

DELEGATED

AGENDA NO 3  
PLANNING COMMITTEE

20 AUGUST 2014

REPORT OF CORPORATE DIRECTOR,  
DEVELOPMENT AND NEIGHBOURHOOD  
SERVICES

14/0637/FUL

Land South Of Kirk Hill, Carlton Village, Carlton

Construction of 36 residential dwellings comprising 13 affordable dwellings and 23 open market dwellings with associated infrastructure and landscaping.

Expiry Date 22 August 2014

**UPDATE REPORT**

Since the preparation of the original Committee Report, 2 further letters of objection have been received as detailed below. The recommendation has been amended in order to give time for the Section 106 to be signed. A new plan is attached to show the development in relation to the wider village.

**RECOMMENDATION**

**That planning application 14/0637/REV be approved subject to the following conditions and informatives and subject to the applicant entering into a Section 106 Agreement in accordance with Heads of Terms below. Should the Section 106 Agreement not be signed by the 22 August 2014 or any other date as agreed by the Head of Planning then the application should be refused due to lack of adequate provisions in respect to the details listed within the Heads of Terms.**

**OBJECTIONS**

**Mr A Mallen, 29 Green Leas, Carlton, Stockton**

I write further to my earlier objections to the above proposal for development

1 The access road to Green Leas off the main road running through Carlton is almost opposite the proposed development. West of the entrance to Green Leas and beneath the road a drainage pipe carries surface water from the rear of these homes into a culvert/ditch on the south side of the road that empties into Letch beck. It runs parallel to the proposed new development. At times of heavy water runoff, it is unable to cope causing localised flooding

2 Property owners have in the past requested the Fire Service to pump excess water from their gardens, to prevent flooding of their homes. Residents have clubbed together to purchase their own pumping equipment to help in the process.

3 The road into West Garth and as well as the green adjacent to the village shop floods after heavy rain and snow melt. Sometimes it looks like a lake. This location is also opposite the proposed new site. At the opposite end of the village the road floods for similar reasons. It has caused residents to build a small wall to prevent water running through their property. The drains cannot cope! Too many new properties have been added to the infrastructure as the village has been overdeveloped.

4 The developer has engaged M. Design to conduct a Flood Risk Assessment *in support* of the development. The report obviously concentrates solely on the proposed development site. It states the site land *generally* falls away to the south. Their 'Topographical Map' illustrates land falling southwards toward Letch Beck. I cannot find mention of the land immediately to the front falling gently northwards toward the main road running through the village. More concrete at this development means surface water runoff. It will not all discharge east as stated. Some will, but thousands of gallons will obviously discharge to the north as the hard surface of new access

gress roadway act as a conduit with a river like effect. The overall amount of rain may remain the same over the ground area involved but the run off rate will change. Instead of the land slowing the process by absorption, it will race into existing road surface drains. This will not effect the proposed development site, but it is highly likely to add to village problems. Perhaps those compiling the report were unaware of these. Table D.2: of the FRA report submitted by M. Design reveals the vulnerability classification and residential properties fall under the category 'Highly Vulnerable'. The surface drains cannot cope at present as acknowledged by Northumbrian Water who have refused permission to add further surface drainage piping to the network. Northumbrian Water do not seem to have made comment about any additional effect the development will have relative to existing problems, although it is obvious more surface water will run into their drains.

5 At 2.2 of M.Design's report it states the site slopes towards Letch Beck by approximately 2 m. I note the approximate. The incline appears to be steeper, and residents living at The Poplars are concerned about additional discharge of surface water into this beck as it becomes quite dangerous after heavy rain or melting snow. Normally it runs quite shallow but at times of heavy rain and snow melt it rages like a small river, deep and dangerous. There is also a downstream effect. The fields at the base of the bank leading into Thorpe Thewles from the direction of Carlton regularly flood during winter, making the roads impassable for small vehicles and pedestrians. The surrounding fields resemble lakes. Matters can only be made worse as the water in Letch Beck runs towards Thorpe Thewles.

6 Reference is made to R&ELDD recommendations due out the middle of this month but due for implementation next year. I believe these are simply proposals (if implemented) that may be taken into consideration in the future. I understand it does not follow that a final planning decision should necessarily favour a developer.

7 Elsewhere in the country, there is great need for the implementation of government policy for additional building. There is insufficient homes--- pushing up prices making those available too expensive for most. Common sense needs to prevail. This type of need simply does not exist in this area. There are hundreds of affordable homes available in the Stockton areas that are not selling. Within a mile new unsold affordable homes are available. At Whitton Village nearby a small development has been underway for two or three years and the plots have not sold. The northeast is one of the cheapest locations in the country to purchase property. Development proposals now have to include the affordability aspect due to a crisis elsewhere. Affordable? This does not seem to have been defined. Homes are for sale in Carlton and nearby. In real terms, compared to elsewhere they are affordable.

8 The problems mentioned in this report are not one in 5, 10, 20 ,30 or 100 years. They are regular occurrences especially through winter which seems to becoming wetter as a result of climate change.

**Dr Jean M MacLeod, High Farm House, Carlton Village, Carlton, TS21 1EA**

I wish to register a number of objections to this development and note the revised plans which have been submitted.

The development is large in scale for this village which has already been over-developed. The number of low cost houses suggested is well beyond that deemed necessary in the council's own local plan. It is relevant that low cost housing is available within a very close distance with much greater access to public transport and amenities. There is no established need for further executive development within the village with numerous houses of similar size on the market. Suggesting that a green field which floods regularly and historically was a natural pond be turned into a playground when the village has an existing play area does not increase the benefit of the development for existing villagers. Given that these are family houses local school provision cannot meet the needs of this development, particularly as Egglecliffe now has to meet the increased demand of Yarm. Similarly local health services would struggle to cope, whether Stillington or Norton GP practices.

The proposed development is situated on green fields beyond the village boundary and acceptance of the development would set an unwelcome precedent for this area. The unobstructed view to the Cleveland hills is a significant amenity for this village which would lose character through this loss of open space. Despite the suggestion of landscaping the visual impact will be

significant and will affect both Carlton and Redmarshall. The impact will be particularly severe for houses in High Farm Close, Poplars lane and Green Leas. The landscaping will not be congruent with existing old hedging on the field boundaries. The appearance of this historic village will be irrevocably damaged. The increase in light pollution particularly given the security light recommendation from the crime prevention team would be substantial in an area known to support wildlife, again impacting on the experience for existing residents.

By definition traffic will increase through the village as a result of this development, particularly as the size of housing would attract 2 car plus families and an hourly bus service without any Sunday service would not offer alternative options. The village already has speeding traffic and the egress from the development is on a blind bend. The situation of the bus stop is such that should a bus be at the stop the lack of visibility would exacerbate the risk to pedestrians and drivers.

In recent years the fields in question have been flooded for weeks at a time and run off into Letch Beck has led to very high levels in the Beck which approaches houses in the Willow Bridge close development. The hard standing for each house and access roads will reduce natural drainage and increase the flood risk downstream. Planning for a 1 in 30 year storm given recent weather patterns is insufficient and recent experience suggests that floods will occur in Willow Bridge Close and on Letch Lane itself. Given the standing water on the fields in the last three winters it is possible that the development itself would face problems. Any single episode of flooding will result in increased insurance costs for the village. Repeated flooding and freezing will result in increased road repair costs for the council.

As well as water drainage, the sewerage resulting from such a large development will overwhelm the existing drainage. The sewage pipes have already burst in the field of the proposed development yet it is expected that they will cope with effluent from 36 more dwellings. Since they are close to the surface the health risks are significant.

I note the comments from the two parish councils and the data from their survey of opinion. The manipulation of data in the report of the consultation event is troubling though not entirely surprising. The overwhelming opinion of that meeting was not in support and changing the denominator by excluding those who chose not to complete questions verges on mendacity. It is entirely relevant that this family company has previously had a planning application refused despite appeal to the Secretary of State and that past applications to develop in these fields were refused. There is no lack of housing in the Stockton area especially given planned developments in Yarm. It is also of interest that a recent application for increased housing in Ingleby Barwick was refused suggesting that the council recognises that fact. A brief online search reveals that currently over 330 houses are available for purchase in Stockton on Tees in the below £100000 range and over 160 four bedroomed properties.

This application would appear to benefit no-one but the developers and I reiterate my strong objection to the original and revised applications.

## **CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO THE ABOVE**

### **Northumbrian Water**

Further to my response dated 7<sup>th</sup> April 2014 to this application, I can provide some additional details which might be useful.

This developer of this site has been through our pre-development enquiry process and we have approved a connection and discharge rate for foul flows into our existing combined sewer. This sewer and the network downstream have been modelled to check available capacity to accommodate this new development. The results show that our system can accommodate these additional flows without causing flooding downstream. The effect of developing the site for 39 dwellings and discharging foul flows into our network will be minimal. Foul flows, even from this size of development, only comprise a few litres per second and the 300mm diameter sewer which we have approved a discharge to is capable of accommodating these flows.

We have also confirmed through this process that no surface water will be allowed to discharge into our network. This is due to the existence of a watercourse within close proximity to the site. We aim to reduce or restrict any new surface water from entering our network where a watercourse is available. The developer proposes to discharge surface water to the nearby Letch Beck meaning

the management of surface water is outside our remit. We therefore cannot comment on flooding from these sources.

In summary, we have no concerns regarding this proposed development and have confirmed through detailed modelling and analysis that the existing system can accommodate this new development without flooding the site itself or surrounding area.

### **Head of Technical Services – Flood Risk Management**

I have looked at the two objections received from Mr A Mallen, 29 Green Leas and Dr Jean MacLeod, High Farm House, with respect to their drainage concerns, I am satisfied the developer is aware that the new development will be limited to existing greenfield runoff rates that the 1 in 100 year storm intensity events must be contained within the boundary of the site.

Full approval of the proposed drainage solution must be given by the Local Planning Authority before any construction works can commence. As this will be a condition of the planning approval, I am satisfied that all of their concerns will be addressed.

### **Considerations**

The additional comments received have been considered within the main report and also by the bodies responsible for the drainage of the site and matters detailed within this update report are considered to not affect the considerations within the main report.

### **Recommendation**

That the application be determined in accordance with the recommendation within the main report and the additional recommendations and condition as detailed above.

**PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT**

