that existing flows are low and therefore should the closure go ahead, it is unlikely to alter the assessment of the development. Furthermore, the TA includes a sensitivity test at the Tesco roundabout assuming all development traffic travels through the junction in the AM peak and the sensitivity test showed that the roundabout, with the mitigation proposed, has sufficient capacity to accommodate all the development traffic. If Network Rail do decide to close the crossing they will need to assess the impact on the local highway network at that time, taking into account the committed and proposed developments, and put forward mitigation to make the closure acceptable to the highway authority.

#### Travel Plan and Sustainable Transport

The submitted Travel Plan Framework is considered inadequate. For a development of this size, the framework should commit to the production of a Travel Plan, with mode shift targets and associated measures, to reduce the long-term impact of the development on the highway network and improve the sustainability of the site. Given the measures the applicant proposes, including the subsidy of a bus service and the funding of cycle parking, there are no initiatives set in place to encourage the use of these modes. The current Travel Plan only proposes to deliver a welcome pack to all new residents. Whilst a welcome park may form one of the measures of the Travel Plan, it cannot alone fulfil the wider requirements of a Travel Plan. The production of an adequate Travel Plan, to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority, is a requirement for a development of this size and should be secured by condition.

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. The Framework Travel Plan which has been submitted as part of this application indicates that no Travel Plan Coordinator is to be appointed to promote, monitor and review the Travel Plan for this development – this is not acceptable. 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.

The full Travel Plan must include;

Contact details for the Travel Plan Coordinator (TPC);  
Timescales for the TPC to be in place (minimum of 5 years). For a residential development this post should be in place as part of the marketing stage of the development to promote the aims and objectives of the Travel Plan to prospective new occupants;  
Modal split targets and measures to achieve these targets, which must be SMART: Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Timebound;  
Details of when the Travel Plan is to be monitored and reviewed including timescales for when travel surveys are to be carried out. The site survey should be carried out after an appropriate number of properties have been occupied to ensure an adequate sample size; and  
Details of an exit strategy of how the Travel Plan will be continued once the TPC has left the site (e.g. a community travel plan forum/group established).

Within the welcome pack there should be incentives including cycle vouchers and bus travel vouchers. The Heads of Terms of the Section 106 Agreement should request £100 per dwelling be made available as a Travel Plan incentive payment. This should include the provision of discounted bus passes to encourage residents to use the subsidised bus service 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.

The Framework Travel Plan suggests that the volume of cycle trips would be low – an ideal target for the Travel Plan would therefore be to address this, especially given that there are several employment opportunities within the desirable 5km cycling 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 applicant is proposing to fund the provision of cycle parking in a convenient location for those accessing Yarm High Street. Whilst the number of trips by bicycle are anticipated to be low at the outset, and the provision of cycle parking would not therefore mitigate any impact on the highway network at the start of the development, the provision of good quality, secure cycle parking within Yarm should assist in encouraging residents to travel to Yarm, and other areas, by bicycle. The provision of cycle parking would therefore be a welcome initiative as Yarm is within cycling distance of the site and it may reduce the number of car journeys to Yarm High Street in the longer term. The contribution should be secured as part of the Section 106 Agreement.

To further 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 has been proposed 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 a Section 278 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.

The Framework Travel Plan highlights several local amenities which are within the reasonable walking distance of 2km. 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 Section 278 Agreement with the Highway Authority. These improvements should link to the proposed cycleway.

The TA forecasts that very few trips would be made by bus with just 3 trips in the morning and evening peak period. This could be attributed to the existing low level of public transport provision serving the area which has recently been reduced further with the bus stops on Urlay Nook Road and the Lartington Way stop withdrawn from use (from February 2013). The

applicant is therefore proposing to fund an extension of the Arriva North East X6 service which provides connections to Middlesbrough, Yarm and Stockton.

The X6 service would be extended to the Lartington Way stop on Urray Nook Road which is located around 300m from the site entrance and immediately to the east of the A67 / Urray Nook Road roundabout. By using this stop buses from the Yarm and Eaglescliffe direction could u-turn at the roundabout. The maximum walk length to this stop from properties within the development would be no more than approx 550 metres which is an acceptable walking distance. The proposals would extend the service for a period of five years. The subsidy would provide an hourly service on all days, including Sunday. Any necessary improvements to the bus stop would also need to be funded by the development. The provision of a bus service is welcomed as it would support the longer-term principles of the Travel Plan to promote sustainable travel and provide an alternative mode of transport to car. The commitment should be secured as part of the Section 106 contribution alongside an agreed start date for the extended service. The applicant must provide confirmation in writing from Arriva that they have agreed to extend the service and that the level of funding to be secured as part of the Section 106 Agreement is sufficient to cover the cost of the service over a 5 year period.

#### Mitigation

The following is a summary of transport mitigation that is required to accommodate the development:

#### A66 / Elton Interchange Improvements

Improvements are proposed at the A66 / Elton Interchange which build upon committed improvements as part of the Allen's West development (11/2842/EIS). 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 Section 278 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 before the committed improvements for the Allen's West development have been 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 Section 278 Agreement for the coordinated highways works required at the junction, the applicant should provide a Section 106 contribution 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 Section 278 Agreement with the Highway Authority for the coordinated improvements at the interchange.

#### Yarm High Street – Off Street Car Parking

In line with other local developments, the applicant is required to mitigate their impact by contributing towards improving car parking facilities in Yarm. Based on the anticipated increase in demand associated with this development, the applicant must provide 7 off-street car parking 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 Support

In accordance with other developments locally, the Heads of Terms of the Section 106 agreement should request £100 per dwelling be made available as a Travel Plan incentive payment. The Travel Plan welcome pack should provide such incentives for residents to a

minimum of £100 per dwelling. The Travel Plan Coordinator should devise a list of priorities for the remaining funding should all dwellings not take up this incentive.

#### Bus Service Provision and Bus Stop Improvements

The applicant has agreed with Arriva North East to extend the X6 bus service to the Lartington Way bus stop to provide an hourly service on all days of the week (including Sunday). A contribution towards providing the cost of this service should be secured as part of the Section 106 Agreement. The contribution should fund the extension to the bus service for five years from an agreed trigger point (suggest from occupation of the 75<sup>th</sup> dwelling). Any necessary improvements to the Lartington Way stop (to be agreed if planning permission is granted) should be funded by the development.

#### Pedestrian Facilities

An additional crossing point (dropped kerbs and tactile paving) must be installed at a suitable location on Uray Nook Road to facilitate pedestrian connections between the site and the areas to the east. These improvements on the existing highway would be subject to a Section 278 Agreement and could be carried out in association with works to provide the access into the site.

The Public Right of Way through the site should be upgraded. If these works are carried out by the developer the works should be implemented to the required Council specifications and should be approved by the Council's Right of Way officer.

#### Cycle Facilities

The development should fund improvements to the existing cycle network between Lartington Way and Lingfield Drive. These works would be subject to a Section 278 Agreement. All costs of the Highway Works to be paid by the applicant (estimated to be £50,000).

A Section 106 contribution towards the provision of cycle parking in Yarm would be of benefit to the local facilities and would promote sustainable travel to Yarm.

#### 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 Section 106 contributions, Section 278 agreements for works to the highway and a Travel Plan.

#### Landscape & Visual Comments

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

#### Site Character

Previous comments made in respect of the layout indicated on plan SI-102 rev F continue to apply to this development.

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 Uray 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 within 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 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 Section 106 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 (Urray 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.

#### Environmental Policy

There are no objections subject to the provision of a clear statement of how Core Strategy Policy 3 (CS3 – Sustainable Living and Climate Change) is to be met including details of any proposed renewable energy supply. 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 August 2013, has been prepared by Fairhurst. The FRA concludes the following:

The development site is wholly within flood zone 1, low probability, and the development 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 124 (IH124);

The equivalent greenfield run-off rates range from 8.3 l/s for 1 in 1 year storm, to 20.4l/s for the 1 in 100 year storm. These discharge rates have been based on the anticipated impermeable area of 2.68ha within the development site;

The site is underlain by low permeability soils, and as such infiltration drainage techniques will not be appropriate;

Surface water will be discharged from the site into the public surface water sewer (attenuated to appropriate rates) and will be discharged to Nelly Burdon's Beck, south of the site; and

The FRA states that attenuation within the main development site could be provided through a combination of green roofs, permeable pavements, geo-cellular tank, ponds, swales or oversized pipes.

Nelly Burdon's Beck is an ordinary watercourse which has significant flooding issues downstream of the proposed development site, including internal property flooding, therefore should this option be pursued the discharge rate to Nelly Burdon's Beck must be restricted to help mitigate against this property flooding. Nelly Burdon's Beck is an ordinary watercourse and therefore the consent to discharge into the watercourse would be required from the Local Authority. If the option to discharge to Nelly Burdon's Beck via Northumbrian Waters system is pursued then the discharge rate from the outfall must be agreed with the Local Authority and Northumbrian Water.

The development must not increase the risk of surface water runoff from the site or cause any increased flood risk to neighbouring sites. Any increase in surface water generated by the development or existing surface water / groundwater issues on the site must be alleviated by the installation of a suitable drainage system within the site. The Council supports the use of sustainable drainage systems and welcomes the pending legislation.

The developer proposes to discharge surface water to the Northumbrian Water surface water sewer south east of the site at the junction of Urlay Nook Road and Lartington Way with attenuation of surface water provided entirely within the proposed housing development. A detailed design of the proposed surface water system must be submitted to the Local Authority for consideration.

A number of concerns have been raised regarding this application and the issue of water-logging and flooding at and around the development site. 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.

The Head of Technical Services has recommended Informatives in respect to the following matters;

Title Transfer

Damage to Highway Verge

Construction of Highways for New Developments

The works require alterations and extensions to the existing adopted highway.

Retained Trees Prohibited Works

Retained Hedges Prohibited Works

Minor Works e.g. signage near trees

Minor Works e.g. poles near trees

Fencing Works

Street Naming and Postal Numbering

Information Associated with 10% Renewables Condition

#### Children, Education and Social Care

The following puts into context the current and future position on available school places in Eaglescliffe and Yarm in terms of both the primary and secondary school sectors (the latter includes details on Ingleby Barwick).

#### **Current pupil numbers – Primary**

The ten primary schools across Eaglescliffe & Yarm form one planning area that the Council uses for school place planning decisions. Tables 1 and 2 indicate that in all schools there were spaces available as shown. Since 2011 some schools agreed to increase their Published Admission Number (PAN) for the reception school year to meet increased pupil numbers. Furthermore those schools received capital monies to do so with an investment of over £2m at Junction Farm to increase its PAN to 60 from Sept 2014. This will increase the number of Reception places each year to 331 and add a further 210 school places in this planning area. The overall capacity of school places in this area across all schools is 2,317.

Table 1 details the current numbers of pupils on roll in the Eaglescliffe area based on the Autumn 2012 school census.

Table 1

School Name	Net Capacity	Total pupils on roll	Spaces	% of surplus	PAN
Durham Lane	210	201	9	4.3	30
Egglecliffe CE	210	192	18	8.5	30
*Junction Farm	210	207	3	1.4	30
**Preston	168	165	3	1.8	29

St Mary's CE	105	86	19	18.1	15
The Links	206	195	11	5.3	30
Total	1109	1046	63	5.7	164

Current build work going on to increase capacity to 420 from 210 and a higher PAN to 60.  
 \*\*increased their PAN to 29 from 24 for September 2012 which has increased their capacity by 5 in each year group which will see its Net Capacity rise to 203 from 168 – further increasing available places.

Analysis of the school census (Autumn 2012) of Durham Lane, Egglecliffe CE and Junction Farm indicated that of the 600 pupils on roll, 494 (82.3%) lived in Egglecliffe. This equates to only 78% of the total places taken from the 630 spaces available.

Table 2 details the current numbers of pupils on roll in the Yarm area based on the Autumn 2012 school census.

Table 2

School Name	Net Capacity	Total pupils on roll	Spaces	% of surplus	PAN
Kirklevington	147	98	49	33.3	20
Layfield	168	123	45	26.8	27
Levendale	210	206	4	1.9	30
Yarm	394	374	20	5.0	60
Total	919	801	118	12.8	137

**The predicted number of pupils - Primary**

Table 3 below details the projected pupil position of the 10 primary schools in the Egglecliffe & Yarm Primary Planning area taking into consideration the approved planning developments and other strategic sites held within the Councils Regeneration and Environment Local Development Document (LDD).

Table 3

*PAN	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2015/16	2016/17	2018/19	2019/20
301	255	280	282	285	291	296	299

\*the PAN will increase to 331 with the expansion at Junction Farm Primary

The latest pupil projection data used in the above indicates that currently there are 15% surplus places in Reception. From September 2014 available Reception places will increase to 331 and with the rise in pupil numbers in this area expected, surplus places will still be around 15%. There after we will start to see surplus places gradually reduce to around 6.3% by 2023/24 This surplus position satisfies the Council's school place planning key aims within the 'Strategy for Stockton' to:

Provide sufficient school places across the Borough and have between 5-10% surplus places to:

Provide every primary pupil a place within 2 miles

Provide every secondary pupil a school place within 3 miles

Ensure that schools are maintained in a good condition, with maintenance work undertaken.

Identify opportunities to improve the school stock.

### **Proposed development contribution**

The initial application by Taylor Wimpey proposed a development of up to 159 homes on the Urlay Nook site, however the latest revised proposal is now for up to **145** homes which would equate to **38 extra pupils** (rounded up). This has been determined using the Council's SPD6 calculation of 145 x 0.26 (pupil yield ratio).

The Council would require a revised education contribution of **£301,600** based on the development (**37.7 places x £8,000** – based on 2006 building prices although this figure is subject to index linking in accordance with the Tender Index published by the Building Cost Information Service). The final stage would entitle the developer to a discount of £8,000 per vacant place in the neighbouring school. The Council would subtract a discount at the time of the last annual School Census at an agreed point of the development.

We would seek to allocate 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 Durham Lane school site whilst considering other opportunities to increase places at another school as demand increases.

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.

In view of these matters, although there is considered to be adequate school places within all primary schools within the admissions zone and planning area for the site as the tables suggest. However it is anticipated therefore that there would still be a requirement for the development to contribute to the provision of education places within those primary schools that are in the immediate area although this is dependent on the date for commencement of development and other circumstances. As such, it is considered necessary for the applicant to agree to meet the Council's formula in respect to the provision of primary school places.

### **Current pupil numbers – Secondary**

The following table below details the position of the three secondary schools in Ingleby Barwick' and Eaglescliffe & Yarm' planning areas to reflect pupil numbers in those schools. The table indicates that there were few spaces available. School place numbers includes the decision by All Saints to increase their PAN of 120 to 140 for the Year 7 intake in 2011 to meet increased pupil numbers therefore offering 599 Year 7 places.

Table 4

School Name	Net Capacity	Total pupils on roll	Spaces	% of surplus	PAN
All Saints CE Academy	700	671	29	4.1	140
*Conyers	1,369	1,058	62	5.5	224
*Egglecliffe	1,434	1,168	7	0.6	235

Total	3,503	2,897	98	4.3	599

includes capacity for 250 Sixth Form places at Conyers and 260 at Egglecliffe

Analysis of the school census (Autumn 2012) of the two schools in Egglecliffe & Yarm indicated that of the 2,228 pupils on roll, 567 (25.4%) lived in Egglecliffe. This equates to only 24.7% of the total places taken from the 2,295 spaces available.

Ingleby Barwick pupils account for a further 829 (37%) of the spaces filled and Yarm only accounted for 379 (17%) of the places filled. Other children from across the borough account for the rest.

### **The predicted number of pupils - Secondary**

Table 5 details the projected pupil position of the three schools in the Egglecliffe & Yarm and Ingleby Barwick planning areas taking into consideration the approved planning developments and other strategic sites held within the Councils LDD.

Table 5

Planning area	P A N	2013 /14	2014 /15	2015 /16	2015 /16	2016 /17	2018 /19	2019 /20
Ingleby Barwick	140	140	165	165	140	144	135	132
Egglecliffe & Yarm	459	457	501	486	494	509	534	560
Total	599	597	666	651	634	653	669	692

The latest pupil projection data used in above indicates that currently there are very few surplus places in Year 7 less than 1%. From September 2014 demand for Year 7 places may increase even further and exceed current available school places in the immediate schools. However the total number of current surplus places across all schools in the borough is around 12.5% (280 pupil places) with the majority of places available namely in Thornaby and North & Central Stockton planning areas.

Furthermore the proposed Free School in Ingleby Barwick already approved by the Dept of Education and at the Pre-opening phase would increase pupil places by 120 from September 2014 to 719 across these two planning areas.

The Free School plans to open in a temporary location on Teesside Industrial Estate in the south of the borough and to admit up to 120 Year 7 pupils only. Subject to final DfE approval and a signed Funding Agreement with the Education Funding Agency in place the Free School will move from its temporary site location to a new purpose built 11-18 school in 2015.

It is expected that the school will only recruit another Year 7 cohort of up to 120 pupils plus some sixth form places and plans to recruit up to 120 Y7 pupils each year thereafter until it has five year groups. Potentially this could 'free up' secondary places for Egglecliffe residents in the future, if current Egglecliffe School in zone applications from parts of Ingleby choose the Free School.

### **Proposed development contribution**

If the Free School is delayed or does not get built, then the LA may need to look at securing school places by considering other available options including potential expansion of other existing schools.

The initial application by Taylor Wimpey proposed a development of up to 159 homes on the Urlay Nook site; however the latest revised proposal is now for up to **145** homes which would equate to **29 extra pupils**. This has been determined using the Council's SPD6 calculation of 145 x 0.20 (pupil yield ratio).

The Council would therefore require an education contribution of **£375,840** based on the development (**29 places x £12,960** – based on 2006 building prices although this figure is subject to index linking in accordance with the Tender Index published by the Building Cost Information Service). The final stage would entitle the developer to a discount of £12,960 per vacant place in the neighbouring Egglecliffe Secondary School. The Council would subtract a discount at the time of the last annual School Census at an agreed point of the development.

We would seek to allocate 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 Egglecliffe School site whilst considering other opportunities to increase places at another school as demand increases.

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.

In view of these matters, it is anticipated that there would be a requirement for the development to contribute to the provision of education places within secondary schools within the immediate area although this is dependent on the date for commencement of development and other circumstances. As such, it is considered necessary for the applicant to agree to meet the Council's formula in respect to the provision of secondary school places.

### Private Sector Housing

No comments, suggest Housing Strategy are consulted.

### 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.*

Based on the residential market site scheme of 145 units, 20% affordable housing would equate to up to 29 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. 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.

A worked example based on the SHMA 2012 and on a requirement for 29 affordable units: -

Tenure: Using the ratio of 70/30, it is proposed the split should be:

Proportion	No. of units	Tenure
70%	20 units	Rent
30%	9 units	Intermediate Tenure
100%	29 units	Total

Bed Size: Using borough wide figures from the SHMA 2012

Size	Proportion	No. of units
2 bed	91%	26 units
3 bed	9%	3 units
Total	100%	29 units

Tenure for the above would then be split as follows:

No. of units	Size	Tenure
26 Units	2 bed	18 x Rented 8 x Intermediate Tenure
3 units	3 bed	2 x Rented 1 x Intermediate Tenure

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

We note from the Supporting Planning Statement submitted with application 13/23184/OUT the developer is proposing a 75%:25% 2 bed:3 bed split.

Taking into account the proposed property mix (specifically bedroom sizes) for the full site, Housing Services would on this occasion accept this split as a minimum, however due to issues arising from welfare reform the Housing Services requirement for the tenure split remains at 70% rented:30% intermediate and would be as follows: -

Size	Proportion	No. of units
2 bed	75%	22 units – (20 x rented) (2 x intermediate)
3 bed	25%	7 units - (7 x intermediate)
Total	100%	29 units

The applicant is advised that all affordable housing units should comply with the Homes and Communities Agency design and quality standards.

#### Contaminated Land Officer

I have reviewed the latest Ground Investigation dated 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2013 (Submitted by Fairhursts) and I am satisfied that the report addresses near surface sampling required around the Elementis effluent/surface water discharge culvert, the report shows no evidence of



hexavalent chromium and associated heavy metal contamination, I therefore have no objection in principle to the development, however I would recommend a condition be imposed in respect to unexpected land contamination. s as detailed below, be imposed on the development should it be approved.

#### Environmental Health Unit

I have no objection in principle to the development, however, I do have some concerns and would recommend conditions be imposed in respect to;

Construction Noise

Unexpected land contamination

Site Waste management Plans

#### Tees Archaeology

I recommend that a conditioned scheme of archaeological works for the western third of the southern field would be appropriate. A domestic settlement or farmstead of the Iron Age or Romano-British period (likely date 200BC ' 200AD) survives in this part of the site. These remains are considered to be of local to regional importance and should not preclude development at the site (NPPF para. 135). However an excavated and written record would be an appropriate mitigation response to the loss of these deposits (NPPF para.141). This recording can be achieved by means of a planning condition. I recommend the multi-part condition set out below:-

Recording of a heritage asset through a programme of archaeological works

No development shall take place until a programme of archaeological work including a Written Scheme of Investigation has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The scheme shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and:

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

Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.

No development shall take place other than in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (a).

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 Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (b) and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured.

This condition is based on a model recommended to the Planning Inspectorate by the Association of Local Government Archaeology Officers (2010).

I would be happy to provide a brief to the developer for the excavation or agree a WSI on behalf of the Local Authority.

#### Northern Gas Networks

Have indicated they have no objections apparatus may be at risk during the construction phase of the development and the developer should make early contact with them to discuss matters.

#### Spatial Plans Manager

As you will be aware section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that an application for planning permission be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless the material considerations indicate otherwise.

This response focuses on the key spatial, housing and economic planning policy issues which relate to the application and the draft allocation of the site in the emerging Regeneration and Environment LDD.

The Development Plan - overview

The development plan currently comprises the following elements:

Stockton-on-Tees Core Strategy LDD (March 2010),  
Saved policies of the Stockton-on-Tees Local Plan (1997)  
Saved policies of the Local Plan Alteration Number One (2006), and  
The Tees Valley Joint Minerals and Waste LDD (September 2011).

The application site is within the defined limits to development and does not have any protective designation such as Green Wedge, although it is a greenfield site.

You will also be aware that the Council consulted on the Regeneration and Environment LDD preferred options document in the summer of 2012. This included a policy (draft Policy H1b) which identifies the application site as part of a draft housing allocation. However, due to the number of objections to the policies and the statement in paragraph 216 of the NPPF, only limited weight can be attached to these policies.

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.

#### The supply of deliverable housing land

The five year housing supply assessment for Stockton-on-Tees is updated annually using a base date of 31 March. The Council has produced a report entitled 'Five Year Deliverable Housing Supply Final Assessment: 2013 – 2018'. The Report concludes that the Borough has a supply of deliverable housing land of 3.96 years.

The five year supply assessment is also being updated every 3 months on a trial basis. The latest quarterly update of the five year supply of deliverable housing sites covers the period 1<sup>st</sup> October 2013 to 30<sup>th</sup> September 2018 and uses a base date of 30<sup>th</sup> September 2013. This is being reported to the 13<sup>th</sup> November 2013 Planning Committee as the Five Year Supply of Deliverable Housing Sites: 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarterly Update report. The Report shows that the Borough has a 4.23 year supply of deliverable housing sites using a 20% buffer which is a shortfall of 559 dwellings. This means that the Borough is not able to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites. The reason for the application of a 20% buffer is explained in the report.

Point 3 of Core Strategy Development Plan Policy CS7 indicates that no additional housing sites would be allocated before 2016. Point 4 of the policy states that land for only 50 – 100 dwellings (approximate) will be allocated between 2016 and 2021 in this area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to points 3 and 4 of this policy. 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, when considered against paragraph 49 of the NPPF. With regard to housing supply, 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.

The 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet point of the decision-taking section of paragraph 14 of the NPPF has been engaged because the Council is not able to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites. The absence of a demonstrable five year supply of deliverable housing sites needs to be placed in context in relation to this application. Points 3 and 4 of Core Strategy Policy 7 which deals with housing distribution and phasing are not considered "up-to-date" (NPPF paragraph 49) in this context. However, given the highly restrictive nature of points 3 and 4 of this policy, they are contrary to the NPPF requirement to boost the supply of housing and would be considered out-of-date even if a five year supply were demonstrable. The application is not contrary to other policies in the adopted development plan. This means that if the Council were able to demonstrate a five year supply then the 1<sup>st</sup> bullet point of the decision-taking section of NPPF paragraph 14 would be engaged. This states that development proposals that accord with the development plan should be approved without delay.

When assessing paragraph 14 of the NPPF, weight should also be given to saved development plan policies, which do not deal with housing supply, according to the degree of consistency with the NPPF, in accordance with paragraph 215 of the document. Other policies

in the development plan that are relevant to the application and remain up-to-date, are referenced where relevant in these comments.

#### Relationship to the NPPF and the adopted Development Plan

##### Development on unallocated sites

The site is within the Limits to Development and generally in accordance with Saved Local Plan Policy HO3.

##### Sustainable transport and travel

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

##### 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'. It is understood that the proposal generally achieves this although details of reserved matters remain to be considered through a further application.

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. The Section 106 (S.106) agreement is currently unsigned. However, the applicant wishes to proceed and sign the S.106. This remains a material consideration in relation to this application.

##### Affordable housing

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'. 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%.'

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, not ceilings.

It is understood that the applicant will provide affordable housing at a rate of 20%. This will make a contribution towards achieving the affordable housing targets set by policy CS8 and is a significant material consideration in support of the application.

##### 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 approximately 0.7 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 Greenspace 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 greenspace.

The application includes 0.7Ha of open space within the red boundary as a single piece of land. This is in general conformity with the Open Space, Recreation and Landscaping SPD.

#### Environmental Protection and Enhancement

The proposal will need to be assessed in relation to Core Strategy Policy 10 (CS10) - Environmental Protection and Enhancement. It is understood that the Tees Valley Wildlife Trust are satisfied that the proposal accords with the biodiversity aspects of the policy.

#### 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.

#### Relationship to the emerging Development Plan

##### The Regeneration and Environment Preferred Options

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.

#### Prematurity

The draft policies include the application site as part of a draft housing allocation. This application potentially creates the possibility that the proposal could be premature, especially as a core principle in the NPPF 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.

#### Summarising comments

The starting point for consideration of the application is the adopted development plan. However, the Council accepts that it is not able to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites. Paragraph 47 of the NPPF stresses the importance the Government attaches to boosting significantly the supply of housing and paragraph 49 of the NPPF sets out that where a five year supply cannot be demonstrated, relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up to date.

The 2nd bullet point of the decision-taking section paragraph 14 of the NPPF makes clear that where the development plan is absent, silent or out-of-date, planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies of the NPPF taken as a whole.

The benefits of the application within a housing context are that it would boost significantly the supply of housing; the provision of affordable housing would contribute to reducing the annual net shortfall of affordable housing identified in the TVSHMA and that it would, if implementation begins within a five year time frame, make a significant contribution towards the five year supply of housing.

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, Policy CS8 - Housing Mix and Affordable Housing Provision and Policy CS10 - Environmental Protection and Enhancement. No conflict with any of these policies has been identified by the Spatial Planning team.

To summarise, the 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet point of the decision-taking section of paragraph 14 of the NPPF is engaged by this proposal because the Council is not able to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites. The Spatial Planning team have not identified any adverse impacts that outweigh the benefits associated with the proposal.

#### Northumbrian Water

The drainage strategy proposes surface water being restricted to 20 litres per second before connection to public sewer. Northumbrian Water have not yet decided whether surface water capacity is available or not.

The trunk water main remains to be precisely located.

Please continue with conditions as before.

#### The Environment Agency

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.

#### Condition

The development permitted by this planning permission shall not begin until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the 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 include:

A definitive surface water drainage strategy as outlined in section 2 of the re-submitted Flood Risk Assessment (D/I/D/91483/03) using the allowable discharge rate of 20.4 l/s for the 1 in 100 year event.

Reason

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

To prevent flooding elsewhere by ensuring that compensatory storage of flood water is provided.

We also have the following advice to offer:

**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 Econorth October 2011.

**Sustainable Drainage Systems - Advice to LPA/applicant**

Support for the use of SUDS approach to ensuring development does not increase flood risk elsewhere is set out in paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Further information on SUDS can be found in:

the CIRIA C697 document SUDS manual;

HR Wallingford SR 666 Use of SUDS in high density developments; and

CIRIA C635 Designing for exceedance in urban drainage - good practice;

the Interim Code of Practice for Sustainable Drainage Systems. The Interim Code of Practice provides advice on design, adoption and maintenance issues and a full overview of other technical guidance on SUDS. The Interim Code of Practice is available on our website at: [www.environment-agency.gov.uk](http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk) and CIRIA's website at [www.ciria.org.uk](http://www.ciria.org.uk)

**Disposal of Foul Sewage - Advice to LPA/applicant**

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.

Natural England

Indicate that their advice to the previous application applies to this current application, re-iterating that no objection was made. Natural England's previous comments are summarised below;

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.

#### National Grid

An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid Electricity Transmission plc's and National Grid Gas plc's apparatus. National Grid has identified that it has no record of apparatus in the immediate vicinity of your enquiry. National Grid therefore has no objection to these proposed activities.

#### Tees Valley Wildlife Trust

We have reviewed the Ecological Assessments Summary dated 22nd July 2013. It is our view that this document gives a complete picture of the ecology of the application site. The Trust has no objection to the application.

We note the reference to the National Planning Policy Framework given on page 13 "that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... providing net gains in biodiversity where possible." On this basis we feel that the scheme proposed by the developers for Eliffs Mill Local Wildlife Site on page 26 should be confirmed through a planning condition, if approval is granted.

Table 3.5 recommends that any vegetation removal on site is carried out between April and September in order to protect amphibians. However, this may adversely affect breeding birds and could potentially result in a breach of the Wildlife and Countryside Act. The planning authority might seek further advice from the applicant on how these interests will be reconciled.

#### Stockton Police Station

If this 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. Please visit [www.securedbydesign.com](http://www.securedbydesign.com) Secured by Design SBD New Homes for more information.

#### Campaign for the Protection of Rural England

CPRE find no significant difference between this new application and the previous application 12/2047/OUT that would change our stance in our original objection statement of 16th October 2012.

We wish to object to the above proposal 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

Loss of green space: The continued loss of agricultural land and greenspace 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 greenspace at the beck and call of developers is certainly in contravention of this definition.

Once it's gone, it's 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 the recent revocation of the Regional Spatial Strategy for the North East on 15th April 2013 and the publishing of the latest Government housing projection forecasts 2011-2021 on 9th April 2013, there is now a considerable difference between the original SBC projected figures in the LDF Preferred Options report based on the RSS forecasts and those projected forecasts in the above mentioned latest Government figures for Stockton-on-Tees UA. This radical change in projected forecasts should be taken into account before sacrificing any further green field land in the Borough.

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. Northumbria Water in their report stated that the 159 houses would create an increase in traffic flow by 69.7% on the Urray 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 Ellifs 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 Ellifs 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 -  
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 Ellifs 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.

#### The Ramblers Association

Our remarks are essentially the same as for the previous application for this site. The consent should be conditioned that the integrity of the existing ROW should be preserved and that there is no interference with the ROW during construction. The plans for the new development should include suitable access for the residents to the existing ROW.

#### Highways Agency

No objections.

#### Sport England

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

#### Durham Tees Valley Airport

Durham Tees Valley has no objection to the above proposal. It is worth pointing out that aircraft will be regularly over flying the development at a height of approximately one thousand feet

#### Network Rail

With reference to the protection of the railway, Network Rail has no objection in principle to the development, but below are some requirements which must be met

Given the size and proximity of the development in relation to the railway it is considered appropriate that a contribution is sought from the developer towards improvements for

sustainable transport at Allens West Station. A contribution towards cycle stands would be considered appropriate.

#### Drainage

All surface and foul water arising from the proposed works must be collected and diverted away from Network Rail property. In the absence of detailed plans all soak-aways must be located so as to discharge away from the railway infrastructure. The following points need to be addressed:

There should be no increase to average or peak flows of surface water run-off leading towards Network Rail assets, including earthworks, bridges and culverts.

All surface water run-off and sewage effluent should be handled in accordance with Local Council and Water Company regulations.

Attenuation should be included as necessary to protect the existing surface water drainage systems from any increase in average or peak loadings due to normal and extreme rainfall events.

Attenuation ponds, next to the railway, should be designed by a competent specialist engineer and should include adequate storm capacity and overflow arrangements such that there is no risk of flooding of the adjacent railway line during either normal or exceptional rainfall events.

#### Encroachment

The developer/applicant must ensure that their proposal, both during construction, and after completion of works on site, does not affect the safety, operation or integrity of the operational railway, Network Rail and its infrastructure or undermine or damage or adversely affect any railway land and structures. There must be no physical encroachment of the proposal onto Network Rail land, no over-sailing into Network Rail air-space and no encroachment of foundations onto Network Rail land and soil. There must be no physical encroachment of any foundations onto Network Rail land. Any future maintenance must be conducted solely within the applicant's land ownership. Should the applicant require access to Network Rail land then must seek approval from the Network Rail Asset Protection Team. Any unauthorised access to Network Rail land or air-space is an act of trespass and we would remind the council that this is a criminal offence (s55 British Transport Commission Act 1949). Should the applicant be granted access to Network Rail land then they will be liable for all costs incurred in facilitating the proposal.

#### Noise/Soundproofing

The Developer should be aware that any development for residential use adjacent to an operational railway may result in neighbour issues arising. Consequently every endeavour should be made by the developer to provide adequate soundproofing for each dwelling. Please note that in a worst case scenario there could be trains running 24 hours a day and the soundproofing should take this into account.

#### Trees/Shrubs/Landscaping

Where trees/shrubs are to be planted adjacent to the railway boundary these shrubs should be positioned at a minimum distance greater than their predicted mature height from the boundary. Certain broad leaf deciduous species should not be planted adjacent to the railway boundary. We would wish to be involved in the approval of any landscaping scheme adjacent to the railway. Where landscaping is proposed as part of an application adjacent to the railway it will be necessary for details of the landscaping to be known and approved to ensure it does not impact upon the railway infrastructure. Any hedge planted adjacent to Network Rail's boundary fencing for screening purposes should be so placed that when fully grown it does not damage the fencing or provide a means of scaling it. No hedge should prevent Network Rail from maintaining its boundary fencing. Lists of trees that are permitted and those that are not permitted are provided below and these should be added to any tree planting conditions: Acceptable and unacceptable species are detailed within their letter and it is advised that a comprehensive list of permitted tree species is available upon request.

## Lighting

Where new lighting is to be erected adjacent to the operational railway the potential for train drivers to be dazzled must be eliminated. In addition the location and colour of lights must not give rise to the potential for confusion with the signalling arrangements on the railway. Detail of any external lighting should be provided as a condition if not already indicated on the application.

It is realised that much of the above does not apply directly to the application but should be taken into consideration as appropriate. Nevertheless it gives a useful guide as to the considerations to be taken into account in relation to development adjacent to the railway. I would advise that in particular the drainage, soundproofing, lighting and landscaping should be the subject of conditions, the reasons for which can include the safety, operational needs and integrity of the railway. For the other matters we would be pleased if an informative could be attached to the decision notice.

I trust full cognisance will be taken in respect of these comments. If you have any further queries or require clarification of any aspects, please do not hesitate to contact myself I would also be grateful if you could inform me of the outcome of this application, forwarding a copy of the Decision Notice to me in due course.

## **PUBLICITY**

Neighbours were notified initially followed by a re-consultation due to the submission of additional information. A significant number of representations have been made with some individuals submitting numerous individual objections. A total of 548 people have commented, all of whom have objected to the scheme. Due to the extent of correspondence the following is a summary of the comments made. Full unedited versions are available to view on line or in the planning office.

Comments have been received from the following;

Mr Robert Wilde, 58 Grassholme Way  
Eaglescliffe  
Mr D Shuttleworth, 30 Emsworth Drive, E'cliffe  
Mrs C Dinsley, 50 Mayfield Crescent  
Eaglescliffe  
Mr L Rosenberg, 1 Eggescliffe Ct Eggescliffe  
L Axon, 8 Ettersgill Close Eaglescliffe  
Mr Peter Gray, 24 Birchfield Drive Eaglescliffe  
Mrs Anne Barber, Laneside Back Lane  
Lauren Farrow, 3 Highfield Close Stockton  
Jessie Rennison, 3 Birchfield Drive  
Eaglescliffe  
Mrs V Chadwick, 1 Seymour Grove  
Eaglescliffe  
Mr + Mrs Wallace, 22 Langdon Way  
Eaglescliffe  
C Henderson, 10 Langdon Way Eaglescliffe  
Mr D Rhodes, 28 Bromley Road Stockton-on-  
Tees  
Mr Chris Smith, 9 Mickleton Drive Eaglescliffe  
Mrs J Underwood, 54 Grassholme Way  
E'cliffe  
Ms Christine Franklin, 21 Hird Road Yarm  
Mrs katie Fletcher, 20 Easby Lane Gt Ayton  
Mrs J A. Nichol, 19 Chillingham Dr, Chester le  
St  
Mr J Rogerson, 20 Marrick Road Stockton  
Mr C Rhodes, 47 Greenfield Drive Eaglescliffe

Mr G Dickson, 8 Emsworth Drive Eaglescliffe  
Mr Simon Tranter, 12 Bulmer Close Yarm  
Mrs Enid Harding, 21 The Slayde Yarm  
Miss Caroline Sutton, 16 Battersby Close  
Yarm  
Paul M Andrews, 22 Mount Leven Road Yarm  
Mrs Ann Hill, 26 Crosswell Park Ingleby  
Barwick  
Mrs P Smith, 2 Honister Walk Eggescliffe  
Mrs F Collins, 11 Grassholme Way  
Eaglescliffe,  
Mr G Mundy, 28 Crosswell Park Ingleby  
Barwick  
Anthony Watson, 11 Emsworth Drive  
Eaglescliffe  
Mrs Y Sproson, 8 Portland Close Eaglescliffe  
Lee Nockels, 12 Carriage Walk Eaglescliffe  
Mr J Sproson, 8 Portland Close Eaglescliffe  
Mrs Corfield, 20 Diligence Way Eaglescliffe  
Simon Hesketh, 19 Seymour Avenue  
Eaglescliffe  
Mr + Mrs G Hart, 24 Wentworth Way  
Eaglescliffe  
Miss H Bright, 23 Roundhay Drive Eaglescliffe  
Samuel Bright, 23 Roundhay Drive  
Eaglescliffe  
Paul Bright, 23 Roundhay Drive Eaglescliffe

Jacqueline Bright, 23 Roundhay Drive  
Eaglescliffe  
Mike Farrow, 3 Highfield Close Eaglescliffe  
Miss E Sellers, 2 Eggescliffe Court  
Eggescliffe  
Louise Burke, 32 Whinfall Avenue Eaglescliffe  
Richard Gaunt, 3 Rose Terrace Eggescliffe  
J A Wildsmith, 554 Yarm Road Eaglescliffe  
Alison Wharton, 11 Roedean Drive  
Eaglescliffe  
Adele Fletcher, 1 Oakfield Avenue  
Eaglescliffe  
Andy Kernohan, 4 Hunters Green Eaglescliffe  
Avril Ellis, 4 Newbiggin Close Eaglescliffe  
David + Judy Millsom, Rowanside, Darlington  
Rd,  
Peter Savage, 6 Middleton Close Eaglescliffe  
Ian Kidd, 10 Warwick Close Eaglescliffe  
Frank Storr, 16 Aberdovey Drive Eaglescliffe  
A Parks, 14 Monmouth Drive Eaglescliffe  
Janet Storr, 16 Aberdovey Drive Eaglescliffe  
Mr Robert Michael Medd, 43 Lingfield Drive  
Eaglescliffe  
Mr Stephen Graham, 7 Borrowdale Grove  
Eggescliffe  
Mr D Underwood, 54 Grassholme Way E'cliffe  
Jane Pearson, 1 Hindhead Eaglescliffe  
Miss C Milner, 4 Highfield Close Eaglescliffe  
Mrs Angela Gray, 24 Birchfield Drive  
Eaglescliffe  
Mr Brian Harris, 59 Greenfield Drive  
Eaglescliffe  
Mr C Rhodes, 4 Highfield Close, Eaglescliffe  
Mr M Rhodes, 4 Highfield Close Eaglescliffe  
Mrs Tracy Trattles, 3 Baliol Croft Long Newton  
Mr Graham Hall, 17 Dalmuir Close  
Eaglescliffe  
Mrs Shirley Miller, 26 Birchfield Drive  
Eaglescliffe  
Mr Kevin Smith, 6 Baliol Croft Long Newton  
Mr Duncan Clift, 509 Yarm Road Eaglescliffe  
Darren Cooney, 40 Grassholme Way  
Eaglescliffe  
Mrs J Taylor, 19 Durham Lane Eaglescliffe  
Mrs S Ballantyne, 28 Atheron Close  
Spennymoor  
Mr K Ballantyne, 28 Atherton Close  
Spennymoor  
Mrs M Graham, Greencroft Elwick  
Mrs R Reynolds, 2 Birchfield Close  
Eaglescliffe  
Mrs Jill Harrison, Hill Rise The Green  
Eggescliffe  
Mrs A Williams, 35 Coatham Vale Eaglescliffe  
Mr Christopher Neil, Field House Worsall  
Road  
Kay Grenfell, 62 Gilesgate Durham  
Mr Shane Sellers, 2 Eggescliffe Court  
Eggescliffe  
Mrs K Powell, 57 St Cuthbert's Road Stockton  
Mrs S B Rhodes, 28 Bromley Road Stockton  
Chris Wilson, 29 Shearwater Lane, Norton,

Mrs W Bedder, 10 Grassholme Way  
Eaglescliffe  
Mrs Anne Prosho , 38 Birchfield Drive  
Eaglescliffe  
Mr John George Simpson , 15 Mayes Walk  
Yarm  
Mr James Carroll, 41 Upsall Grove, Fairfield,  
Mrs Susan Carroll, 41 Upsall Grove, Fairfield,  
Mrs Ann Wilson, 12 Farnham Close  
Eaglescliffe  
Mrs L Grierson, 31 Mayfield Crescent,  
Orchard Estate  
Jean Alexander, 18 Church Road Eaglescliffe  
Mr Aaron Simmons, 6 Egglestone Dr  
Eaglescliffe  
Mr Ian Reynolds, Wells Cottages Eggescliffe  
Mr Nina Harding, Holly View Darlington Road  
Ms Jessica Metcalfe, 7 Egglestone Dr  
Eaglescliffe  
Jess Metcalfe, 7 egglestone drive  
Fiona Cook, 20 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe  
Lee Robson, 12 Cotherstone Close  
Eaglescliffe  
Nina Carter, 24 Langdon Way Stockton-on-  
Tees  
Nina Carter, Mrs Jill Coulson, 6 Springfield Cl  
Eaglescliffe  
Mr ian hodgson, 30 Royal George Drive  
Eaglescliffe,  
Elizabeth Benomran, 1 Burn Wood Court  
Long Newton  
E A Duffield, 8 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe  
Mrs Deborah White, 2 Old Rectory Gardens  
Yarm  
Miss K Williams, 35 Coatham Vale  
Eaglescliffe  
Maureen Kipling, 5 Newbiggin Close  
Eaglescliffe  
Mrs Diana Tayeb, 19 Grassholme Way  
Eaglescliffe  
Ashley Sotheby, 28 Chaldron Way  
Eaglescliffe  
Nick Tadd, 19 Monreith Avenue Eaglescliffe  
Mr. T Coggle, 13 Butterfield Drive,  
Eaglescliffe,  
Hayley West, 27 Grassholme Way Hunters  
Green  
Kevin West, 27 Grassholme Way Hunters  
Green  
Mr and Mrs A Cotton, 51 Mayfield Cr  
Eaglescliffe  
R J Crouch, 7 Uldale Drive Eggescliffe  
Ewan Cant, 6 Wentworth Way Eaglescliffe  
(Mrs) Jan Crouch, 7 Uldale Drive Eggescliffe  
Vanessa Meek, 4 Eastbourne Ave,  
Eggescliffe,  
Chris McIntosh, 12 Honister Walk,  
Eggescliffe,  
S Ballantyne, 6 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe  
Mr Nicholas Miller, 26 Birchfield Dr,  
Eaglescliffe,  
Mr And Mrs Flint, 23 Meadowfield Dr  
Eaglescliffe

M Hutchinson, 6 Martindale Grove  
 Egglecliffe  
 Mrs. J. R. Bullock, 3 The Glen, Butts Lane,  
 Sheila Carr, 46 Grassholme Way, Egglecliffe  
 Kay Greenhalgh, 25 Grisedale Cr,  
 Egglecliffe,  
 Ian Sheppard, 57, Seymour Grove,  
 Egglecliffe,  
 M Rees, The Old House 4 Blind Lane  
 Mr David Nixon, 2 Orchard Mews Egglecliffe  
 C M Elliott, 20 The Yew Walk Long Newton,  
 Mrs M Cheesebrough, White Cedars Manfield  
 Mrs P Murray, White Cedars Manfield  
 Ms T Greenall, 19A Pierremont Cr Darlington  
 N Davies, 3 Springwell, Ingleton  
 Joyce Dvies, 3 Springwell. Ingleton  
 Mrs Irene Hogan, 19 Belmangate  
 Guisborough  
 MR Colin Harris, 76 Forest Road Aberdeen  
 Mrs Marie Harris, 76 Forest Road Aberdeen  
 Pauline Frame, 8 Meadowfield Drive  
 Egglecliffe  
 Judith Underwood, 8 Pennypot Lane TS16  
 0BN  
 Andrew Bennett, 26 Chaldrone Way  
 Egglecliffe  
 Mrs Sandra Plews, 10, Whitfield Cl  
 Egglecliffe  
 Mr M Davison, 42 Grassholme Way  
 Egglecliffe  
 Pat + John Shallow, 3 Cromer Court  
 Egglecliffe  
 Christopher J Underwood, 6 Croft Rd  
 Egglecliffe  
 Tony Smith, 65 Woodlea, Coulby Newham  
 Mrs Katie Underwood, 6 Croft Road  
 Egglecliffe  
 Alan Carter, 43 Carlile Hill Stockton On Tees  
 A C Harrison, St Annes House The Green  
 Nicola Weir, 18 Grisedale Crescent  
 Egglecliffe  
 Michael Howe, Rose Cottage B Darlington  
 Road  
 Mr M George Street, 20 Church Rd  
 Egglecliffe  
 Marika Smith, 1 Mayfield Close Egglecliffe  
 W J Wright, 22 Battersby Close Yarm  
 Mrs J T Wright, 22 Battersby Close Yarm  
 Mr And Mrs TFR And A Coulson  
 8 Turnberry Avenue Egglecliffe  
 J T O'Keefe, 12 Royal George Drive  
 Egglecliffe  
 Mrs G E Bashford, 80 Mayfield Crescent  
 Mrs B Harvey, 5 Uldale Drive Egglecliffe  
 C Prothero, 6 Talisman Close Egglecliffe  
 17 Church Road Egglecliffe  
 Kris George, 6 Talisman Close Egglecliffe  
 Allison Merryweather, 3 Ettersgill Cl  
 Egglecliffe  
 Ronald Wood, 12 Middleton Close  
 Egglecliffe  
 Mrs D Allaway, 12 Egglestone Drive  
 Egglecliffe

D Palmer, 41 The Front Middleston One Row  
 M Davison, 20 Acorn Close Middleton St  
 George  
 V O'Connor, 65 Mayfield Crescent  
 Egglecliffe  
 Mrs Ruth Blundell, The Briars Yarm Road  
 M Hart, 14 Moorhouse Estate Stockton-on-  
 Tees  
 Edward Harrison, 15 Harrington Road Redcar  
 Emma Harrison, 15 Harrington Road Redcar  
 Stephen Hart, 14 Moorhouse Estate Stockton  
 Karen Harrison, 15 Harrington Road Redcar  
 Mrs G Elgie, 1 Egglestone Drive Egglecliffe  
 Mel Davison, 20 Acorn Close Middleton St  
 George  
 Karen Holder, 33 Albert Road Egglecliffe  
 Jane Horton, 12 Trevithick Close Egglecliffe  
 David Summerfield, 5 Middleton Cl  
 Egglecliffe  
 M Howard, 10 Egglestone Drive Egglecliffe  
 Sue Palmer, 7 Preston Lane Stockton-on-  
 Tees  
 Mrs Reed, 51 Meridian Way Stockton-on-  
 Tees  
 Isabel Alvaiez, 24 Grassholme Way  
 Egglecliffe  
 John W Latimer, Comondale House 1A  
 Countisbury Road, Mr Russ Sawdon  
 32 Grassholme Way Egglecliffe  
 Mr I Robinson, 44 Grassholme Way  
 Egglecliffe  
 Mrs S M Wardle, 7 Rushmere Heath  
 Egglecliffe  
 Mr Mike Thompson, 8 Valley Gardens  
 Egglecliffe  
 C K Stirland, 2 Ivy Cottages The Green  
 Rachel Graham, 1 Newbiggin Close  
 Egglecliffe  
 Mrs Nicola Robinson, 44 Grassholme Way  
 Egglecliffe  
 Mr G Springett, 1 The Glen Egglecliffe  
 I Phillips, 20 Cotherstone Close Egglecliffe  
 M J Brooks, 7 Portland Close Egglecliffe  
 Mr James Sherris, 18 Merlay Close Yarm  
 Mr Robert Sherris, 16 Goosegarth Egglecliffe  
 Mrs K Pickover, 5 Dinsdale Dr Egglecliffe  
 Mrs Patricia Waller, 6 Turnberry Ave  
 Egglecliffe  
 Mr Harry Beau, 60 Croft Road Egglecliffe  
 Mrs Joanna Sellers, 2 Egglecliffe Ct  
 Egglecliffe  
 Mr Peter Chadwick, 1 Seymour Grove  
 Egglecliffe  
 Mr John Hollins, 35 Royal George Dr  
 Egglecliffe  
 Deborah Copley, 21 Uraly Nook Road  
 Egglecliffe  
 David Copley, 21 Uraly Nook Road  
 Egglecliffe  
 Rebecca Copley, 21 Uraly Nook Road  
 Egglecliffe  
 Terry Newman, 16 Marion Avenue  
 Egglecliffe

Carole Newman, 16 Marion Avenue  
 Eaglescliffe  
 G Whitfield, 22 Aspen Road Eaglescliffe  
 Maxine Ferens, 14 Mickleton Drive  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Jen Danby, 7 Birchfield Drive Eaglescliffe  
 C S Leonard, 14 Aspen Road Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs V Keates, 12 Valley Gardens Eaglescliffe  
 Mr D McLone and Petitioners, 12 Parkstone  
 Place Eaglescliffe  
 N A Weir, 7 Valley Gardens Eaglescliffe  
 Ivy Duffield, 8 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe  
 Andrew Cobbold, 7 Cotherstone Cl  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Emma Passmore, 6 Cotherstone Cl  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Colin Boston, 26 Langdon Way Eaglescliffe  
 Alan Barber, Laneside Eggescliffe Village  
 Jo Ripley, 3 Middleton Close Eaglescliffe  
 Mr Martin Barker, 9 Leicester Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Martin Barker, Leicester Way, Eaglescliffe  
 Louise Baldock, 8 Cribyn Close Ingleby  
 Barwick  
 Mrs Aurelie Rene, 22 Mayfield Cres  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs Suzanne Smith, Elton Gates Darlington  
 Road  
 Deborah Varley, 60 Butterfield Drive  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Jonathan Birch, 3 Manor Gate Long Newton  
 R Smith, 9 Locomotion Court Eaglescliffe  
 Ian Todd, The Conifers Newton Morrell  
 David Fox-Holmes, 14 Croft Road,  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Clifford James Hill, 22 Seymour Drive  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Ann Hill, 22 Seymour Drive Eaglescliffe  
 Matthew Wilson, 29 Shearwater Lane Norton  
 Mr C Butterworth, 48 Whitehouse Croft Long  
 Newton  
 Carl Pearson, 14 Grassholme Way Stockon  
 Mrs M Cooney, 3 Bromley Hill Close  
 Nunthorpe  
 Mrs S Donachi, 19 Sledmere Drive Acklam  
 Mr D Donachi, 19 Sledmere Drive Acklam  
 Michael Curtis, 15 Greenlands Road Redcar  
 Joe Cronin-hunter, 31 Grassholme Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mr simon Fletcher, 20 Easby Lane Gt Ayton  
 Freda Armstrong, 86 Greenfield Drive  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Tom Beardsmore, 1 Burn Wood Court, Long  
 Newton  
 Denise Harbisher, 47 Mayfield Cres  
 Eaglescliffe  
 S Metcalfe, Beechcroft Butts Ln Eggescliffe.  
 Mr J H Telford, 1 Honister Walk Eggescliffe  
 Steve Blackett, 62 Grassholme Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mr Denis Butler, 21 Coatham Vale  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs H Robinson, 25 Durham Lane  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mr Stephen Mellor, 12 Strathaven Dr  
 Eaglescliffe  
 S C & M Mellor, 12 Strathaven Dr Eaglescliffe  
 Mr R T Martinson, 4 Hatfield Close  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs D Johansson, 1 Grassholme Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Miss Zoe Johansson, 1 Grassholme Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mr Richard Martin, 29 White House Croft  
 Long Newton  
 Mr P Tompkinson, 3 Warwick Close  
 Eaglescliffe  
 George Millward, 39 Leicester Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs Margaret Cummins, 37, Greenfield Dr  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Colin Scott, 3 Mayfield Close Eaglescliffe  
 E A Millward, 39 Leicester Way Eaglescliffe  
 Craig Dean, 23 Coatham Vale Eaglescliffe  
 Derek Forrest, 23 Valley Gardens Eaglescliffe  
 Ann McLone, 24 St Andrew's Close  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mr Gary Combes, 17 Jacklin Walk Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs Gillian Allen, 4 St Martins Way  
 Kirklevington  
 E Airey, 68 Greenfield Drive Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs B Dyson, 9 Manor Gate Long Newton  
 B Gathergood, 55 Meadowfield Drive  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Donald Barnes, 13 Valley Gardens  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Brian Summerbell, 50 Grassholme Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Gemma Geddes, 30 Grassholme Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 A Mansell, 53 Mayfield Crescent Eaglescliffe  
 Zoe Wildsmith, 6 Grisedale Crescent  
 Eggescliffe  
 Mrs Lesley Lewis, 12 Marion Avenue  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs C Jones, Greenabella Bentley Wynd  
 Yarm  
 Mr Anthony Power, 15 Cotherstone Cl  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Susan Cronin-Hunter, 31 Grassholme Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mr John Bell, 7 Butts Lane Eggescliffe  
 John Shields, 36 Black Diamond Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Sandra Whyte, 36 Black Diamond Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Celia Wilson, 9 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe  
 Stephen Graham, 7 Borrowdale Gr  
 Eggescliffe  
 Elizabeth Graham, 7 Borrowdale Gr  
 Eggescliffe  
 Lisa Lyons, 36 Chaldron Way Eaglescliffe  
 Peter Rodgers, 40 Seymour Drive Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs Barbara Atkinson, 19 Dunbar Dr  
 Eaglescliffe

Mrs Margaret Foster, 2 Middleton Cl  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Andy Marwood, 8 Burdon View Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs Jane Phillips, 20 Cotherstone Cl  
 Eaglescliffe  
 R W Scaife, 1 Hoylake Way Eaglescliffe  
 Neil Abbott, 6 Eastbourne Avenue Eaglescliffe  
 Peter Chadwick, 1 Seymour Grove  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Gleb Feldman, 9 Hazel Slade Eaglescliffe  
 Svetlana Feldman, 9 Hazel Slade Eaglescliffe  
 Robert Smith, 4 Formby Walk Eaglescliffe  
 Michael Dixon, 11 Middleton Close  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Rebecca Adamson, 18 Langdon Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 S Woodhouse, Hendl House Uray Nook Rd  
 Waqas Afridi, 5 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe  
 Mr Thomas Ripley, 3 Middleton Close  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mr Tom Ripley, 3 Middleton Close, TS16 0GA  
 Mr Richard Foster, 2 Middleton Close  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Elaine Tyson, 3 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe  
 Julie Stokes, 14 Cotherstone Cl Eaglescliffe  
 Rebecca King, 12 Cotherstone Cl Eaglescliffe  
 Steven Cooke, 10 Cotherstone Cl Eaglescliffe  
 David Passnore, 6 Cotherstone Cl Eaglescliffe  
 Lynne Mackenzie, 4 Cotherstone Cl  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Ella-Maria Lynch, 2 Cotherstone Cl  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mr M Brabanski, 3 Cotherstone Cl Eaglescliffe  
 Sue Boyes, 22 Cotherstone Close Eaglescliffe  
 Jan Wood, 12 Middleton Close Eaglescliffe  
 S Wilkinson, 1 Langdon Way Eaglescliffe  
 Helen Halsall, 7 Middleton Close Eaglescliffe  
 Kath Dixon, 11 Middleton Close Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs Angela Walker, 10 Middleton Cl  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mr M Scott, 1 Middleton Close Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs Helen Hardy, 14 Langdon Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs Lynn Smith, 12 Langdon Way Eaglescliffe  
 Cora Durham, 20 Langdon Way Eaglescliffe  
 Jonathan Danby, 18 Langdon Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mr Alan Gregory, 12 Grassholme Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Steven Peacock, 24 Langdon Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Julie Boston, 26 Langdon Way Eaglescliffe  
 Antonia Phillips, 20 Cotherstone Cl  
 Eaglescliffe  
 David Howard, 10 Egglestone Drive  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Helen Hird, 9 Egglestone Drive Eaglescliffe  
 John And Helen McManus, 8 Egglestone  
 Drive Eaglescliffe  
 Dr stephen salvati, 7 Egglestone Dr  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Alison Peacock, 4 Egglestone Drive  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Tracey Foster, 2 Egglestone Drive  
 Eaglescliffe  
 David Allaway, 12 Egglestone Drive  
 Eaglescliffe  
 David Reach, 1 Cotherstone Close  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Rachel Ann Coleby, 15 Egglestone Dr  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Dr Aziz Elmalak, 14 Egglestone Drive  
 Eaglescliffe  
 S Oxby, 15 Langdon Way Eaglescliffe  
 C Wilkinson, 11 Langdon Way Eaglescliffe  
 Rachel Power, 15 Cotherstone Close  
 Eaglescliffe  
 N J Stirland, 11 Cotherstone Close  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Gook Kim, 9 Cotherstone Close Eaglescliffe  
 Kate Finlay, 7 Cotherstone Close Eaglescliffe  
 Mr D Carling, 26 Coronation Crescent Yarm  
 Mrs V Lowson, 10 Beaumaris Drive  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Tim Renwick, 9 Langdon Way Eaglescliffe  
 Peter Close, 18 Carr Bridge Close Eaglescliffe  
 Paul Grainge, 20 Black Diamond Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 June Tulley, 12 The Green Egglecliffe  
 Joanne Kenrick, 52B Middleton Lane  
 Middleton St George  
 Mr And Mrs Pickells, 4 Farnham Cl  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Geoff Broughton, 1 East Villa Crathorne  
 Ged Coulson, 6 Springfield Close Eaglescliffe  
 Anne Wildsmith, 554 Yarm Road Eaglescliffe  
 Xavier Davidson, 2 Manor Gate Long Newton  
 D A James, 8 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs Margaret Dale, 60 Meadowfield Dr  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mr And Mrs Ibbetson, 17 Uldale Drive  
 Egglecliffe  
 Mr And Mrs Waller, West End House Church  
 Rd  
 Mr And Mrs Marwood, 12 Pease Court  
 Eaglescliffe,  
 Nigel Billau, 2 Langdon Way Eaglescliffe  
 John Henderson, 10 Langdon Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Cynthia Latcham, 12 Dunbar Drive  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Carmel McGeachy, 3 Brae Head Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs J G Curtis, 20 Seymour Drive Eaglescliffe  
 David Yardley, 16 Dunbar Drive Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs Carole Billau, 2 Langdon Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Hannah Rogerson, 5 Langdon Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mr Simon Plumb, 7 Langdon Way Eaglescliffe  
 Dr Ahmed Kaabneh, 19 Grassholme Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs V Norris, 15 Grassholme Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mr M Collins, 11 Grassholme Way  
 Eaglescliffe



Lesley O'Neil, 34 Grassholme Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs G Sawdon, 32 Grassholme Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 I Garcia, 24 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe  
 Sarah McLaren, 22 Grassholme Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Ronald Cook, 20 Grassholme Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Kate Soley, 18 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe  
 Iain Wilson, 9 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe  
 Brian Sowerby, 7 Grassholme Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Sara Pearson, 14 Grassholme Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mr Steve Bedder, 10 Grassholme Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mary Pinder, 2 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe  
 Graham Midgley, 4 Grassholme Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Gillian McCarthy, 6 Newbiggin Close  
 Eaglescliffe  
 George Kipling, 5 Newbiggin Close  
 Eaglescliffe  
 John Ellis, 4 Newbiggin Close Eaglescliffe  
 A & K Sandys, 3 Newbiggin Close  
 Eaglescliffe  
 L Faulkner, 2 Newbiggin Close Eaglescliffe  
 Mr John Graham, 1 Newbiggin Close  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs J Meadley, 18 Cotherstone Close  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Joan Hillerby, 16 Cotherstone Close  
 Eaglescliffe  
 L W Smout, 60 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs Susan Coverdale  
 56 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe  
 Miss Smith, 52 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe  
 Linda Summerbell, 50 Grassholme Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mr Leonard Smith, 48 Grassholme Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Amy Robinson, 44 Grassholme Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Sarah Cooney, 40 Grassholme Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs Debra Harris, 38 Grassholme Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Eileen France, 29 Grassholme Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Linda West, 27 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe  
 Helen Thompson, 25 Grassholme Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Miss Susan Heath, 23 Grassholme Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Dr G.S Randhawa, 7 Ettersgill Close  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Claire McNiff, 6 Ettersgill Close Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs Pamela Kay, 5 Ettersgill Close  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Jane Thompson, 4 Ettersgill Close  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Philip Merryweather, 3 Ettersgill Close  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Sandra Burns, 1 Ettersgill Close Eaglescliffe  
 John and Elizabeth Burton, 2 Ettersgill Cl  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Paul Foster, 16 Langdon Way Eaglescliffe  
 Chris Hines, 8 Langdon Way Eaglescliffe  
 Karl Richardson, 6 Langdon Way Eaglescliffe  
 Michelle, Grace And Thomas Hodgkinson And  
 Wane Bartlett, 4 Langdon Way Eaglescliffe  
 Ralph Pickles, Bellmount Farm Aislaby Road  
 Mr andrew davey, 74 Greenfield Drive  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Melanie Atkinson, 11 Birchfield Drive  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mr D mcmenamin, 18 Swinburne Rd  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs Amanda Marshall, The Gables Urlay  
 Nook Road Eaglescliffe  
 Mr Ian Betts, 39 Grisedale Crescent  
 Egglescliffe  
 Miss Janine Connor, 30 Coatham Vale  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs Pauline Connor, 30 Coatham Vale  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs B Clare, 48 Grisedale Crescent  
 Egglescliffe  
 Ms sandra mcleavy, 32 Carew Close Yarm  
 Mr Ian Johansson, 1 Grassholme Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mr Alastair Baines, 8 Cotherstone Cl  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs Beryl Sowerby, 112 Meadowfield Drive  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mr D Raper, 10 Rushmere Heath Eaglescliffe  
 Mr Brian Elgie, 1 Egglestone Drive  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs Julie Woollaston, 5 Egglestone Drive  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Matt Simpson , 3 Langdon Way Eaglescliffe  
 Leo Geddes, 30 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe  
 Miss Katherine Johnson, 28 Grassholme Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Sharon Maddy, 26 Grassholme Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 S Summerfield, 5 Middleton Close Eaglescliffe  
 Mr Gary Hughes, 4 Middleton Close  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs Liz Yule, 9 Middleton Close Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs Kathryn Kirby, 7 Newbiggin Close  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs Noree Rosenberg, 1 Egglescliffe Court  
 Egglescliffe  
 Mr Brian Hurst, 5 Orchard Mews Eaglescliffe  
 Megan Duffield, 8 Grassholme Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Michael Duffield, 8 Grassholme Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 I Gilg, 23 Monmouth Drive Eaglescliffe  
 Mr John F Badcock, 10 Finchfield Close  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mr Brian Dalzell, 40 Greenfield Drive  
 Eaglescliffe

Mrs A Brown, 7 Mayfield Close Eaglescliffe  
 Mr Roy Stoves, 17 Orchard Mews Eaglescliffe  
 Mr Robert Willis, 35 Grisedale Cres  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs Alex Wilde, 58 Grassholme Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs Joanne Davison, 42 Grassholme Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs audrey carr, 11 Coatham Vale  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mr Shamas Sadieq, 51 Chaldron Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mr Nicholas Miller, 26 Birchfield Drive  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mr M Grierson, 31 Mayfield Crescent  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mr Alan Toothill, 6 Cromer Court Eaglescliffe  
 James Riach, 6 Monmouth Drive Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs Carol Batchelor, 37 Uray Nook Road  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Jane Wilson, 29 Shearwater Lane Norton  
 Miss Katrina Savage, 24 Burnmoor Drive  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mr N A Weir And Mrs J Weir, 7 Valley  
 Gardens Eaglescliffe  
 Kath Thompson (Mrs), 18 Valley Gardens  
 Gary Combes, 17 Jacklin Walk Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs Linda Adamson, 51 Seymour Grove  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Keep Eaglescliffe Special, 6 Grassholme Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Angela Ballantyne, 6 Grassholme Way  
 Ealescliffe  
 Miss Tracey Charlton, 10 Lartington Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mr Ian James Archibald, 6 Emsworth Drive  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs M Martinson, 4 Hatfield Close Eaglescliffe  
 David Emerton, 21 Grisedale Crescent  
 Egglescliffe  
 Mrs Marjorie Simpson, 15 Mayes Walk Yarm  
 Mrs G D Smith, 11 Whitfield Close  
 Eaglescliffe  
 J A Fletcher, 3 Hoylake Way Eaglescliffe  
 Mr Brian Plumb, 4 Church Road Egglescliffe  
 Mr Stephen Reed, 12 Chaldron Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs Diana Sandford, 47 Dinsdale Dr  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mr Michael Williams, 35 Coatham Vale  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs Helen Page, 34 Carew Close Yarm  
 Mrs C M Sherris, 18 Merlay Close Yarm  
 Mr M Sherris, 15 Merryweather Court Central  
 St  
 Mrs E Ripley, 10 Thornborough Close  
 Stockton  
 Paul Brown, 15 Orchard Mews Eaglescliffe  
 B Atkinson, 19 Dunbar Drive, Eaglescliffe  
 Guy Studholme, 1 Alonby Court Long Newton  
 David H Noble, 592 Yarm Road Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs Marian Johnson, 10 Wentworth Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs Maureen Carroll, 15 Birchfield Dr  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs P Wood, 26 Strathaven Drive Eaglescliffe  
 Josie Graham, 5 Meadow End Eaglescliffe  
 Mr Barry Alexander, 21 Aberdovey Dr  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs Jane Hodgson, 16 Valley Gdns  
 Eaglescliffe  
 E Marsay, 7 Oakfield Avenue Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs Carolyn Casey, 9 Kingsdale Close Yarm  
 Mrs Christine Andrews, 22 Mount Leven Rd  
 Yarm  
 Geoff Jaques, 132 Roseberry Cres, Great  
 Ayton  
 C L Roberts, 3 Hatfield Close Eaglescliffe  
 David Welsh, 13 Heathfield Close Eaglescliffe  
 Rachael Copley, 21 Uray Nook Road  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs Valerie Walmsley, 19 Mayfield Cres  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mr E Routledge, 19 Seymour Drive  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mr A J Duffield F.C.M.A., 2 Springwell  
 Ingleton  
 Mr Alex Conradie, 4 Aberdovey Drive  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mr G Ripley, 10 Thornborough Close Stockton  
 Mr Stephen Dobson, 11 The Crescent  
 Eaglescliffe  
 John Stewart, 21 Grassholme Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mr Ray Blundell, The Briars Yarm Road  
 Sally Renwick, 9 Langdon Way Eaglescliffe  
 Judith Butterworth, 48 Whitehouse Croft, Long  
 Newton  
 Jayne Mahmood, 3 Springfield Close  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Ann Smith, 4 Formby Walk Eaglescliffe  
 Mr Raymond Best, 11 South View Eaglescliffe  
 Janet Smith, 18 Springfield Close Eaglescliffe  
 Mr C Lennon, 3 Butterfield Cl Eaglescliffe  
 Mr Douglas Wilson, 21 Mount Leven Road  
 Yarm  
 Robert P Alexander, 18 Church Road  
 Egglescliffe  
 Mr P Horner, 26 Carew Close Yarm  
 Karl Miller, 26 Birchfield Drive Eaglescliffe  
 Mr Peter Harrison, Hill Rise, The Green  
 Egglescliffe  
 Helen Hollins, 35 Royal George Drive  
 Kingsmead  
 Alan Vaughan, 31 Dinsdale Drive Eaglescliffe  
 Mrs Karen Evans, 17 Battersby Close Yarm  
 Mrs Christine Mundy, 28 Crosswell Park  
 Ingleby Barwick  
 Mrs moira royal, 648 Yarm Road Eaglescliffe  
 Mr Robin Millman, 3 Church Close  
 Egglescliffe  
 Mr Paul Dearlove, 44 Holme Land Ingleby  
 Barwick  
 Joseph Lobo, 46 Grassholme Way  
 Eaglescliffe  
 Mr David Yule, 9 Middleton Close Eaglescliffe

Mrs Jill Simmons, 6 Egglestone Drive  
Eaglescliffe  
Mrs N P Greenstreet, 7 Manor Gate Long  
Newton  
Mrs W Bell, 7 Butts Lane Egglestone  
Mr Andrew Gibbings, 16 Turnberry Avenue  
Eaglescliffe  
Brian Austin Smith, 12 Moor Park Eaglescliffe  
Jane Nicholls, 19 Valley Gardens Eaglescliffe  
Mrs Janice Graham, 10 Battersby Close Yarm  
Mrs Dawn Hull, 10 Grisedale Cres Eaglescliffe  
Mark Lawrence, 19 Coatham Vale Eaglescliffe  
Mrs Helen Blackett, 62 Grassholme Way  
Eaglescliffe  
Margaret Lav, 76 Forest Road Aberdeen  
Anita Birch, 3 Manor Gate Long Newton  
Mr Robert Fenby, 16 Butterfield Gr  
Eaglescliffe  
Candice Dean, 23 Coatham Vale Eaglescliffe  
Emma Savage, 6 Middleton Close Eaglescliffe

Matt Coulson, 6 Springfield Close Eaglescliffe  
Mr Simon Earley, 19 Whitfield Close  
Eaglescliffe  
Mr Ian Hunter, 31 Grassholme Way  
Eaglescliffe  
Helen Pickering, 19 Church Road Egglestone  
Dorothy Jefferson, 2 Wasdale Drive  
Egglestone  
Mrs Helen Rhodes, 47 Greenfield Dr  
Eaglescliffe  
Mrs P Brooks, 7 Portland Close Eaglescliffe  
M Hodgkinson, 4 Langdon Way Eaglescliffe  
Mrs Joanna Rigg, 9 Arisaig Close Eaglescliffe  
Mrs J Rigg, Ellie Duffield  
8 Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe  
Adam Vickers, 13 Lingfield Drive Eaglescliffe  
Christine Hurst, 5 Orchard Mews Eaglescliffe  
Stephen Peacock, 24 Langdon Way, Stockton  
Alex Conradie, 4 Aberdovey Drive,  
Eaglescliffe

## **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. Decisions will be made 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 Strategy 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 Uray 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 Uray 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 Uray Nook is approved, where is the evidence of large scale business investment to support the employment for this development and others around Yarm? The economy is in a recession so who needs this additional housing.

Objectors do not agree with a 20% buffer to housing need figures and consider that the existing 5 year supply figure was derived at a peak in the housing market which is not reflective of the current situation and the 5 year supply figure should therefore be significantly less. Objectors

advise of numerous properties for sale in the locality, that there are numerous brownfield sites stalled which should be supported through the use of monies from the new homes bonus to deliver them. 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 Uraly 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.

The authorities own housing survey (2011) indicates that there is already a surplus of supply over demand of 23% in the Yarm, Eaglescliffe and Preston area.

Considering Hartlepool as a test case, The Planning Inspector is recommencing the suspended Hartlepool Council LDF Examination in Public at end September. At the original examination in February he queried HBC's forecasts which were much lower than the then extant RSS and criticised the figures accordingly. With the advent of the new household projections he has advocated a new figure of 229 homes per annum between 2011 and 2021 versus the original RSS figure of 390 per annum. Hartlepool had originally suggested 320 per annum.

I understand that Councils can still put whatever figure they wish in their LDF 15 year plan but it would still have to pass the Examination in Public held by the Inspector. Would the Inspector ignore any higher forecast than the new projections? This is a situation that SBC could face. Your housing supply figures were created in 2004 when the economy was far stronger. You also agreed to take on a high percentage of Tess Valley Shortfall and based your figures on the manufactured growth of Ingleby Barwick. This was not organic growth and unnaturally inflated the population growth of Stockton by 20%. This growth would never have continued at this rate. Therefore SBC's housing supply figure, is like Hartlepool's, too high and you are running the risk of the Inspectorate pointing this out to you.

The Uraly Nook proposal is a speculative land grab by the developers. As the Planning Committee/Officer you are told you have no choice but let the development go ahead because Stockton has not got 5 years supply of housing land. But as discussed this policy was designed in an economically buoyant era when development could be expected to proceed quickly. Now it is leading to "development at any cost". The poor economic environment and low housing demand is resulting in large numbers of stalled sites, unnecessary greenfield permissions, dereliction, and ever larger land banks for the developers. Allowing greenfield means brownfield won't happen. Stockton could be left with both derelict inner and outer areas. Over the longer term it could lead to over development and urban sprawl by stealth. Is that what we want for our town?

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.

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.

TW are proud of the fact in their recent AGM to announce that they hold 65,000 plots of land in their land bank for the UK. Who says that Urray Nook may not just become one of those land banked areas? This will make no difference to SBCs 5 year housing supply if that were the case. All that will have been achieved is that yet more agricultural land has been lost to land banking.

As house building at Ingleby has slowed, so too will have the demand for housing as this area was attracting people moving into the borough from other areas. There is also major changes in the economy which point to people not moving / purchasing houses due to a lack of supply but due to a lack of ability to do this. Taking into account housing prediction figures being provided by developers, there is scepticism in the suggested requirement for numbers being so high.

Further phases at Allens West 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.

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.

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.

Stockton Council claims that they have a shortfall on their 5 year housing plan. However, it is not the solution to abandon the Brownfield sites for the Greenfield sites that have been earmarked for development around Eaglescliffe and Yarm. As a Council, you are currently working to your Core Development Document 2010. It clearly states that Brownfield sites and regeneration are your main priority. This is your current working document. We have ample Brownfield sites and these should be developed first. In his speech to the House of Commons on 27<sup>th</sup> March 2012, the Rt. Hon Greg Clark MP stated that the reforms to the Planning Policy "Makes explicit what was always implicit: that council's policies must encourage Brownfield sites to be brought back into use".

This is a fundamental part of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Yet you are ignoring it completely. The argument that the developers will not fund the cost of site clearance and the fact that Central Government has withdrawn its funding to help clear the Brownfield sites falls flat on its face. You have the funds to clear the sites. Re-invest the New Homes Bonus into clearing these sites. The developers are now dictating to the Council Planners where they will build because you have allowed them to do so. They will never build on Brownfield sites when Greenfield sites have been made available to them. As long as a developer makes a profit margin on a site it can be developed. It is their search for the best profit margins that is driving their decisions re development sites in our area.

By delaying the LDD, SBC are playing into the hands of the developers and allowing them further power over what applications are applied for and when. The question is in whose interests are SBC working?

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!

This is unnecessary urban sprawl, when will it cease, have 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 this scheme.

I hope Stockton Council adhere to the National Planning Policy Framework and their 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?

Why not build on the old Elementis site and its old ecology park which are 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:

Strategic gaps between the conurbation and the surrounding towns and villages, and between Eaglescliffe and Middleton St George.  
Green wedges within the conurbation, including River Tees Valley from Surtees Bridge to Yarm.....

### ***Highway Related***

Objectors raise concern that some of the highway survey work was carried out in July, suggesting this is a time when SBC officers agree can skew figures, and that this was done immediately after the road had been closed, whilst the 'road closed' signs remained to be in place. Decisions on traffic movements cannot be made on inaccurate results as this has repercussions through all subsequent calculations and assessments.

'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".

Objectors consider the traffic information submitted to be flawed, having used out-dated datasets, 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 most recent traffic surveys undertaken were done so in July, at a time when 2 year groups from local schools had finished for the summer and when the A67 had been closed for a week including up-to the day before the surveys started. The signs indicating 'road closed' were still in place when the surveys were undertaken. These results are therefore flawed and do not reflect the normal traffic movements and as such cannot be relied upon. Surveys should be done on a wet November morning when people are using their cars and when the roads are open and up to normal usage.

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?

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.

The road network around Hunters Green in particular is not suitable to cope with the increase in cars thereby raising the risk of Highway safety considerably.

Journey times have been indicated as being excessive within the surrounding highway with times to get from Eaglescliffe to Yarm and back one day taking 20 minutes and another day taking 1 hour. Other examples of journey times are indicated as;  
25 mins. to get from Aldi in Yarm through Yarm High Street to Urray Nook Road at 5pm).  
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.  
During rush hours an average waiting time on a 2 mile road is 40 minutes minimum.

Darlington to Grassholme Way Eaglescliffe, a 2 hour journey due to being stuck on the flooded A67.

40 minutes to travel less than 2 miles two weeks ago from my residence in Valley Gardens, Eaglescliffe to Goose pastures, Yarm.

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 Uray 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 it's busy.

It regularly takes 30 minutes just to travel from the Eagle pub past the roundabout.

Driving along Uray Nook Road regularly means getting stuck in traffic for over 45minutes trying to get to the Cleveland Bay just to turn left onto Yarm road.

Significant increases in journey times just in the last 2 years.

There is daily congestion already present around Yarm and Eaglescliffe with queues being present every single day into Yarm, at Durham Lane Tesco roundabout and along the A67 and this poses a risk to safety in term of pedestrians, school pupils, access for emergency vehicles etc. The increased traffic from the proposed development and other developments will only make this situation worse.

The main cause of traffic congestion in Yarm and Eaglescliffe 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. This is before all the recently approved developments are built out. 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. Over use and congestion on all the highways will negatively affect highway safety for pedestrians.

Traffic surveys and other statistics which are dependent on human behaviour are extremely unreliable. Speaking to the electorate and spending time observing the areas in detail may prove more reliable.

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 junction of the proposed estate is also far too close to the corner to the north of the development, where cars are exiting a 60mph speed limit when travelling from Long Newton and entering a 30mph limit right on that corner. Site lines are severely restricted. Should the junction for this development be placed anywhere on this stretch of road, then there is a serious accident waiting to happen. The current 30 mph speed limit past Hunters Green is often disregarded or treated with utter contempt. The access to the site will not be safe due to this and the development will result in children and other pedestrians crossing this highway. This results in great risk to highway safety.



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?

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.

There are significant traffic implications for the housing permissions and proposals that exist for the southern part of the borough. Permissions granted include 143 new homes at the Tall Trees, 350 at Morley Carr, 845 at Allens West, 350 at Mount Leven along with a care home as well as the houses proposed by this application and the continuation of house building at Ingleby Barwick. In addition, there is scoping at 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. The highway network cannot cope with this.

The half-hearted attempt to increase the flare at the southern part, which I take to be Tesco's roundabout will not solve anything. As acknowledged by SBC on the first application, the majority of traffic turns right towards Yarm. So this will make hardly any difference and certainly will not mitigate it back to the situation prior to development as planning law dictates.

The closure of the level crossing by network rail was not considered as part of the initial application and needs to be addressed as part of considerations, on matters of highway safety and traffic movements. If the crossing remains open this proposal will result in additional traffic over the crossing resulting in additional risk to highway safety. Traffic congestion at the level crossing will worsen and Long Newton will become a rat run. If the crossing closes then all traffic will be directed towards the roundabout on the A67, further exacerbating congestion at this point and increasing highway safety risk due to the additional vehicles.

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. This village will not welcome the increase in traffic flow either which will cause congestion. 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.

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.

There will be delays in children getting to school, for emergency vehicles and for people generally moving between services.

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.

Survey work is irrelevant when common sense can show that any further development will cause grid lock in the area.

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. Residents have to travel for larger shopping visits due to Eaglescliffe Tesco being limited in size which increases traffic movements.

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. Motorists are becoming impatient and risks are being taken which will cause a serious incident and will involve children as one of the main congestion areas is outside a school which 1400 children attend.

The Highways Agency indicate that Fairhurst have proposed further improvements so that the Urray 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 Urray 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 Urray Nook but also the additional 411 homes on phase 2 of Urray 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.

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.

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.

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*".

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 all the additional homes being approved in this area. Severe adverse weather conditions are happening on a more frequent basis.

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.

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.

The developer is going to subsidise the bus route for 5 years. This is inadequate. What will happen after that as it has already failed?. This site, to be developed, has to be viable and sustainable for the long term, not just for a period to allow TW to get planning passed.

Monies should not be taken for parking in Yarm when there is no approved scheme for it to contribute to.

Pay and display will make no difference to the volume of traffic on our roads. It will also not stop people pressing the traffic lights to cross the road. Stockton Borough Council is naïve if they believe that Pay and Display will solve anything. It will actually create further issues. There will be less spaces available on the High Street under this scheme. A large 30m bay is being allocated for lorries, taking up more of the High Street. However, Boyes needs their deliveries outside of their shop as do the florists. So how will this work? People will still slow down to look for parking spaces even if they are pay and display and visibility of free spaces is very restricted.

The stretch of the A67 west of the proposed development site is an accident black spot, which was closed due to accidents several times last year. The traffic from the A67 was diverted from the A67 past Elementis, across the crossing and past Hunters Green onto the A67. There is no other way that a diversion could be carried out except by sending all of the traffic back through Long Newton, which is what the village will want to avoid at all costs. Also this stretch of the A67 is prone to flooding and is often closed due to this.

Recent situation of a bus breaking down on the approach to the A67/ Tesco roundabout resulted in significant congestion and traffic having to go the wrong way round the roundabout to further their journeys.

### ***Cycle Path comments***

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.

The suggestion is to create a cycle path through Hunters Green to link to Lartington Way and beyond into Eaglescliffe. It is suggested that the cycle path be on-road. Neither Grassholme Way nor Langdon Way 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 submission 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

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 developer should have undertaken surveys for Great Crested Newts at the correct time of the year. This has never been done, even though the know Great Crested Newts are in the ponds at the Old Offices.

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 Clark MP Minister of State to the House of Commons on 27th March 2012. (partial reproduction but verbatim) said .....Our reforms to planning policy have 3 fundamental objectives:

To put unprecedented power in the hands of communities to shape the places in which they live;

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

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:

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; Recognises the intrinsic value and beauty of the countryside (whether specifically designated or not);

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.

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".

Both surveys carried out by EcoNorth were conducted at the wrong time of the year and neither contained the 6 required surveys between March and June of the actual site where the houses will be built, which is within 200m of a pond that contains Great Crested Newts. With newts present to the South and North, the population should be considered as ONE with newts travelling between the habitats

Allowing this development to go ahead will disturb, if not destroy, the natural habitat of over 50 species e.g. badger, bat, owl, cuckoo, woodpecker not to mention the Great Crested Newt. It will negatively impact on the rare breeding birds that are known to use the Elementis Ecology/Admiralty Park. This development is therefore neither environmentally sustainable nor does it follow national or local policy. I object strongly on this basis.

With regard to issues of protecting the environment and the protection and enhancement of biodiversity, the development of this site will neither encourage nor enhance bio-diversity, it would simply destroy areas of natural beauty and habitat. This goes against the National Planning Policy Framework.

The development of this green field site 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 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.

Great Crested Newt surveys were 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.

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 Urray 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 previous 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).

The Urray 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 Urray 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.

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).

### **Education**

Significant parts of peoples objections relate to the perceived lack of school places to serve the development and the problems that occur if provision either cannot be made, or the timing of provisions relative to demand, with the net result of overcrowding, poorer standards of schooling, children being bussed out of the immediate area for schooling etc. Objectors consider this will affect parental choice, catchment zones, the ability for siblings to follow on from one another or be attending the same school at the same time which raises logistical issues.

Residents consider primary schools and secondary schools are already at capacity, some suggest that Egglecliffe Comprehensive is already over capacity and that when Allens West comes on line, primary schools will also be over capacity. Question is raised as to where do senior aged children go to school from Allens West and Urlay Nook.

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.

Stockton Borough Council accepted that their equation for calculating school places from a development underestimates the situation and have had to use another figure.

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 Egglescliffe as there will be a shortage of secondary places by the end of 2012/13?

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 Urray Nook.

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 Egglescliffe (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 Urray Nook (even just the phase 1. 159 homes).

c) If further expansion of housing i.e. phase 2 Urray 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?

The numbers of children are increasing in Egglescliffe without further development. We need to ensure that we accommodate the children that are already living in Egglescliffe first before considering bringing in additional children from new developments.

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

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

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 Egglescliffe. 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?

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. 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 Egglescliffe will have a further detrimental effect on dentists, doctors, the health centre and other services. These are already fully subscribed with there being already difficulties in getting appointments. When Allens West is built this will be made worse and further housing will add to this.

There are no free places at the doctors nor dentists in Eaglescliffe. Already residents are forced to attend surgeries in Middleton-St-George, Stockton and Yarm.

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.

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.

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

There is a lack of sports facilities such as swimming pool etc.

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.

### ***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 developed. Where will the water run off go.

Concern is that this situation will deteriorate as the clay sub soil is disturbed when building commences.

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.

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 where noise from operations will cause noise pollution.

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/m<sup>3</sup>, 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/m<sup>3</sup> ( the highest reading being on the 15/01/2012 at 583mgm/m<sup>3</sup>), 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.

In the planning application accompanying documents, Northumbrian Water utilised the main Met Office site at Loftus to determine our climate and air pollution levels at Urlay Nook. Loftus is 20 miles as the crow flies from Urlay Nook and has a different micro climate. The nearest Met Office site is actually at Teesside Airport and would have been far more relevant to use as a comparison. Loftus is neither a comparable nor appropriate weather station to use. This point

was raised in the initial objections yet Taylor Wimpey has failed to address this and produce relevant results from a local weather station. Therefore, any information submitted with regards to this by the developer is null and void.

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.

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 NO<sub>2</sub> 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 NO<sub>2</sub> 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 Urray 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 Urray 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.

Why has soil testing not been undertaken at the site. Only a soil testing of the Elementis pipe line has been undertaken. To the north west of the site chemicals have been produced for almost 200 years and air-borne pollution could have been affecting the site for many years. Have we not learnt from recent mistakes.

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.

We object to this proposed development, we live adjacent to Urray 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 Urray 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, Urray 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.

Urray 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.

### ***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***

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. 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, 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. 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**

The proposed development would not support a strong and vibrant community, will not meet the housing needs of present and future generations and will only add to the overdevelopment of the Yarm area.

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.

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.

Please respect the extensive number of objections .

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: Urlay Nook

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.

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.

If the development are phased 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.

Anti-social 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.

The Police Training centre use firearms etc and this will raise a safety issue for children wandering in the land around the centre.

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.

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

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.

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 Uraly 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:

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

### ***Stockton on Tees Core Strategy Policy 1 (CS1) – The Spatial Strategy***

Priority will be given to previously developed land in the Core Area to meet the Borough's housing requirement. Particular emphasis will be given to projects that will help to deliver the Stockton Middlesbrough Initiative and support Stockton Town Centre.

The remainder of housing development will be located elsewhere within the conurbation, with priority given to sites that support the regeneration of Stockton, Billingham and Thornaby. The role of Yarm as a historic town and a destination for more specialist shopping needs will be protected.

### ***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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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.
7. 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.
8. 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 6 (CS6) – Community Facilities**

1. Priority will be given to the provision of facilities that contribute towards the sustainability of communities. In particular, the needs of the growing population of Ingleby Barwick should be catered for.
2. 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 Supplementary Planning Document.

**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***

3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.

6. 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.
7. Joint working with partners and developers will ensure the successful creation of an integrated network of green infrastructure.
8. 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.
9. The enhancement of forestry and increase of tree cover will be supported where appropriate in line with the Tees Valley Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP).
10. 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.
11. 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**

14. The scheme is an outline application with only the approval of 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 of the development. Information has been submitted relative to an indicative site layout, drainage, tree reports, archaeological survey work, transport assessment soil testing, ecology and other matters. It is appropriate to consider these at this stage in order to demonstrate that the development is likely to be achievable subject to 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 are limited to their individual purposes (access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) and cannot seek to control new matters.
15. 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 and emerging policies.

***Principle of Residential Development***

16. The northern part of the application site is where the residential development is proposed, being located within the defined limits of development (appendix 4) and within the Yarm, Eaglescliffe and Preston Housing sub division.
17. The application site is 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). The site is not Green Wedge as suggested by some objectors and there are no specific safeguarding designations for the site.
18. 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.*
19. 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 considered to be in accordance with criteria (i), (ii) & (iii) of Policy HO3. Criteria (iv), (v) & (vi) are subjective criteria and considered elsewhere within this report.
20. Objectors consider the scheme is contrary to Core Strategy Development Plan Policy CS10(3) which requires separation between settlements including between Eaglescliffe and Middleton St George although as detailed on the Core Strategy Strategic Diagram (Appendix ref. 5) this site is not within the strategic gap which instead lies to the west of this site.
21. The Council is currently going through the plan led approach of allocating housing land, being at the 'preferred options' stage with formal allocation of sites 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. 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, 350 at Morley Carr in Yarm, up to 370 at Greens Lane, 143 houses at Tall Trees and 350 at Mount Leven along with a 100 bed care home, 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. The current proposal would further add to this. A significant number of objections reflect on this situation, suggesting that the principle of development is contrary to the NPPF and to the Councils Core Strategy Development Plan in respect to the need for housing in this area. Objectors indicate the site for 999 dwellings at North Shore is presently not viable which shows that developers are not proceeding with developments at the present time because of the decline in house prices, and are building land banks for use when prices and profits rise, indicating that a report to the AGM of Taylor Wimpey plc on April 25<sup>th</sup> 2013 showed an increase in Strategic Land plots 2011 to 2012. Objectors consider that this banking of approvals has an obvious effect on the 5 Year Housing Supply calculation and is outside of the control of Stockton Borough Council.
22. 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.

23. 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 under Policy H1(b). 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. Furthermore, due to the number of objections to the policies only limited weight can be attached to these policies.
24. The conflict with the existing Core Strategy Policy is detailed within resident's objections which take account other schemes in Yarm and Eaglescliffe. Notwithstanding this conflict, consideration must be given to the NPPF which 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. The NPPF further advises 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 the latest quarterly update of the five year supply of deliverable housing sites uses a base date of 30<sup>th</sup> September 2013. This is being reported to the 13<sup>th</sup> November 2013 Planning Committee and shows that the Borough has a 4.23 year supply of deliverable housing sites using a 20% buffer. This 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 and that its conflict with the housing based policy CS7 should not be relied upon.
25. 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.
26. 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. The Core Planning Principles of the NPPF (para.17) advise *'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. These matters add some weight in favour of the proposal.

27. 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 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 being achieved.

2010/2011	74.31%
2011/2012	79.58%

28. 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. 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. Importantly, Policy CS7 does not preclude development on green field sites and this development would therefore not be in conflict with this policy, particularly as the lack of a 5 year supply renders it out of date.

29. Comments were previously raised 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. The principle of industry is supported by Policy, however, the airport has its own business park approved which would be able to accommodate significant airport related business.

30. 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.

31. Objectors consider the scheme is contrary to emerging Policy SP1 of the Core Strategy Local Development Document which is at the preferred options stage as this seeks to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area and they consider that this development does not fit with this criteria. The housing development will boost the economy through the construction phase and new residents will assist in boosting the local economy of the area. The affordable housing being provided within the scheme would assist in fulfilling the social role. The environmental implications are considered within the remainder of this report.

***Principle of scale of housing in Yarm, Eaglescliffe and Preston***

32. 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 associated buffers 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 support the principle of residential development on this site should be taken.

33. 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, these however are not relevant to the consideration of this scheme which has to be considered on its own merits. Should any further residential developments be put forward, these would have to be considered against policy at the time of their submission.
34. The developer has indicated that the site would be built out at a rate of 40 – 50 units per year although residents are concerned that approving this scheme will not increase housing delivery but instead allow developers to land bank and that it is therefore an unnecessary permission. The council do not control developers build out rates which are more market led and the decision making process has to be a precursor to development occurring. This objection is somewhat speculative and does not outweigh the need for the councils to provide a deliverable 5 year supply of housing.
35. 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. A wide range of provision is needed to meet a 5 year supply and assists with it being a balanced provision which the delivery of solely core brownfield sites such as Mandale, Hardwick and Parkfield may not achieve. Whilst objectors desire to resist development of green field sites is understood, the development of green field sites as well as brownfield sites such as Queens Park North, Boat House Lane and North shore 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.
36. Objectors indicate that in the authorities own 2011 housing survey there is an indication that there is a 23% surplus of supply over demand in the Yarm, Eaglescliffe and Preston area. The council's review of general market supply and demand is detailed in the 2012 Strategic Housing Market Assessment (which references a 2011 survey). This showed that supply and demand are balanced in the Yarm, Preston and Eaglescliffe housing sub division apart from bungalows, 4+ bedroom and detached properties where demand exceeds supply and for flats where supply considerably exceeds demand. This has to be understood in the context that the Borough's housing requirement is Borough-wide and that sites that deliver that requirement have to be deliverable and that the very strong interest from the development industry in sites in this area suggests a strong level of market demand. The matter remains that the council does not have a 5 year Borough wide housing supply.
37. Objectors cite developers making more money from sites such as this and the council benefitting from the New Home Bonus with suggestion that the New Homes Bonus should be used to ease the developments on the brownfield sites and therefore prevent the need for the green field sprawl which objectors are requesting a stop to as it can never be reversed. Whilst noted, the council's spending and funding regimes are not material in determining this application which has to be based on current matters.

***The part of the application site out-with the Limits of Development***

38. The previous scheme proposed a Sustainable Urban Drainage Scheme (SUDS) on the land to the south of the A67, locally known as Ellif's Mill. Taking into account concern over this, the applicant has removed this from their scheme, with drainage matters intended to be dealt with on the northern part of the site. The land at Ellifs Mill remains to be within the overall application site although the applicant now intends to only carry out an ecological

enhancement scheme on this area. Specific works to undertake an ecological enhancement scheme may not require planning permission in their own right although these works have been welcomed generally as they will contribute to the mitigation against development impacts to the northern part of the site. The requirement for the ecological enhancement scheme is detailed within the Heads of Terms.

***Indicative Site Layout & Landscape Assessment / Masterplan***

39. The indicative site layout shows the residential development being undertaken on the northern part of the site. As residential development is not suitable on the southern part of the site, a condition is recommended to clarify this. To the north of the A67 the indicative layout shows 145 properties, a 0.7ha area of open space and landscape areas to the periphery of the site which in part reflects the presence of existing easements for underground pipes. There is a single point of vehicular access off Uraly 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.
40. The indicative site layout 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 off street parking and private garden areas.
41. 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, thereby encouraging recreational use of the surrounding area and better links with the existing urban area. The footpaths retention is welcomed.
42. 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. Although the indicative layout retains the peripheral hedgerows, which is positive, officers consider that the overall indicative site layout would benefit from several changes which can be dealt with at Reserved Matters Stage.
43. There are trees and hedges within the site which could be valuable assets to the final layout and an informative is recommended to detail this matter and which will then inform the landscaping reserved matters.
44. The submission indicatively indicates 12 different house types 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 indicative 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. Any 3 storey properties would benefit for the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor being provided within roof space although these matters will be considered as part of the reserved matters submissions. Although objectors have suggested that the development has a poor mix of properties and should include provision for bungalows it is considered that a wide mix of property types is being indicated and although adding bungalows would further improve this, it is considered to not be essential.
45. Objectors comments suggest sufficient space for children to play should be achieved and that the public open space should be securely fenced from the A67. These points would be

given due consideration at Reserved Matters Stage although the existing layout is considered to sufficiently demonstrate that this could be achieved. The Head of Technical Services has suggested moving the Public Right of Way within the site to achieve better spacing from the A67 which would also act as a natural break between the open space and the buffer area from the A67. Whilst not essential, this change would be welcomed.

46. 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***

47. 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 significant impacts and therefore development should only be refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe. This reference to severe residual impacts is considered to be 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;
48. *“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”.*
49. 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 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. Objectors further consider that the layout of the existing highway network makes it impossible for any significant road enhancement schemes to be undertaken and only tweaks can be achieved which are insufficient to make any notable improvements to the existing traffic problems, or in deed the additional impacts as a result of this and other recently approved schemes.
50. The Highways Agency (HA) have raised no objections to the scheme which provides for some mitigation works at the roundabout at the Elton Interchange.
51. The Head of Technical Services has reviewed submission documentation and has no highway objections to the scheme subject to mitigation measures being agreed in detail and implemented in order to mitigate its impacts which itself is considered only to have limited impacts in any case. In reaching this conclusion, the HoTS has noted and advised the following;
- The Transport Assessment provides for more properties than are detailed for the site, thereby providing an over estimation of impacts,
  - One access is proposed into the site, along a 30mph stretch of road which has been demonstrated as being able to provide appropriate visibility splays for the new junction.

- An existing PRow runs through the site which can be retained and re-aligned if required to gain benefits to the overall scheme,
- The PRow surface should be improved to provide for the additional use and make it suitable as an all-weather surface.
- New pedestrian and cycle links would be incorporated into the development to provide attractive links with community facilities. This would include a crossing on Uray Nook Road.
- Suitable parking will need to be provided within the final layout.
- Matters of refuse collection and auto-tracking will need to be provided with the final layout.
- Traffic surveys were conducted by the Highway Authority and by the applicant (out-with school holidays and when all roads were open), the findings have similar results to those conducted by the applicant,
- The results show that in the peaks of traffic using Uray Nook Road are generally below half or just above half of the capacity indicated as being suitable for this road type within the Design Manual for Roads.
- Queue length data submitted indicates a maximum queue length of 15 vehicles within the morning peak and is supported by a statement indicating that junction analysis cannot be expected to account for short term spikes in queuing.
- Based on the findings, the proposed development does not appear to significantly worsen the situation at the A67/Durham Lane junction.
- The proposal would mitigate the impact of traffic on the Durham Lane / A66 Elton Interchange.
- The A67/ Uray Nook Road Junction are forecast to operate with spare capacity in future years.
- Journey times through Yarm High Street would increase by 14 seconds southbound and 48 seconds northbound in the morning peak and 9 seconds and 46 seconds respectively in the evening peak. These are considered to be marginal increases.

52. In order to mitigate the schemes impacts, the HoTS has requested the following;

- A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit be undertaken;
- Contribution towards the improvement of existing cycle ways,
- A Construction Management Plan be provided to limit the impact of construction works on the highway;
- The provision of a full travel plan to encourage sustainable transport modes.
- Elton Interchange Improvement works
- Off street parking in Yarm High Street
- Travel Plan
- Bus Service and bus stop improvement works
- Pedestrian Facilities
- Cycle Facilities

53. A scenario was undertaken whereby all committed development in the area, their associated highways works mitigations and all the traffic from this proposed development was moved through the junction. This was found to not significantly worsen queuing. The HoTS accepts that the A67/ Durham Lane Junction may have notable peaks, these are short term and evidence provided suggests that this development would not have a severe impact which would warrant a highway objection.

54. Matters of final layout / road widths / footpath provisions are all matters which would be dealt with at reserved matters stage.

55. Whilst there is considerable objection to traffic impacts, in view of the assessments and associated testing that has been undertaken, it is considered that, subject to mitigation, this scheme would not unduly impact on the surrounding highway network and the proposed development 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 these regards.

56. Although not detailed within the TA, officers consider the scheme will place a demand on parking in Yarm Town Centre, the ratio of which has been derived from the Allen's West development. This indicates a demand for an additional 7 spaces to be provided close to Yarm High Street as a fully operational long-stay spaces. This is required to be provided by the applicant prior to the occupation of the 10<sup>th</sup> dwelling, or by way of a contribution paid to the Local Authority. Objectors consider that there is no certainty of parking within Yarm being able to be provided and this mitigation may therefore not be able to be provided. Whilst there is no approved scheme of parking within Yarm at the moment, it is not unreasonable for the authority to take a contribution to mitigate an impact. Furthermore, in line with the NPPF, the application should only be refused if the impacts are significant and cannot be mitigated. The impacts of traffic from this scheme are considered to not be significant and as such were parking not to be achieved, this in itself would not warrant refusal of the scheme in view of the lack of a 5 year housing supply carrying significant weight.
57. 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 as well as cycle parking in Yarm. The S106 Agreement and conditions allow for these which is in line with the principles of Core Strategy Development Plan Policy CS2 and the NPPF. Network Rail have suggested that given the size and proximity of the development in relation to the railway the developer could provide cycle stands at Allens West station in order to encourage sustainable transport. Whilst this is not an essential requirement, such a provision would further improve the schemes sustainability and provision of this can be dealt with through the travel plan required by condition.
58. The HoTS has advised that pedestrian crossing facilities should be improved on Urray 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 and CSDP principles of mitigating impacts of traffic.
59. Significant local objection is made in respect to the way in which footways and cycle routes are used, their safety and their effectiveness. It has been pointed out that the problems of pinch points for cyclists at Yarm Bridge and the contours of land in and out of Yarm 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 noted, there are persons who can navigate such routes and Yarm would be only one of many destinations for cycle users from the site. It therefore remains to be considered that the provision of improved cycle routes and facilities will assist the development in reducing dependency on the private motor car.
60. Residents strongly believe that the proposal will significantly worsen the existing traffic problems which residents consider to be already unacceptable due to waiting times and traffic queue lengths (extent of concerns detailed within publicity section). Resident's indicate their journey times as being up to 1 hour for a short 3 to 6 mile journey when traffic is busy and when they have to navigate areas such as the Tesco roundabout in Eaglescliffe, the Cleveland Bay junction and Yarm High Street. 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 photographs have demonstrated that there are times when traffic backs up at these and other locations in the vicinity of the site. Notwithstanding these concerns, the Council have to consider the impacts and the ability for a development to mitigate where appropriate. Residents are citing existing traffic congestion with some suggesting that this proposal should mitigate this although such an approach would not pass the test of reasonableness which is required for all planning obligations, agreements and conditions. A number of concerns over congestion also refer to ad-hoc occurrences such as flooding of highways and vehicles breaking down in traffic whereby significant congestion resulted. These are likely to cause problems during any peak traffic and being only occasional unpredictable occurrences, should not be relied upon to determine the suitability of this scheme.

61. 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 as providing alternative options. 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 and conditions, it is the opinion of the HoTS that 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.
62. With regards to the indicative layout and access, the Head of Technical Services considers that the access is suitably located and that it and the nearby A67 / Uraly Nook Road roundabout could accommodate the development traffic with both junctions operating with plentiful spare capacity in future years. The revised indicative plan shows a 30m buffer from the A67 and open space thereafter which 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.
  - An additional crossing point (dropped kerbs and tactile paving) on Uraly Nook Road would improve connections to the south-east and should be provided.
  - The applicant is asked to contribute towards cycleway improvements as outlined in the Travel Plan comments.
63. The site is located within reasonable close proximity to a wide range of services including education, employment, retail and 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.
64. Suitable levels of parking are generally demonstrated and would need to form part of a Reserved Matters submission to be considered in detail.

65. Objectors have advised that speed limits in the Hunters Green area are disregarded and that although the site access is within a 30mph limit people retain higher speeds from the 60mph zone further along Urlay Nook Road. The Head of Technical services has indicated that adequate visibility splays can be achieved at the site for the road type whilst the junction is at a point along Urlay Nook Road where traffic would be either building speed from the nearby roundabout or starting to reduce speed on approach to the roundabout. Further to this the access into the existing housing estate is positioned closer to the change between the 30mph and 60mph zones. In view of all these matters, it is considered that a suitable access could be achieved for the site without unduly compromising highway safety.
66. Objectors cite problems for emergency vehicles navigating the congested roads which is a common problem in any peak time traffic congestion and will already be a factor of these local roads. Further concern is raised that traffic to the airport may also struggle and therefore have its viability affected. 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. Objectors, including Long Newton Parish Council have raised concern that the scheme will result in additional traffic through Long Newton as residents seek uncongested routes, however, if journey times are not expected to change significantly then 'rat runs' are not anticipated to increase unproportionately and any such activity would therefore have a marginal impact.
67. The Transport Assessment forecasts a very low level of bus usage, attributable to there being no operational service which runs along Urlay Nook Road. The applicant has indicated that they will subsidise the extension of the existing local X6 bus service to provide a stop within close proximity to the site which is considered to be close enough to the development to form a viable form of transport and also provide for existing residents in the area. The provision of this bus service (hourly during normal work hours including weekends) is welcomed as it will support the long term principles of the travel plan. Confirmation of this provision is required and in providing this, improvements would be required to the bus stops. These matters are dealt with within the S106 Agreement. Objectors consider that the 5 year provision is of limited benefit and question what will happen in 5 years once the subsidy is removed. Whilst officers cannot predict the future situation, should the service be well used then it is assumed that the bus company would retain the service although clearly, were it to not be used then it may be at risk, although retaining a service which is not used is not sustainable in its own right.
68. Concern is raised about safety for pedestrians and school children using local footpaths / highways and having to cross Urlay Nook Road. As there would be a crossing provided and additional traffic numbers are not significant, it is considered that pedestrian safety would not worsen as a result of this proposal.
69. 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.
70. 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 common place situation.
71. Several 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.

72. Objectors suggest 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 and 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.
73. Objection has been raised against the way in which the traffic modelling and more recent traffic counts have been undertaken, suggesting these are questionable and should not form the basis for considerations. Whilst noted, these have been done to the satisfaction of the Head of Technical Services and are therefore considered to be fit for purpose.
74. Concern has been raised by objectors over the possible future closure of a section of Urlay Nook Road due to the closure of the Level crossing. Were this to occur, access to the site would rely solely on the A67 / Urlay Nook Roundabout which it is already anticipated would be the main point of access. Network Rail are aware of the need for them to undertake a full transport assessment to review the implications of such a closure and mitigation for the closure may be required. Survey information shows that very few trips from the existing housing estate on Urlay Nook Road go via the rail crossing and this would be likely to be the same for the proposed site. The redistribution of such small numbers is considered to have limited impact whilst part of the assessment already makes an assumption that all traffic moves via the Tesco roundabout (A67/Durham Lane Junction). Further to this, it could not be justified that the applicant of this current scheme provide for the possibility of the rail crossing closing as this would not be their impact and there is no certainty it would occur.
75. Were the crossing to remain open, objectors consider the additional traffic using it will increase risk to highway safety. Whilst noted, expected traffic numbers using the crossing from this development are considered to be particularly limited and should therefore not have any significant impacts on highway safety as a result.
76. Objections are raised over the difference in highway contributions for the industrial scheme approved under 08/0241/OUT for the adjacent site and this current application. The schemes are different, on different sites, with different impacts / traffic movements. Different considerations therefore apply.

### ***Open Space***

77. 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.
78. 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.
79. 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. The scheme has detailed incidental green space to the northern, eastern and southern site boundaries along with a 0.7ha area of usable amenity green space shown in the south western corner of the site, with a 30m



buffer from the A67. These are indicative, however they are considered to demonstrate that an adequate amount of open space can be provided.

80. 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 and suitable 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. The HoTS has 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.
81. 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 these into account it is considered that there is no need for further provision off site open space.
82. 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.
83. Sport England has advised that they do not wish to comment on the application.
84. 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 these would be dealt with by condition and the Heads of Terms.

### ***Affordable Housing***

85. Core Strategy Policy CS8 (5) requires new major housing developments of 15 dwellings or more to provide affordable housing within a target range of 15-20%. The Councils Housing Strategy Team have advised that the 2012 Tees Valley Strategic Housing Market Assessment identifies an annual affordable housing requirement of 560 dwellings for the borough and includes an annual requirement for the Yarm, Preston and Eaglescliffe housing sub-division of 97 dwellings. The Councils Spatial Plans Manager considers that it is clearly not realistic to meet this 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 and not ceilings and significant contributions to the annual target will be achieved if applicants for this type of site provide affordable housing at the higher end of the target rate. Officers previously requested a 20% provision of affordable housing for the site and the applicant has retained this provision, with the intention of this being provided on site and achieved through a Section 106 Agreement as detailed in the Heads of Terms.
86. The Head of Housing has indicated need for affordable housing to be provided as 30% intermediate and 70% rented tenures suggesting a high priority be given to smaller houses and bungalows. The Heads of Terms sets out the requirements for affordable housing.
87. Objectors 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***

88. 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. In order to consider drainage constraints and solutions for the site a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and Drainage Assessment has been undertaken.
89. The proposed residential part of the site is located within Flood Zone 1 which renders the site suitable for development of all types (in flood risk terms) and as such meets the aim of Core Strategy Plan Policy CS10. The initially proposed scheme sought to provide a water detention basin (pond) to the south of the A67 although following that application being refused at committee, the applicant no longer proposes to develop this part of the site. Instead, the proposal now intends attenuate the surface water on site to the appropriate run off rate and then discharge it to the public surface water sewer which in turn leads to Nelly Burdon's Beck.
90. Northumbrian Water have noted the proposed flow for surface water and have indicated that they have not agreed to a surface water connection as yet and therefore suggest a suitable condition be imposed to agree a surface water drainage scheme for the site. The Environment Agency has similarly raised no objections to the proposed development and also recommends that a condition be imposed in respect to surface water drainage.
91. Notwithstanding the above, there has been significant objection in respect to 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 and elsewhere. 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 Head of Technical Services considers that the development of the site and the provision of a drainage scheme designed in accordance with current standards is likely to alleviate standing water problems.
92. The HoTS has advised that Nelly Burdon's Beck is an ordinary water course which has significant flooding issues down-stream of the proposed development site, including internal property flooding, therefore, any discharge rate to Nelly Burdon's Beck must be restricted to mitigate against flooding. A condition is recommended to achieve a suitable surface water drainage scheme and discharge rates from the site which will allow the development to not increase the risk of surface water run off on the surrounding environment.

93. The applicant has advised that foul sewerage would be disposed of via the existing foul sewer arrangement. Northumbrian Water previously 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 this current proposal in respect to foul water discharge.
94. Northumbrian Water have advised that the site is crossed by a 15" (375mm) Trunk Water Main and they 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. Working care around the water main is the responsibility of the developer and rather than imposing a condition to address this matter, it is considered appropriate to deal with this by providing an informative to the decision which advises the applicant of the presence of the water main.
95. Network Rail have requested that all surface and foul water arising from the proposed works must be collected and diverted away from Network Rail property and soak-aways must be located so as to discharge away from the railway infrastructure. A detailed scheme would be provided via condition although every indication at this stage is that drainage would be to public sewer at the opposite end of the site to the railway line. The final surface drainage scheme can take these points into account.

### ***Archaeology***

96. The application has been accompanied by an archaeological desk based assessment and field evaluation in the form of a geomagnetic survey. Tees Archaeology previously considered these reports which indicated that a number of anomalies consistent with archaeological features existed within the site. 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. The applicant undertook trial trenching as part of the previous application, the report to which confirmed the results of the earlier interim report that an Iron Age and Romano-British settlement survives in a discrete area of the site. Tees Archaeology previously requested a condition be imposed requiring a record to be made of the heritage asset. The same request has been made in respect to this current application. This is an approach 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. This approach 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.
97. Objectors have raised concerns over the impact of the scheme on archaeology and on the timing of requests being made within the previous application for trial trenching / evidence to be provided. In view of information provided and the advice from Tees Archaeology, it is considered that adequate account has been taken for Archaeology on the site.

### ***Loss of Agricultural Land***

98. The loss of agricultural land has been raised as an objection to the development, considering brownfield sites exist which would be more suitable and that as a nation we are not self-sufficient and rely on many imports suggesting that 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. Objectors also consider that insufficient work has been undertaken to establish the actual grading of the land classification, thereby it being unclear as to its actual value.

99. 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.' In this context, this site is considered to be of a relatively limited scale.
100. Best and most versatile agricultural land is defined as land in grades 1, 2 and 3a of the Agricultural Land Classification (ALC). 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. This has not been undertaken for this site and reliance is therefore placed on the pre 1988 maps as provisionally being Grade 3 although, this cannot be relied on for accuracy 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.
101. Notwithstanding this circumstance, many objectors indicate that this land regularly floods which is likely to affect its ability to be actively farmed, it is also split by hedgerows and a Public Right of Way. 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 become a relatively small piece of agricultural land separated from surrounding swathes. In view of the limited scale of the site, surrounding constraints and the land being within the defined limits of development, it is considered that its loss would at worst to have a negligible impact. No site specific testing to establish the grade of the land is therefore requested.

#### ***Education Provision***

102. 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 highlights a need for housing developments to contribute towards the provision of school places in circumstances where there is insufficient 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.
103. There has been significant objection to the development based on the perceived lack of existing capacity within the nearby schools and suggestions that the provision of additional spaces needs to be made prior to the development occurring. Were provision of spaces to be made prior to a development being approved, then there would be no requirement for developments to contribute to spaces and capacity would already exist, thereby burdening the Local Authority with these costs.
104. Objections raised suggest that primary schools are already at capacity and Egglecliffe 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 generated by this scheme would therefore have to be transported elsewhere for school places. Objectors suggest that there is a difference between stating funds will be made available for places and actually providing classrooms and the school places, being concerned that approving further housing development will leave schools over stretched which will in turn result in poorer schooling. Objections suggest that the council has in the

past, approved housing and then had to 'ship' the children to schools further afield which have capacity.

105. The Councils Education Strategy Manager has responded to the consultation exercise, indicating that there are available spaces at primary schools and very limited capacity at secondary schools in the catchment for the site and therefore recommends that the applicant be required to sign up to the standard formula for the provision of both primary and secondary school places. Notwithstanding this, it is anticipated that the Free School at Ingleby will move forward and provide secondary school places within the local area, thereby freeing up spaces at the Eaglescliffe schools, particularly as a notable percentage of children in Egglecliffe Comprehensive are from Ingleby. The requirement for the applicant to sign up to the secondary school contribution is therefore being done as a precautionary measure, taking into account the council not having control over whether the free school becomes operational or its success rate at attracting students. This is a different approach to the earlier scheme for Urray Nook which sought a contribution to only primary school places although the Planning Committee refused the previous application on three grounds, one of which was due to there being a significant degree of uncertainty in ensuring the provision of adequate places within local schools to support the anticipated demands from the proposed development. Officers accept that there has been significant changes in the way in which funding for schools improvements is made, the availability of funding and that the choices that parents have also affects matters. The councils influence over all matters impacting on school places is therefore limited and as such uncertainties are unavoidable as there is a changing situation year by year. However, it is not appropriate for uncertainty to prevent any further development taking place if appropriate provisions can be made. By requiring the applicant to sign up to providing contributions for both primary and secondary school places, should they be necessary, adequate provision can be made. Further to this, for secondary schools, providing places out-with the catchment could free up school places within the catchment by allowing children within other catchments to have alternatives. Various options therefore become available and the council needs the flexibility to spend the monies to provide the number places at the most appropriate location to the address the needs of the development. Allowing a flexible approach to where the monies are spent is considered to be necessary.

106. Objectors are 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 advice is that adequate spaces will be provided through a strategic approach.

### ***Ecology***

107. 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. 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.

108. 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. Additional information was submitted.

### **Assessment of impacts on Great Crested Newts**

109. The application has been supported by an Ecological Assessment Summary dated July 2013 in order to deal with matters relating to ecology and ornithology. This includes the Great Crested Newt Survey Risk Assessment and Protected Species Management Plan. The submission indicates that there are two distinct areas of the site, the land to the south of the A67 where the SUDS scheme was previously being proposed and the land to the north of the A67 where the housing is proposed. The supporting documents conclude that the land where the housing is proposed is limited in its value for wildlife with the only moderately valuable habitat being the hedgerows which would be retained in part and enhanced by the scheme. The land to the south of the A67 was moderate to high in ecological value, however, the development of the SUDS pond on this land is no longer being proposed, instead, the applicant is proposing to undertake an ecological enhancement scheme in this area by way of small scale, terrestrial enhancements for Great Crested Newts which it is indicated would be developed at a detailed design stage in consultation with Tees Valley Wildlife Trust.
110. The submission considers the newts to the north of the site and those to the south are not from the same meta population, meaning that newts are unlikely to interact between the two sites and the application site is therefore not a commuting route between ponds for newts. It is further indicated that the habitat of the development site is not optimal for Great Crested Newts. Based on this, the method statement approach put forward is for the retention of peripheral hedges along with a 5m buffer. The submission indicates that there are no ponds on the area of the proposed dwellings, although a small marshy habitat exists to the north west corner of the site which most likely becomes inundated in wet spells, however, the applicants ecologist considers that this is not suitable to support a sustainable breeding population of Great Crested Newts which require habitat throughout the year.
111. The latest submission details all of the nearby ponds known and those with Great Crested Newts present. Breeding ponds for Great Crested Newts are shown to the north of the site beyond Urray Nook Road and the Railway Line, and to the south, beyond the A67. There is only one pond indicated on land near to the application site (which is not separated from the site by a highway or similar, and the submission indicates that there is no evidence of Great Crested Newts using this pond for breeding which itself lies approximately 200m from the application site, with farm land in between. The ecologist has undertaken a two part assessment of the proposed housing site which factors in the local knowledge and the fact that there is no breeding ponds on this side of the roads and due to connectivity or lack of between the site and breeding ponds. They consider that at most the development of the site would cause a minor offence to Great Crested Newts. The ecological survey highlights Natural England's advice (2012) that *Great Crested Newts tend to be present at increasingly low density the further one looks from breeding ponds and the task of detecting and capturing them becomes more problematic. Additionally, Natural England states "impacts beyond the core area have little or no tangible impact on the viability of populations. Mitigation is of questionable value in conservation terms"*.
112. 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 the works would not interfere with the wider GCN population. 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.
113. In response to the consultation exercise, Natural England noted 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,

114. 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.

115. Having reviewed the Ecological Assessments Summary, Tees Valley Wildlife Trust consider a complete picture to have been given for the application site in respect to ecology and has no objection to the scheme although has noted that the timing of vegetation clearance to protect amphibians may conflict with the breeding bird season. This is noted and there are methods of containing sites or features, such as newt fencing around a site or netting over hedgerows which can be placed at the appropriate time of the year to allow works into the more ecologically sensitive seasons. A condition is recommended which requires such a scheme to be submitted to and agreed with the Local Authority.

116. Tees Valley Wildlife Trust have also recommended that the applicants proposed ecological enhancement scheme for the Eliffs Mill part of the site to the south of the A67 should be further detailed and agreed. This is detailed within the Heads of Terms.

117. There has been significant local 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. Objectors advise that insufficient newt surveys were undertaken and were not conducted at the right times of year and results are likely to be inaccurate. Objectors consider that newts could travel between ponds, that there are newts at the nearby pond to the site and that the development will cause injury or kill this protected species. 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 Urray Nook could contravene all three of these factors.

118. The site is not within a flood zone, does not have a newt pond within it and is not a local wildlife site and as such would not contravene these points. Further to this, the council have specialist independent advice from both Natural England and Tees Valley Wildlife Trust that raise no objections to the scheme subject to conditions / control being achieved. Officers have seen no evidence to suggest that there is undue risk to Great Crested Newts and therefore have no reason to recommend anything other than this scheme be agreed subject to the mitigation required. It is considered that retaining a reason for refusal as placed on the initial application could therefore not be substantiated.

119. Objectors raised concern over the difference in impacts on Great Crested Newts for the industrial scheme approved under 08/0241/OUT for the adjacent site and this current application. The industrial scheme affected different land, in closer proximity to a pond where Great Crested Newts are known to exist. The knowledge of this pond and earlier findings have been taken in to account in considering this current proposal.

120. Whilst the objections are noted, 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.

***Assessment of impacts of wildlife – excluding Great crested Newts***

121. The Ecological Assessment Summary details the Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey and the breeding bird survey report which suggest breeding birds on the developable part of the site are sparse, limited to more common species and those present are nesting within the hedgerows, woodland and scrub which is generally found around the edges of the site. The removal of some hedgerows within the site would affect the potential for breeding birds although any hedgerows to be removed can be done at a time of year out-with the breeding season. Other hedgerows can be retained within the site layout with new hedgerows being provided to supplement the overall landscaping scheme for the site. The applicant's ecologist has assessed the development site as having a value to breeding birds which is less than one of local importance.
122. 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.
123. The applicant has taken account of objector's previous comments to the earlier application about certain species of rare birds using the site and as such a further survey was carried out along with an assessment of data provided from Teesmouth Bird Club. The submitted results indicate that the data search undertaken with Teesmouth Bird Club illustrates areas lying to the north of the site comprising of Allens West (Elementis), Coatham wood, Carter moor and Coatham Stob are of relatively high interest for birds throughout different stages of the year. At Urray Nook itself some key species recorded include quail, barn owl and long eared owl. It is noted however that within the site boundary itself at Urray Nook there are no opportunities for barn owl breeding and very limited suitable habitat (tall hawthorns) for breeding long eared owl. The record of quail breeding at Urray nook in 2009 has some potential significance however this migratory species is not site faithful and birds breed at varying site's and in varying numbers each year. Avoidance of timing of any construction work during the breeding season should avoid of any effects on breeding quail.
124. The applicants survey work 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 and 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. Evidence was seen of foxes although there was no evidence of badger or reptiles with limited foraging / habitat for these species.
125. 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,

126. Natural England have advised the Local Authority that their comments to the previous application still stand. No objection is raised and the Local Planning Authority are recommended to use Natural England's standing advice to assess the impact on species. Tees Valley Wildlife Trust have raised no objections to the scheme although recommend ecological enhancement works be undertaken and that further detail be provided in respect to the timing of works relevant to ecologically sensitive seasons. Conditions are recommended accordingly. Teesmouth Bird club were consulted on the application although no response has been received.

127. Natural England's standing advice leads to a view being taken that there is limited potential for species on site due to its habitat and there is the ability to provide mitigation. The landscape corridors can in the main be retained or where not being retained, replaced with native species landscaping. Subject to the final site layout being agreed, notable provision could be made to allow the site to retain habitat corridors and links to the wider areas. In view of this, subject to suitable ecological enhancement, mitigation and landscaping works taking place, it is considered that there would only be a limited short term impact, being in accordance with the principles of relevant policy and guidance.

128. The applicant has indicated that their ecologist has confirmed that there would be an appropriately licensed/qualified ecologist on site to check for Great Crested Newts when the vegetation is cleared (especially any hedges which are being cleared). At the same time he/she can do a checking survey for birds. If any birds are nesting on the ground or hedges where the vegetation is to be cleared then work will need to stop until the fledglings are hatched. Whilst noted, a condition is recommended to achieve a specific mitigation scheme.

### ***The Environment***

129. Objection has been raised that the proposed development would be contrary to the NPPF as it neither protects or enhances the natural environment. 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.

130. 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);

131. The Head of Technical Services (HoTS) accepts that the site is a presently undeveloped agricultural 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. There is a public footpath in the southern part of the site which runs from east to west. Two hedges also cross the site from east to west, the first crossing the centre of the site, considered to be species poor (gapped hawthorn), the second located near the southern site boundary, being a gapped hawthorn with a mature tree at its eastern end and which is considered to be a strong visual feature when viewed from Uray Nook Road.

132. 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 open space areas as large forest species such as Ash, Lime and Oak. These matters would be dealt with at Reserved Matters stage.

133. Whilst concerns over the loss of the land in its current form are appreciated, 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. Conditions and reserved matters submissions can address these matters.

### ***Heritage and the Environment***

134. 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 and 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 want the Council to help preserve the nature of Yarm. Such concerns are noted although this particular site is of a relatively modest scale, is on the western periphery of Eaglescliffe and is served off the A67/ Uray Nook Road. As such, it is considered that the proposed development would have a particularly limited impact on the historic areas / centres of Eaglescliffe or Yarm other than through the provision of some additional traffic which has been detailed within the highways section of the report as being limited, and

through some additional footfall. Arguably, additional footfall is a positive attribute for centres as it improves their vitality and viability.

135. 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. The site has an existing landscape buffer against 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 thereby giving some green screening between the highway and the development, thereby prevent any significant or undue impact.
136. Objection has been raised that Yarm Bridge, being a heritage asset, cannot cope with the extra traffic that is being expected of it as it was never built to withstand such loads. The bridge is part of the highway network and this proposal is considered to add little additional traffic onto the network in view of the overall surrounding use. There is no evidence to suggest that this additional traffic would cause detriment to the bridge structure.

#### ***Local Provisions / Amenities***

137. 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 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 whilst a scheme to redevelop the fire damaged centre and re-provide retailing has been approved. 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.
138. Objectors considers that the site is not going to provide a sustainable community, situated on the edge of the built up area of Eaglescliffe as residents will feel obliged to use their cars in order to access shops, schools and leisure facilities because of the time taken to walk to these destinations and the perceived difficulty and lack of safety for children crossing an often busy road being a deterrent to more sustainable travel.
139. 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 operational bus stop to the application site for this service is the bus stops at the Durham Lane Tesco Roundabout. Technical Services previously advised that the proposed housing would be located well over the 400 metre guideline distance for access to the nearest public transport stop. The previous application was refused by committee, in part due to the limited nature of public transport and the development therefore not being well served by an attractive choice of transport modes.
140. In order to address this matter, the applicant has sought to provide a subsidy for a 5 year period for the daily bus service to detour from its current route, along the A67 to the

roundabout where it meets Urray Nook Road. This new stop considered to represent a reasonable distance to travel for the occupiers of the estate whilst will help to provide for other residents at this end of Eaglescliffe. Objectors consider this is not long term and question what will happen once the subsidy is removed. A 5 year subsidy should be sufficient time for the extended service to provide residents with an alternative to the car and to provide certainty within the service, allowing for its regular patronage. Like all other bus services after any subsidised period, should patronage be insufficient to make the extended service viable then the bus operator would be likely to examine this and consider appropriate action. Arguably, if the service is not being used after a 5 year period then it becomes unsustainable to continue operating it in any case. This is beyond the control of the applicant or planning controls and arguably, the applicant should not subsidise a service long term that residents of their development or surrounding developments choose not to use.

141. Residents raised objection over the lack of a swimming pool and other sports facilities which are considered to be significant strategic provisions and not something which is justified by a development of this scale.

142. 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***

143. Significant objection is raised regarding the pollution arising from the additional traffic and as a result of standing traffic through further congestion on the highway caused by this proposed development. 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 and which would occur along the route children take to school. Objectors point out that whilst levels may be within EEC limits, so was asbestos previously, 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, it has been recorded much higher levels and 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 further 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.

144. As detailed within the highways section of the report, it is forecast that additional traffic from this development would not significantly increase journey times or queue lengths and additional pollution related to traffic would therefore not increase by any significant amount. Further to this, traffic impacts of the scheme are to be mitigated through highway improvements. Importantly, 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.

145. Objection has 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 associated drainage infrastructure running near to and through the site. Objectors point out that a chemical site has been present at Urray Nook since 1833 having always produced chemicals and suggesting that the surrounding land has been subjected to various noxious airborne and other pollutants, with potentially not all incidents at the site having been recorded. Objectors indicate that chemicals used at the site are known to settle over land and water,

attach strongly to soil with only small amounts dissolving, thereby moving deeper into the ground. Objectors point out that Hartburn Beck was recently polluted. Objectors suggest drainage infrastructure with these nearby sites have cracked in the past and are known to be in a poor state of repair. Following the determination of the previous application for the site, although land contamination was not a reason for refusal, the applicant has undertaken soil testing of the ground along the line of the Elementis drainage pipe. The Councils Environmental Health Officer is aware of the importance of the surrounding drains from former industries and the associated outputs from these. Whilst the Councils Environmental Health Team was previously satisfied that this matter could be dealt with by condition, the applicant's additional survey work is welcomed. The councils Contaminated Land Officer is satisfied that the report addresses near surface sampling required around the Elementis effluent/surface water discharge culvert which shows no evidence of hexavalent chromium and associated heavy metal contamination and therefore raises no objection in principle to the development and recommends a condition be imposed dealing with unexpected land contamination. As there is no evidence to suggest significant pollution or risk to future residents, this approach is supported.

### ***Impacts on Amenity***

146. 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 and that the level of amenity for future residents will be affected due to the sites close proximity to the A67, the railway line to the north (vibration and noise), the Police Training Centre to the west and plane movements associated with Durham Tees Valley Airport. Network Rail have indicated that the developer should make endeavours to provide adequate soundproofing for dwellings taking into account the nearby railway line, with a worst case scenario that the railway line would be operational 24 hours a day.
147. Officers are not aware of any continual or high frequency noise impacts from the surrounding uses. Whilst the road, railway and airport have the potential to see significant increases in traffic using them and their impacts increase, consideration needs to be given to the current situation. The A67 is set to the south of the site behind a landscape buffer which it is expected will be added to through additional planting. The railway line to the north is not used by high speed trains and does not currently take significant amounts of rail traffic whilst the airport is also limited in its use. Living within proximity to these transport routes will be noticeable to future residents, however, there is no evidence that they would significantly harm living conditions whilst the site layout and development specification can assist in minimising the impacts of such.
148. The development is adjacent to a site where development has been approved for an industrial development subject to the signing of a Section 106 Agreement. Some buffer will be required between these two sites to prevent undue overshadowing and limit noise and other related impacts. This can be dealt with at Reserved Matters Stage.
149. Concern and objection is raised regarding the presence of the Police firearms training centre to 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. Officers are aware of the centre, have visited the site and witnessed some operations taking place at the site including the use of a firing range and the external use of charges. The centre clearly generates noise and residential development in too close proximity would be a concern. Helicopters using the site land on the area of hardstand to the sites southern boundary and housing in and around the immediate vicinity of the site would require careful consideration. This proposed residential development lies to the east of the Police Training Centre beyond a field where the industrial permission (subject to S106 Agreement) exists. This current proposal has the ability to design in features such as the use of acoustic fencing and landscaping to mitigate some impacts of loud noise. Were the industrial permission to be undertaken then this would further mask any noise generated at

the Police Training Centre. It is understood that the louder external noises are less regular than some of the more continual indoor noises generated whilst the helicopter landings are themselves infrequent. In view of the nature of the uses and noise impacts, as well as the ability of the final layout to take such matters into account and their being approximately 330m between the two sites, no significant concerns are raised in this respect.

150. This proposal does not affect the land immediately adjacent to the centre and in view of the above matters it is considered that the proposal would not unduly impinge on the operations of the centre and that adequate amenity for future residents of the scheme could be achieved.
151. Objections that the development would increase disturbance to existing residents on the nearby housing estate are noted, however, it is considered that this 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 whilst 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 however is a temporary impact of new development and generally accepted as such. In instances where it has the potential to affect residential amenity control of working hours via condition is considered appropriate and in view of the proximity of nearby housing a condition is recommended in this regard.
152. 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. 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 to existing properties 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 and cycleways is supported as being 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.
153. Concerns raised regarding overlooking of properties in the adjacent site from the proposed dwellings carries 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 that adjacent, it is expected that ample spacing between properties can be achieved to prevent an undue overbearing impact.
154. 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***

155. Network Rail have indicated that they have no objection in principle to the development although have indicated that it should not encroach or affect the railway line in terms of construction works, that the potential for lighting from the site will not dazzle train drivers and planting should be carefully controlled near to the railway line. There is no apparent requirement for construction works to encroach onto Network Rail's land or for lighting to be erected which would affect train drivers visibility. These are in part matters for

the developer to deal with. Notwithstanding this, the layout is not yet known and as such a condition has been recommended to address this matter. There are no trees and shrubs that could be planted immediately adjacent to the railway line due to the presence of Urray Nook Road. Notwithstanding this, a site landscaping scheme is required by reserved matters and can take this matter into account.

156. 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. Conditions are recommended to address these matters.
157. 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.
158. 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, that the proposal will reduce house prices in the area and in the 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. 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 potential change to long term tenure of the surrounding residential areas would be affected by varying factors beyond this proposal. This matter is considered to add little weight against the proposal.
159. 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.
160. 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 and traffic based pollution. There is no clear evidence that would support this claim whilst the additional traffic loading at peak times is considered to be minimal as detailed within the highways section of the report.
161. Residents suggest that there could be further phases of residential development at Urray Nook thereby having greater impacts. No further applications have been submitted and this application needs to be considered on its own merits. Should any future applications be submitted for further housing, these would need to be considered at that time.
162. 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 prior to the target determination date of the 26<sup>th</sup> November 2013.

163. 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.
164. Concern is raised over the ability for the children from the new development to venture onto the railway lines due to its close proximity or for a derailment of a train. Whilst noted, railway lines pass through several residential areas of Stockton Borough. The risks associated with railway lines are similar to those of highways where a certain degree of safety consciousness is required by those in proximity to it. Were a derailment to happen, this would be an unforeseen occurrence. There is no evidence to suggest a derailment has a greater likelihood of occurring near to this site and as such this matter can be given little weight.
165. Northern Gas Networks have responded to the consultation exercise indicating that they have no objections to the scheme although indicate that apparatus may be at risk during the construction phase of the development and the developer should make early contact with them to discuss matters. This is a standard response from Northern Gas Networks and an informative is recommended to deal with this matter.
166. The National Grid has advised that they have no record of apparatus in the immediate vicinity of the site and therefore have no objection.

### **CONCLUSION**

167. 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. However, the National Planning Policy Framework guidance makes clear that 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. The Head of Planning considers that Stockton Borough currently has a 4.23 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 considered to be acceptable as it accords with the NPPF guidance.
168. 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 could be undertaken (subject to appropriate conditions) without having an undue impact on traffic, highway safety, ecology, archaeology, pollution 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. Therefore approval is recommended subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions and the signing of a Section 106 Agreement in accordance with the Heads of Terms indicated 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 are 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

Supplementary Planning Document 3. Parking Provision for new developments

Supplementary Planning Document 6: Planning Obligation

Supplementary Planning Document: Open Space, Recreation and Landscaping

Regeneration and Environment LDD preferred options draft

Five Year Deliverable Housing Supply Final Assessment: 1<sup>st</sup> October 2013 to 30<sup>th</sup> September 2018  
(2<sup>nd</sup> quarterly update report)