

DELEGATED

**AGENDA NO
PLANNING COMMITTEE
12 NOVEMBER 2014**

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

14/2367/VARY

Morley Carr, Allerton Balk, Yarm

Application to vary condition no.2 (approved plans) of planning approval 13/2487/REM (Application for reserved matters approval (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) for the erection of 350.no dwellings, provision of associated open space, recreational/community facilities and landscaping) to allow for a replan (affecting plots 148-177 and 251- 350) and update roundabout layout on Allerton Balk.

Expiry Date: 3 December 2014

SUMMARY

Outline planning consent was granted in 2012 for a residential led development, with associated community facilities at Morley Carr Farm, Yarm (12/0980/OUT). The principle of the development has therefore been established; all matters were reserved except for access as part of the original approval.

A reserved matters application (13/2487/REM) application for the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale was subsequently approved in 2013.

This application seeks to vary condition no 2 (approved plans) of planning approval 13/2487/REM.

The main changes relate to an amendment to the layout and house type substitution to some of the plots. These changes are a result of drainage easements required for surface water drainage; an increase in some driveway lengths and the roundabout updated to reflect the approved layout.

The proposals are considered to be modest changes which would not adversely affect the character of the approved development or surrounding area or adversely affect the amenity and privacy of neighbouring land users.

The site has an existing planning permission for housing and there have been no material changes in the circumstances relating to the previous decision and there are no new wider fundamental policy implications arising from the details of the variation of the parent planning permission.

Comments have been raised which are set out in the consultation section of the report which are considered to relate primarily to the principle of development which has already been established by the granting of planning permission. The issues and matters raised were fully considered and addressed as part of the original planning permission.

RECOMMENDATION

That planning application 14/2367/VARY be approved subject to the following conditions and informatives.

01 *The development hereby approved shall be in accordance with the following approved plan(s);*

<i>Plan Reference Number</i>	<i>Date on Plan</i>
<i>MCF:Y:03 REV C</i>	<i>3 September 2014</i>
<i>MCF:Y:04 REV B</i>	<i>3 September 2014</i>
<i>MCF:Y:00 REV J</i>	<i>3 September 2014</i>

Reason: To define the consent.

02 *This approval relates solely to this application for the revision to the approved plans and does not in any way discharge the conditions contained in Planning Approval reference 13/2487/REM which conditions apply to this consent.*

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt.

Informative 1: National Planning Policy Framework

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

BACKGROUND

1. Outline planning consent was granted in 2012 for a residential led development, with associated community facilities at Morley Carr Farm, Yarm (12/0980/OUT). The principle of the development has therefore been established; all matters were reserved except for access as part of the original approval.
2. Reserved matters application for the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for the erection of 350.no dwellings, provision of associated open space recreational/community facilities and landscaping wqs approved in 2013 (13/2487/REM).

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

3. The land at Morley Carr Farm consists of a farmhouse, associated agricultural buildings and open arable fields. The site extends to approximately 22 hectares and lies immediately to the west of the defined urban area of Yarm. The site abuts the B1264 (Thirsk Road) to the south, the B1265 (Allerton Balk) to the east with Worsall Road to the north. To the west of the site lies agricultural land with associated agricultural buildings.
4. The immediate built surroundings are predominantly residential in nature with a mixture of detached and semi-detached 2 storey dwellings and single storey bungalows arranged in a typical suburban layout arranged around a hierarchy of residential roads. A number of large individual detached houses including Field House Farm a Grade II Listed Building are situated to the north east.

PROPOSAL

5. This application seeks to vary condition no 2 (approved plans – see Appendix 1) of planning approval 13/2487/REM (Reserved matter approval for the erection of 350 dwellings, provision of associated open space, recreational/community facilities and landscaping at Morley Carr, Yarm).

6. The main changes relate to an amendment to the layout and house type substitution to plots 148-177 and 251-350 and an update to the roundabout layout (See Appendix 2 – Proposed Layout Plan).

CONSULTATIONS

7. The following Consultations were notified and any comments received are set out below:-

Head of Technical Services

Highways Comments

The revised planning layout (ref MCF:Y:00 rev J) details minor changes to the proposed housing layout and an updated roundabout layout.

The changes detailed to the proposed housing layout are acceptable and the updated roundabout layout is in accordance with the agreed design. Therefore, there are no highways objections to the proposal.

Landscape & Visual Comments

The changes detailed in the proposed housing layout together with the revised landscape drawings are acceptable and therefore, there are no landscape objections to the proposal.

Northumbrian Water Limited

Thank you for consulting Northumbrian Water on the variation of condition 2 to the original planning application ref. 13/2487/REM.

In making our response Northumbrian Water assess the impact of the proposed development on our assets and assess the capacity within Northumbrian Water's network to accommodate and treat the anticipated flows arising from the development. We do not offer comment on aspects of planning applications that are outside of our area of control.

I can confirm that further to our response dated 4th December 2013 to the original application, we would have no additional comments to make.

National Grid Transmission Asset Protection Team

National Grid has No Objection to the above proposal which is in close proximity to a High-Pressure Gas pipeline – Feeder FM06 Elton to Pickering and to High Voltage Transmission Overhead Line – VC.

PUBLICITY

8. Neighbours were notified and comments received are set out below :-

Mr Peter Horner, 26 Carew Close, Yarm

Back land development; Car parking issues; close proximity; Devaluation of property; development not suitable for area; effecting drains; Health concerns; Loss of Light; loss of open space; loss of privacy; means of access; Noise; over development of site; scale/size of development; set precedent; smell/fumes; terracing effect; Traffic or Highways; visual impact

I object to this planning application

I object to the proposed housing at Morley Carr Farm even though the outline planning approval was granted by a block vote in August 2012 and also the reserved matters.

Which will never be forgotten by the majority of Yarm residents?

I object to this proposed housing development mainly on a safety issue regarding H.P Gas Main, Traffic and the safety of children in layfield estate due to the existing estate becoming a rat run for traffic.

The main feeder road into Morley Carr Farm is via a new roundabout linking in Everingham road which runs past Layfield primary school this will increase the traffic.

Planning approval was granted on an application which should never have been allowed to progress to the application stage if SBC had removed the site from the SHLAA document in 2010 due to the existence of a H.P gas main running through the site. The report clearly states :
Category 1 :sites with Zero housing potential should be ascribed including - Health & Safety (HSE) Inner Zones (at this time 65 metres)
Category 2 : Designated uses which effect the development of a site - HSE middle & outer zones. The zones at that time were Inner Zone 65 metres, Middle 135 metres and outer 240 metres.

The H.P Gas main running through this site and is fifty years old, how is the new pipe to be joined to the old pipe a disaster waiting to happen?

The words from the ombudsman on the 13 August 2013 was " There was maladministration in that appendix 3 of the councils Strategic Housing Land Availability assessment was wrong , however we cannot say that if not for this fault a planning application would never have been made" but who knows ?

There is also too many road junctions into the proposed site from Allerton Balk on an already dangerous road.

SBC have ignored the views of local residents on the traffic problems regarding Yarm and instead have used a computer model which does not predict the problems which we know are existing.

Yarm does have a traffic problem and SBC must take notice of residents and not take the side of the developers. Many existing residents in the local area have 3 or 4 cars and this has not been taken into account by SBC. I think the original application was based on 1.6 cars per household. Also the increase in traffic coming from North Yorkshire on the B1965 has not been taken into account.

Traffic backing up on the Single road bridge near the station has not been taken into account.

Reserved matters / variations should address all of the 32 S106 points not only the selected few?

No reference is made in the reserved matters for the point 28, 29 & 30 regarding the H.P gas main in the S106 agreement which is a serious health & safety issue. Further detail should be provided prior to progressing with the reserved matters application.

Planning Compliance Statement of the reserved matters application - Section 6 - of the 32 sections of the S106 agreement only no 1,5, 7 and 10 are referred to in the section with the remainder to be dealt with at a later date , surely reserved matters should detail out all of the 32 sections and in particular points 29,30 & 31 relating to the H.P gas main . What work has to be carried out - this is a major safety concern and is an accident waiting to happen if not dealt with as requested by the Health & Safety executive.

The residents of Yarm need assurance that this work will be carried out in a safe manner and until these proposed works are detailed in a methods statement no planning approval should be granted.

SBC are using Yarm as a cash cow and the residents must not forget or forgive if the housing development goes ahead.

SBC are not interested in what the residents of yarm think they are hiding behind the NPFF and the new homes bonus. the excuse used by SBC on the 5 Year housing supply is very simple if developers are allowed to build at a reduce rate of say 15 per year SBC will never have a 5 year housing supply and developers will continue to land grab as they are doing now, so the principle of the calculation of the 5 year housing supply must be reviewed and changed immediately

This site has commenced and to date the disruption existing residents have had to put up with is unacceptable with rule breaking by Talyor Wimpey - Early Starts , Construction Traffic going into Layfield Estate , Water pipe taking forever up allerton Balk , Dust on Existing properties and now high wooden fence on alleton balk .

Mr John Latimer, 1A Countisbury Road, Norton

As Stockton BC has not been able to explain why the Section 106 Agreement reference mitigation of the approved development effects on car parking in Yarm Town Centre is specifically NON REFUNDABLE in the sum of £265000, this is its opportunity to redeem itself?

Contributions on account of mitigation are REFUNDABLE and deemed to be a fair estimate of the cost of providing that mitigation. By admission, Stockton Council has calculated that mitigation required the provision of six additional car parking spaces in Yarm Town Centre, which, also by admission, it claims an estimated cost of £55000 or £9167 per space. Stockton BC has not, when asked, provided a detailed justification of ths £9167. By admission, Stockton BC has said that the difference between the £265000 and £65000 (latter for six spaces), i.e. £210000 was on account of a potential change in the housing mix, which hasn't transpired. This £210000 is not a fair estimate of necessary mitigation so why is this part also included as NON REFUNDABLE? Clearly, this £210000 becomes irrelevant once the original housing mix is confirmed.

It seems obvious that the sum of £265000 was on account of something more than a fair estimate of mitigating the approved development effects on car parking in Yarm Town Centre. It may be that the applicant was offering a community benefit contribution and Stockton BC was accepting such, however this was not highlighted within the Case Officers report and recommendation to Planning Committee. Neither the Members of the Planning Committee nor the general public were supplied with transparent information, therefore, the original approval should be set aside.

The Applicant has not yet satisfied National Grid, who has again put in a holding objection. The Applicant may be able to satisfy National Grid, however, this site should not have been on the development radar. Planning approval was granted on an application which should never have been allowed to progress to the application stage if SBC had removed the site from the SHLAA document in 2010 due to the existence of a H.P gas main running through the site putting it into Category 1 - sites with Zero housing potential. The Local Government Ombudsman acknowledged this, saying on the 13 August 2013 " There was maladministration in that appendix 3 of the

councils Strategic Housing Land Availability assessment was wrong , however we cannot say that if not for this fault a planning application would never have been made" but who knows?
Stockton BC has two reasons to extricate itself from extremely embarrassing situations, which form part of the raison d'etre for Yarm 4 Yorkshire.

J Tarran, 54 Knaith Close, Yarm

I would like to object to all matters of this planning application. For the same reason I have listed in previous letters and emails. Unfortunately I still have had no reply from yourselves or Taylor Wimpey regarding this matter.

Ms Sandra Mcleavy,32 Carew Close Yarm

I object to any building work on Morley Carr farm , if Stockton council had not made a mistake and removed the site from shlaa because it fell into h&s zone inner and middle site below is taken from sbc website Sieving out sites

Category 1: Sites where zero housing potential should be ascribed

2.16 The regional SHLAA guide sets out a series of sites that should be ascribed nil housing potential due to their designations (paragraph 5.8 of the guide). These are sites that Government policy or law designates as inappropriate for residential development (or, in most cases, any development). I have done a foi which states -Potentially Vulnerable Locations: 1,676 properties have been identified within the plan based upon a 1km distance either side of the pipeline. I stress that this 1km is significantly larger than the emergency planning distance associated with the pipeline. Properties within this 2km corridor identified in the plan as potentially vulnerable due to their usage include Elementis Chromium Highfield Nursing Home, St Marys Church of England Primary School, Yarm Railway Station and Layfield Primary School.

Infrastructure:

This list includes those transport links which are contained in the plan and which are crossed by the pipeline. A66, Allens West to Teesside Airport Railway Line, Green Lane, Kirklevington Back Lane Aislaby Road and A67.

Arrangements for obtaining lists of streets and roads, where appropriate: In the event that information on streets and roads beyond that included within the plan is required Stockton Council?s Geographic Information Systems including the land and property gazetteer would be accessed. Arrangements are in place for access both during and out of office hours.

N Tadd,19 Monreith Avenue Eaglescliffe

What improvement are you making to the roads to accommodate all the extra traffic from these 350 new houses?

What are you going to do about the gridlock around Yarm (needs a by-pass from Uraly Nook to Tall Trees.

What about access to Doctor's, Dentist's, Hospitals, Schools etc for this influx.

What's happening about the High Pressure Gas Main that runs through this land?

Mrs Leslie Horner, 26 Carew Close Yarm

Back land development; Car parking issues; close proximity; Devaluation of property; development not suitable for area; effecting drains; Health concerns; Loss of Light; loss of open space; loss of privacy; means of access; Noise; over development of site; scale/size of development; set precedent; smell/fumes; terracing effect; Traffic or Highways; visual impact

I object to this proposed housing development mainly on a safety issue regarding H.P Gas Main, Traffic and the safety of children in layfield estate due to the existing estate becoming a rat run for traffic.

It is interesting to see that Taylor Wimpey locate this site as North Yorkshire.

The main feeder road into Morley Carr Farm is via a new roundabout linking in Everingham road which runs past Layfield primary school this will increase the traffic.

Planning approval was granted on an application which should never have been allowed to progress to the application stage if SBC had removed the site from the SHLAA document in 2010 due to the existence of a H.P gas main running through the site.

The report clearly states : Category 1 :sites with Zero housing potential should be ascribed including - Health & Safety (HSE) Inner Zones (at this time 65 metres)

Category 2 : Designated uses which effect the development of a site - HSE middle & outer zones. The zones at that time were Inner Zone 65 metres, Middle 135 metres and outer 240 metres.

The H.P Gas main running through this site and is fifty years old, how is the new pipe to be joined to the old pipe a disaster waiting to happen?

The words from the ombudsman on the 13 August 2013 was " There was maladministration in that appendix 3 of the councils Strategic Housing Land Availability assessment was wrong , however we cannot say that if not for this fault a planning application would never have been made" but who knows ?

There is also too many road junctions into the proposed site from Allerton Balk on an already dangerous road.

SBC have ignored the views of local residents on the traffic problems regarding Yarm and instead have used a computer model which does not predict the problems which we know are existing.

Yarm does have a traffic problem and SBC must take notice of residents and not take the side of the developers. Many existing residents in the local area have 3 or 4 cars and this has not been taken into account by SBC. I think the original application was based on 1.6 cars per household. Also the increase in traffic coming from North Yorkshire on the B1965 has not been taken into account.

Traffic backing up on the Single road bridge near the station has not been taken into account.

Reserved matters / variations should address all of the 32 S106 points not only the selected few?

No reference is made in the reserved matters for the point 28, 29 & 30 regarding the H.P gas main in the S106 agreement which is a serious health & safety issue. Further detail should be provided prior to progressing with the reserved matters application.

Planning Compliance Statement of the reserved matters application - Section 6 - of the 32 sections of the S106 agreement only no 1,5, 7 and 10 are referred to in the section with the remainder to be dealt with at a later date , surely reserved matters should detail out all of the 32 sections and in particular points 29,30 & 31 relating to the H.P gas main . What work has to be carried out - this is a major safety concern and is an accident waiting to happen if not dealt with as requested by the Health & Safety executive.

To date no method statement on the HP gas main has been issued to the public.

SBC are using Yarm as a cash cow and the residents must not forget or forgive if the housing development goes ahead.

SBC are not interested in what the residents of yarm think they are hiding behind the NPFF and the new homes bonus. the excuse used by SBC on the 5 Year housing supply.

Why should existing council tax payers have to put up with 7 / 10 years disruption on a site we did not want.

Mr John Darbyshire, 32 Carew Close Yarm

Development not suitable for area; effecting drains; Health concerns; Loss of Light. After reading objections already posted I think every aspect has been covered Stockton council should never have allowed a Housing estate to be built on a high pressure gas pipe, lives are being put at risk, the site should have been removed from shlaa. Taylor Wimpey have breached planning conditions twice since the site started

Mrs Christine Mundy 28 Crosswell Park, Ingleby Barwick, Stockton-on-Tees TS17 5BE

Loss of open space; means of access; scale/size of development; Traffic or Highways Having previously commented upon the Morley Carr application I have to say I am aghast that this development is still forging ahead under the pretence it is a safe development despite the existence of a high pressure gas main, therefore in regards to this VARY application I firmly stand by my original objection.

In regards to the particulars of this variance the subject of the highway is one of great concern given the level of housing to be introduced which will undoubtedly raise the number of cars onto the roads of Yarm considerably. The vicinity of the nearby school of Layfield Primary will be subject to increased traffic flows as it will inevitably be used as a rat run for the new estate once the residents realise that the main route into Yarm via Willey Flatts is gridlocked at peak times. The concern is the use of computer aided models to predict the effects of numerous developments now approved in and around Yarm, all used to good effect in bolstering the developers case for development approval. The suggestions made by Stockton Council in regards to these traffic assessment predictions is that there is no evidence of a traffic problem in Yarm, a truly astonishing claim which is an affront to the intelligence of the residents of Yarm. Further it needs to be asked where are the assessments and RSAs demonstrating the validity of this suggested roundabout? Why has it needed to be amended twice? Taylor Wimpey have demonstrated nothing but uncertainty in their plans for this site which does not instill any confidence in those members of the public concerned about the pipeline. This has been further compounded by the contempt in which residents of Layfield have been subjected to with Taylor Wimpey in breach of planning conditions imposed upon the site by SBC on 2 occasions all ready.

As a final point, although not part of this particular vary application I refer back to the key critical issue of this whole application which is the inescapable high pressure gas pipeline which has never been addressed satisfactorily. Despite the fact no upgrade of the pipeline has yet taken place, work on the site has already commenced to the dismay of all who have objected to it in the first place. By all accounts Taylor Wimpey have taken taken steps in producing a question and answer fact sheet about the pipeline to hand out at their sales office and they have now indicated that only one half of the site will be built until the pipeline is upgraded. This is truly astonishing given that the public will be occupying properties in the vicinity of this high pressure pipeline which will be undergoing sensitive work to its structure sometime in 2015/16.

All this chopping and changing does not reflect well on a company proportedly claiming to be in control of what they are doing. This level of uncertainty does not bode well for the future important task of dealing with the pipeline and I would suggest in the interest of highway safety that further consultations and realistic traffic survey evidence are required in order to justify the proposed roundabout on Allerton Balk for a VARY approval.

PLANNING POLICY

9. 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

10. 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

11.. 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.

The NPPF also has a number of core planning principles including conserving and enhancing natural environment and conserving heritage assets.

Saved 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.

Saved Policy EN28

Development which if likely to detract from the setting of a listed building will not be permitted.

Saved Policy EN30

Development, which affects sites of archaeological interest, will not be permitted unless:

- (i) An investigation of the site has been undertaken; and
- (ii) An assessment has been made of the impact of the development upon the remains; and where appropriate;
- (iii) Provision has been made for preservation 'in site'.

Where preservation is not appropriate, the Local Planning Authority will require the applicant to make proper provision for the investigation and recording of the site before and during development.

Saved Policy EN38

Residential development or development which attracts significant numbers of people, particularly the less mobile, will be permitted in the vicinity of a hazardous installation only where there is no significant threat to the safety of the people involved.

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. All new non-residential developments will be completed to a Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) of 'very good' up to 2013 and thereafter a minimum rating of 'excellent'.

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

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

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

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

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

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

_ Make a positive contribution to the local area, by protecting and enhancing important environmental assets, biodiversity and geodiversity, responding positively to existing features of natural, historic, archaeological or local character, including hedges and trees, and including the provision of high quality public open space;

_ Be designed with safety in mind, incorporating Secure by Design and Park Mark standards, as appropriate;

_ Incorporate 'long life and loose fit' buildings, allowing buildings to be adaptable to changing needs. By 2013, all new homes will be built to Lifetime Homes Standards;

_ Seek to safeguard the diverse cultural heritage of the Borough, including buildings, features, sites and areas of national importance and local significance. Opportunities will be taken to constructively and imaginatively incorporate heritage assets in redevelopment schemes, employing where appropriate contemporary design solutions.

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

Core Strategy Policy 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. Opportunities to widen the Borough's cultural, sport, recreation and leisure offer, particularly within the river corridor, at the Tees Barrage and within the Green Blue Heart, will be supported.
3. 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.
4. Support will be given to the Borough's Building Schools for the Future Programme and Primary Capital Programme, and other education initiatives, the expansion of Durham University's Queen's Campus, and the provision of health services and facilities through Momentum: Pathways to Healthcare Programme.
5. Existing facilities will be enhanced, and multi-purpose use encouraged to provide a range of services and facilities to the community at one accessible location, through initiatives such as the Extended Schools Programme.

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.
10. The Council will support proposals that address the requirements of vulnerable and special needs groups consistent with the spatial strategy.
11. Major planning applications for student accommodation will have to demonstrate how they will meet a proven need for the development, are compatible with wider social and economic

regeneration objectives, and are conveniently located for access to the University and local facilities.

12. The Borough's existing housing stock will be renovated and improved where it is sustainable and viable to do so and the surrounding residential environment will be enhanced.

13. In consultation with local communities, options will be considered for demolition and redevelopment of obsolete and unsustainable stock that does not meet local housing need and aspirations.

Core Strategy Policy 10 (CS10) Environmental Protection and Enhancement

1. In taking forward development in the plan area, particularly along the river corridor, in the North Tees Pools and Seal Sands areas, proposals will need to demonstrate that there will be no adverse impact on the integrity of the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA and Ramsar site, or other European sites, either alone or in combination with other plans, programmes and projects. Any proposed mitigation measures must meet the requirements of the Habitats Regulations.

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

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

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

ii) Green wedges within the conurbation, including:

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

iii) Urban open space and play space.

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

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

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

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

- i) Haverton Hill and Seal Sands corridor, as an important gateway to the Teesmouth National Nature Reserve and Saltholme RSPB Nature Reserve;
- ii) Tees Heritage Park.

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

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

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

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

Core Strategy Policy 11 (CS11) - Planning Obligations

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

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

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

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

12. The principle of development has been accepted as part of the original permission. As the variation only relates to changes to some of the plots and roundabout detail, only the impacts of these will be considered as part of the report as other matters such as highway capacity or health and safety etc. were fully considered and addressed on the previous outline and reserved matters applications. As such the main considerations relate to the impact on the character and appearance of the area, the impact on the amenity of neighbouring land users and the impact on highway safety and health and safety.

13. The proposals are considered to be modest changes comprising an amendment to the layout and house type substitution to plots 148-177 and 251-350 and an update to the roundabout layout which would not adversely affect the character of the approved development or surrounding area or adversely affect the amenity and privacy of neighbouring land users.

14. The site has an existing planning permission for housing and there have been no material changes in the circumstances relating to the previous decision and there are no new wider fundamental policy implications arising from the details of the variation of the parent planning permission.

15. Comments have been raised which are set out in the consultation section of the report which are considered to relate primarily to the principle of development which has already been established by the granting of planning permission. The issues and matters raised were fully considered and addressed as part of the original planning permission.

16. The Head of Technical Services and National Grid Asset Protection Team have considered the proposal and raise no objection on highway or health and safety grounds to the proposed development.

CONCLUSION

17. The nature and scale of the changes are acceptable and it is considered the changes do not give rise to any undue impact on the amenity of any adjacent neighbours and is acceptable in terms of highway and health and safety and is in accordance with policies in the Development Plan identified above and therefore the recommendation is to approve the application subject to the conditions set out in the report.

Corporate Director of Development and Neighbourhood Services
Contact Officer Mr Gregory Archer Telephone No 01642 526052

WARD AND WARD COUNCILLORS

Ward **Yarm**
Ward Councillor **Councillor A B L Sherris**

Ward **Yarm**
Ward Councillor **Councillor Mark Chatburn**

Ward **Yarm**
Ward Councillor **Councillor Ben Houchen**

IMPLICATIONS

Financial Implications: As Report

Environmental Implications: As Report

Human Rights Implications:

The provisions of the European Convention of Human Rights 1950 have been taken into account in the preparation of this report.

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

Background Papers

The Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

National Planning Policy Framework

Stockton on Tees Local Plan Adopted Version June 1997

Core Strategy Development Plan Document March 2010

Supplementary Planning Document 3: Parking Provision for New Developments

Supplementary Planning Document : Open Space, Recreation and Landscaping

Supplementary Planning Document 6 : Planning Obligations