

**DELEGATED**

**AGENDA NO 5  
PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**6 JULY 2016**

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

**15/1643/OUT**

**Land South Of Kirklevington, Thirsk Road, Kirklevington**

**Outline application for the construction of up to 145 dwellings and associated community and sport facilities (all matters reserved)**

**Update Report**

The council have this morning received correspondence from the National Casework Planning Unit who advise on behalf of the Secretary of State. They have advised that they have received a third party request to 'call-in' the application for the determination of the Secretary of State. The Local Authority has formally agreed to not issue a decision on the application if the committee is minded to approve the application in order to enable the Secretary of State to consider the proposal.

The description of development was amended by the applicant to remove Access as a detailed matter and for this to become a reserved matter which takes into account the internal layout of the development and highway not being fixed by this outline application. The description of development within the committee report has not been amended to reflect that change. Therefore, to confirm, this proposal is outline only with all matters reserved. The second condition of the recommendation requires slight change to incorporate the need for access details to be submitted and agreed as a reserved matter.

A detailed letter has been issued to committee members from SK Transport who are acting as consultants to the Kirklevington and Castleleavington Parish Council. Although many of the details are addressed within the main report for the sake of clarity, certain points raised and officers considerations on these points are detailed below;

Question was raised about which developments have been included within the junction assessments. These are set out in the Transport Assessment at Section 6.4 as being Morley Carr Farm, Greens Lane, Tall Trees and Mount Leven. At the point at which the assessment of Crathorne Interchange was undertaken two sites at Ingleby were at Appeal and at that time were not committed developments and their impact on Crathorne was not assessed. Both have been granted on appeal. Notwithstanding this, any traffic associated with the Ingleby appeal sites wishing to access the A19 northbound would not do so via Kirklevington due to much closer connections onto the A19 and as such, would not have a material effect on the operational capacity of the proposed junction works at Crathorne. This has been demonstrated by a re-assessment.

Question has been raised about the proposed mitigation for the Crathorne Interchange, going from a roundabout to a Priority Right Turn. A roundabout had been proposed on the back of an earlier housing approval in Yarm (Greens Lane) although this has since been amended to be a Priority Right Turn with ghost Island, which was approved as a non-material amendment.

Question has been raised about the suitability of the proposed Protected Right Turn at Crathorne however this has been designed in accordance with DMRB, having a deceleration length of 80 m and a turning length of 55 m which is capable of accommodating the maximum queue of 11 vehicles as is being required during the peak period.

Question has been raised in relation to the Junction capacity assessment for the required works at Crathorne. Both Stockton Borough Council and Highways England are satisfied that the proposed mitigation measure at Crathorne Interchange which would be required by S106 Agreement is fit for purpose and the impacts of the development on the interchange can be mitigated.

Question has been raised about the submitted modeling in applicants the Transport Assessment and the decision to omit modeling the Green Lane/A67 roundabout junction known as Crossroads Roundabout. An assessment of this junction was undertaken as a part of the Transport Assessment submitted in support of the approved Green Lane residential development which also required the developer to undertake improvement works at this location to increase the exiting capacity of the roundabout. That assessment demonstrated that, with the proposed mitigation scheme, the A67 approach to the (Crossroads) roundabout from Kirklevington would operate well within capacity during the AM peak period. The trips using this junction from this current proposal at Kirklevington equate to an additional vehicle every 2 minutes during the AM peak period which can be accommodated within the existing spare capacity on this arm of the roundabout and the impact would not be severe. Although the impact on the junction was not assessed within the applicants TA, the applicant has undertaken a '*strategic*' assessment of this junction via the Yarm and Ingleby Barwick AISUM Model (YIBAM) which considers the journey times along key routes within the model. The results from the YIBAM generally show that there would be limited practical difference in terms of traffic impact on the local road network with or without the proposed development. This is because the development would be a small proportion of both the population and the overall future development proposals within the YIBAM area.

Objection is raised highlighting the view that the access details into the site should not be left as a reserved matter but should instead be dealt with in detail at this point in time and that there is a lack of modelling to support this. Whilst noted, and possibly beneficial to view all details of a scheme at once, legislation allows for outline application to be submitted with some or all matters reserved, as is the case with this application. Indicative details have been submitted showing a position of an access and its layout which officers consider reasonably demonstrates that a safe access for the site can be achieved. As such, the LPA is not in a position to insist on access being detailed in full as part of this application. Concern has further been raised about the design of the indicative junction relative to traffic speeds. The initial 'indicative' junction was believed to be unsuitable by officers and a revised indicative junction type is now shown. Based on the indicative details and the width of the highways verge on the western side of the A67 (approx. 5m) the required visibility splay can be achieved.

Question is raised over the internal highway arrangements relative to an existing one way system and the need for stopping up of sections of highway. Whilst noted, these will be part of the detailed considerations of any reserved matters submission were outline permission to be granted.

Question has been raised whether all highway works can be undertaken within land owned by the application / Local Highways Authority. Officers believe this can be achieved.

Question is raised over the quality of the submitted Travel Plan and suggestion that there is a lack of appropriate SMART travel plan targets in the document. A full Travel Plan is to be secured by planning condition for approval prior to occupation of the development and this will include appropriate SMART targets.

### **Conclusion and recommendation**

The additional comments received do not alter the recommendation within the main report other than in respect to confirming within the description of development and the recommended condition 2, that the scheme is outline with all matters reserved and access is a reserved matter.