

**DELEGATED**

**AGENDA NO 5  
PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**UPDATE REPORT**

**26 FEBRUARY 2014**

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

**13/3107/OUT**

**Land at Little Maltby Farm, Low Lane, Ingleby Barwick**

**Outline application for residential development of up to 550 dwellings, local centre up to 2500m2 and means of access**

**Expiry Date 11 March 2014**

### **SUMMARY**

Since the original report to members of the planning committee additional comments have been received from local ward councillors and also additional objections have been received from members of the public. The additional comments are detailed below and do not raise any new issues. Therefore the material planning considerations remain as set out within the original report and the recommendation remains unchanged.

### **CONSULTATIONS**

8. The following Consultees were notified and comments received are set out below:-

#### **Cllr Kevin Faulks**

i Strongly object on the following grounds 1) This was designated green wedge and no plans for development 2) Traffic will be a major issue on Low Lane 3) At present all primary schools and secondary schools are full to capacity 4) local facilities such as doctors' and dentists surgeries are full to bursting and do not need this extra pressure. If this gets the go ahead i will be strongly objecting to the developers false promises of six primary schools and two secondary schools as these will already will be full to capacity along with the poor road network.

#### **Cllrs Ken Dixon, David Harrington and Ross Patterson**

I strongly object to the planning application 13/3107/13 for the permission to build a further 550 houses on the Low Lane ,Little Maltby Farm site , the reasons are outlined as follows :-

#### **History**

This site has since I have been a councillor for some 9 yrs been designated as Green Wedge with no plans to encourage development of the area.

Planning permission was sought originally via consultation for 250 houses and a 650 place secondary school this being an enabling development, however when the plans were submitted they were for 350 houses and no link to be an enabling development. This permission was refused by the planning committee and subsequently went on appeal via Secretary of State for Communities Mr Pickles MP. Although the vast majority of residents, local councillors and SBC

were against the development, but had the backing of Stockton South MP, the permission was subsequently granted! We warned then that this was just a Trojan horse with bigger applications following which indeed is what has happened and the start is before you today!

### Green Wedge

Anyone who knows Ingleby Barwick would agree that this further application if granted would have a profound impact on the purposes, identity and character of this part of designated wedge. Remove its identity and to completely change its character means it would be permanently lost as an asset to its community. The green wedge at this location is serving a useful and much valued open space and buffer area; I can see NO compelling or satisfying reasons that justify such a loss. Again this site should be viewed as a very important of the existing green infrastructure of Ingleby Barwick and its environment not as a means to further build for the sake of profit.

### School provision

The idea of the original 250 houses was to be part of enabling development to build a 650 place secondary school, this has gone out of the window .The 350 houses granted by government on appeal are as far as I am aware given the statement by MR Pickles MP, are stand alone applications and not enabling developments.

11.29 (part of appeal decision Low Lane)

“In terms of the housing element. The proposal would deliver open-market and affordable housing, where there is an acknowledged shortfall, and generate employment and economic activity. Given the prevailing situation in the terms of housing supply in the Borough, these benefits are sufficient to justify the housing element of the proposals, whether or not the Free School and Sixth Form ever materialises. For this reason, there is no need for a Grampian condition linking the two separate elements together “

If the planning applications were given this means the original intention to build a secondary school for the children travelling off Ingleby would be lost because most if not all the places would be swallowed up by these developments. This also means that there would be an urgent need for an extra Primary School provision! There is no provision for education from primary age upwards in these applications and with no foreseeable plans for provision within Ingleby Barwick, there would be no capacity to extend existing schools and defiantly no provision to build a new one.

### Site Allocation

This site is not on the council's preferred housing document and is not proposed to be; this is not proposed as an enabling development and therefore does not support the development of any wider strategic need!

### Traffic Impact

There are as far as I am aware any plans in the application to prove that this is a traffic neutral development. I believe the guide lines for cars allotted to new build are 1.5 cars per household ,this means in real terms that there would be if this development went ahead there would be an extra mind boggling 1350 vehicles, using what are already essentially heavily congested road within Ingleby Barwick. There is no way anyone can mitigate this amount of extra traffic on our roads! It goes without saying that our residents and environment would be put in real serious danger, yet no mention from the developers which beggar's belief!

It has been mentioned that the recently acquired funding to improve the Thornaby Road / A174 Spine road junction was for this development, as far as I am aware I know having been in

discussion with officers that these plans have been drawn up for the past 4-5 years in order to improve the traffic flow on and off Ingleby Barwick NOW! Not for any future development. So how do the developers propose to mitigate this huge problem? They cannot be allowed to just build and leave our residents with the huge problems that would arise!.

**PUBLICITY**

9. Following the original report to members of committee a further 2 letters of objection have been received.

**Objection comments:**

- Loss of greenfield site/green wedge/open space
- Ingleby does not need more housing
- The housing is also self defeating and will require children to travel by bus to secondary school.
- Loss of green field site
- Flooding/drainage issues
- Impact on wildlife
- Land is designated Green Wedge
- Planning laws need to be changed to stipulate 'Brownfield' site development first and foremost
- Implications for future food supplies
- Road Infrastructure/access points insufficient
- Lack of infrastructure
- Will cause an Increase in traffic

**Objectors:**

Christine Mundy - 28 Crosswell Park, Ingleby Barwick  
Mrs Kendra Fox - 43 Henshaw Drive, Ingleby Barwick, Stockton-on-Tees  
Mr C.E. Clarke and Mrs J.H. Clarke – Glencoe, Low Lane High Leven

**Corporate Director of Development and Neighbourhood Services  
Contact Officer Mr Simon Grundy Telephone No 01642 528550**

**WARD AND WARD COUNCILLORS**

**Ward Ingleby Barwick East  
Ward Councillor Councillor Jean Kirby, K C Faulks & Gillian Corr**