

DELEGATED

**AGENDA NO
PLANNING COMMITTEE**

6 JULY 2016

**REPORT OF DIRECTOR,
ECONOMIC GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT
SERVICES**

16/1024/REM

Land South Of Cayton Drive, Thornaby,

Application for reserved matters approval (appearance, landscaping, layout, access and scale) for the erection of 45 No. dwellings, access from Cayton Drive and ancillary works pursuant to outline planning consent ref:15/1466/OUT

Expiry Date: 21 July 2016

SUMMARY

Planning permission is sought for the reserved matters of Scale, Access, Layout, Appearance and Landscaping associated with the approved outline planning permission for up to 45 dwellings on the site at Thornaby which was approved on appeal.

A number of objections have been received in respect to the application, the main ones being about the principle of development on the site, the additional traffic, the proximity of new dwellings to existing dwellings and the impacts on privacy and amenity as well as impacts on wildlife. A single submission of support was received.

The principle of development has already been established under the earlier application and cannot be re-considered as part of this application. The proposal shows 2 storey dwellings in a street layout, having front and rear gardens and private drives all of which is generally in keeping with the existing residential area to the north. The proposed dwellings have been positioned to prevent any direct overlooking with existing dwellings and will maintain a degree of openness. Landscaping within the site will largely be within defined gardens and private curtilages and will support the existing tree belt to the south. Properties have been positioned away from the maturing tree belt to the south which will ensure adequate levels of amenity for the future occupiers.

The Highways, Transport and Environment Team have accepted the access into the site and the internal road layout and parking provision.

The development was approved under an earlier outline application. Matters of ecology, impact on green wedge and the Tees Heritage Park were all considerations of the earlier application and do not have a bearing on the detailed considerations of this application for reserved matters.

RECOMMENDATION

That planning application 16/1024/REM be approved subject to the following conditions and informatives;

Approved Plans

- 01 The development hereby approved shall be in accordance with the following approved plans;

Plan Reference Number	Date on Plan
005A	21 April 2016
002	19 April 2016
009	19 April 2016
010	21 April 2016
001C	20 June 2016
007C	20 June 2016
008B	20 June 2016
006A	2 June 2016
003 B	2 June 2016
004 A	2 June 2016
011	2 June 2016
012	2 June 2016
013	2 June 2016
014	2 June 2016

Reason: To define the consent.

Detailed landscaping scheme

- 02 Notwithstanding details hereby approved, no dwellings shall be occupied until a scheme of landscaping has been implemented on site in relation to each dwelling in accordance with a scheme of landscaping which has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to achieve a suitable form of landscaping in accordance with the requirements of saved Local Plan Policy HO3.

Materials – prior to above ground construction

- 03 Notwithstanding any description of the materials in the application, no above ground construction of the dwellings shall be commenced until precise details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external walls and roof of the buildings have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to allow the Local Planning Authority adequate control over the appearance of the development and to comply with saved Policy HO3 of the Stockton on Tees Local Plan.

Levels

- 04 Notwithstanding details shown on the plans hereby approved, prior to any works commencing on site, a scheme of ground levels and finished floor levels for all properties within the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall indicate the finished floor levels of adjoining land. The development shall be carried out in accordance with these approved details.

Reason: To take into account the properties position and impact on adjoining properties and their associated gardens in accordance with saved Stockton on Tees Local Plan Policy HO3.

Design of Boundary Treatments

- 05 Notwithstanding details hereby approved, the design of all boundary treatments within the site shall be in accordance with details which have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to achieve a high quality development.

INFORMATIVE OF REASON FOR PLANNING APPROVAL

Informative 1: Working practice

The Local Planning Authority has worked in a positive and proactive manner and sought solutions to problems arising in dealing with the planning application by seeking amendments to improve the scheme and limit its impacts and by the identification and imposition of appropriate planning conditions.

Informative 2: Gas Apparatus

Northern Gas Networks have advised that there may be gas apparatus in the area and that the developer should contact them to discuss this.

BACKGROUND

Planning application 13/0809/FUL for the erection of 54 dwellings, formation of access, provision of landscaping and associated works was refused for the following reasons;

Reason 1: Impact on the green wedge

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposed development would cause irreparable damage to the character and openness of the green wedge at this point as a result of the nature of the development on the site, its scale and its position at a high point relevant to the adjacent parts of the green wedge. The scheme would be likely to impact on the adjacent woodland which would further reduce the value and function of the green wedge to its detriment. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to the guidance contained within Stockton on Tees Core Strategy Development Plan Policy CS10(3). It is considered that the lack of a 5 year housing supply within the Borough is insufficient reason to outweigh this policy of restraint.

Reason 2: Highway provisions

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the proposed development would raise unacceptable risk to highway safety and not sufficiently make provision for access and parking as a result of there being insufficient physical traffic calming features within the highway, excessive reversing manoeuvres being required for plots 22 & 23, insufficient provision for increased parking associated with 'affordable units' and insufficient width to one of the cul de sac's, thereby being contrary to the guidance contained within saved Local Plan Policy HO3(vi) and Core Strategy Development Plan Policy CS3 (8).

Reason 3: Insufficient provision of affordable housing

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the proposed scheme fails to make an adequate provision for affordable housing with no mitigating circumstances put forward in detail for such a shortfall. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Stockton on Tees Core Strategy Development Plan Policy CS8 (5).

Reason 4: Impacts on existing tree belt

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the extent and position of development along the southern boundary would have a significant and detrimental impact on the health and longevity of the trees associated with the woodland

planting adjacent to the southern site boundary due to the likely impacts on their root structures. The development would also place future pressure for the removal of trees from within the woodland due to significant impacts of overhanging and overshadowing of gardens and properties. The scheme therefore fails to adequately take into account the impact on surrounding features, contrary to the requirements of saved Local Plan Policy HO3(iv), Core Strategy Development Plan Policy CS3(8) and the National Planning Policy Framework (para. 61).

Reason 5: Insufficient amenity for future occupiers

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, properties 45 to 53 will be unable to achieve adequate levels of natural light into the rear gardens and to rear windows due to the maturing trees, the position of adjacent properties and the limited depth of gardens provided, thereby being contrary to the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraphs 17 & 58) which seek to secure a high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings and ensure that developments function well over their lifetime.

Application 14/0954/REV was a revised application for the erection of 50 dwellings, formation of access, provision of landscaping and associated works that was recommended for approval by officers and refused by planning committee on the 9th July 2014 for the following reasons:

Impact on the green wedge

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposed development would cause irreparable damage to the character and openness of the green wedge at this point as a result of the nature of the development on the site, its scale and its position at a high point relevant to the adjacent parts of the green wedge. The scheme would be likely to impact on the adjacent woodland which would further reduce the value and function of the green wedge to its detriment. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to the guidance contained within Stockton on Tees Core Strategy Development Plan Policy CS10(3). It is considered that the lack of a 5 year housing supply within the Borough is insufficient reason to outweigh this policy of restraint.

Highway provisions

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the proposed development would raise unacceptable risk to highway safety and not sufficiently make provision for access and parking as a result of there being insufficient physical traffic calming features within the highway, excessive reversing manoeuvres being required for plots 22 & 23, insufficient provision for increased parking associated with 'affordable units' and insufficient width to one of the cul de sac's, thereby being contrary to the guidance contained within saved Local Plan Policy HO3(vi) and Core Strategy Development Plan Policy CS3 (8).

Highway provisions

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the proposed development would raise unacceptable risk to highway safety and not sufficiently make provision for access and parking as a result of there being insufficient physical traffic calming features within the highway, excessive reversing manoeuvres being required for plots 22 & 23, insufficient provision for increased parking associated with 'affordable units' and insufficient width to one of the cul de sac's, thereby being contrary to the guidance contained within saved Local Plan Policy HO3(vi) and Core Strategy Development Plan Policy CS3 (8).

15/1466/OUT

Outline planning application (all matters reserved) for residential development of up to 45 dwellings
Recommended for approval by officers
Refused by committee on 28th September 2015 for the following reason;

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the benefits of the proposal are significantly outweighed by the harm to the visual amenity and character of the area which includes the Tees Heritage Park and would

change the built boundary of Thornaby contrary to the adopted Stockton on Tees Local Plan Saved Policy HO 3 (iv) and (v) and adopted Core Strategy Development Plan Policy CS3 (8). It is considered that the lack of a 5 year housing supply within the Borough is insufficient reason to outweigh this policy of restraint

Approved on appeal.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

1. The site is located on the southern side of Thornaby, adjacent to Bassleton Beck Valley which lies between Thornaby and Ingleby Barwick. A line of mainly semi-detached housing backs onto the northern boundary of the site and young / semi mature woodland planting adjoins the southern boundary. To the west lies several houses and to the east lies Middleton Avenue.
2. The site itself has no notable planting within it, being a linear field which has some undulations to the south central edge. The field consists mainly of overgrown grass with two small patches of scrub. The character of the site is mainly defined by its openness, the adjacent tree planting along the southern edge and existing housing along the northern edge.
3. A number of properties along the northern boundary have low height rear garden boundaries and therefore gain relatively open views across the site.

PROPOSAL

4. Permission is sought for the reserved matters of access, scale, layout, appearance and landscaping associated with the outline approval granted on appeal for the development of up to 45 dwellings.
5. The layout detailed on plan is a linear layout, with a single point of access into the site off Cayton Drive. Properties lie to the north and south of the internal road layout and are shown as two storey having front and rear gardens and private drives.

CONSULTATIONS

Consultations were notified and any comments received are summarised below:-

Councillor Moore

I object to the proposals on the grounds of.

Lack of access and egress to the site the original plans include access of Middleton Drive and Cayton Drive, two entry exit points were originally proposed as part of the development.

Comment, " if the design is for one access this should be from Middleton Ave away from existing properties"

The singular access proposed will create excess traffic on estate roads already congested and create a safety hazard for children and resident's, it also raises concern about access for emergency vehicles on the narrow road.

Document 001A showing the proposed housing is using an out of date plan with the proposal overlaid this does not show the true outline of housing on Liverton / Lockton with extensions built on.

These extensions raise cause for concern about the distance between properties. "The Council will normally expect a minimum of 21 metres separation to be provided between the main habitable

room windows on facing residential properties. Where main habitable room windows will face windows of secondary rooms, such as bathrooms and hallways, or a blank gable, there should normally be a gap of at least 11 metres between the two properties." Supplementary Planning Document 1: Sustainable Design Guide.

A new plan showing parameters should be supplied for residents and others before any decisions are taken in relation to this development.

Privacy and Amenity

Providing a balance between the natural surveillance of public areas and excessive overlooking of private areas can be difficult to achieve but is important. Private garden areas should not be subject to an inordinate level of overlooking from public spaces or neighbouring properties. There is a lack of public open space on the development and possible overlooking from neighbouring properties these issues should be addressed.

There is a semi - ancient hedgerow, The Hedgerows Regulations 1997 protect most countryside hedgerows from being removed (including being uprooted or otherwise destroyed).

Councillor Ian Dalgarno

Objection based on car parking issues, the development not being suitable for the area, loss of open space, loss of privacy, scale / size of development, traffic / highways matters, visual impact. This land was classed as Green Wedge and Tees Heritage Park and should not be developed on.

Thornaby Town Council

Object to this planning application because of the layout, design and access.

Friends of Tees Heritage Park

FTHP have consistently objected to proposals for this site because of the loss of land in the Tees Heritage Park and Green Wedge, which has been supported by the Council. Sadly the Secretary of State has seen fit to overturn the Council's refusal and we are now dealing with reserved matters pursuant to the outline consent.

Our objection to this application is the visual/access relationship between the proposed development and the Heritage Park. Historically, housing estates along the Tees valley have turned their backs on the river and its tributary valleys, isolating these green "lungs" visually and environmentally from local residents. The Tees Heritage Park seeks to change this attitude and increasingly new housing schemes are responding and turning to face the open space and integrating with it. Unfortunately this submission pays no respect to the Park and once again turns its back on it. Furthermore, we are of the opinion that the density of development is too high, which prevents the introduction of incidental open spaces along the Park frontage.

There is the opportunity for an imaginative design approach, which could benefit the new occupiers and existing local residents if the housing turned its face to the valley with open front gardens and a more informal layout. This could also benefit the scheme commercially in terms of house values providing many with views onto the adjoining woodland and green space. An optional footpath link could also be provided to enable resident's direct access onto the footpath system being developed within the Park area.

We therefore object to the proposal as it is detrimental to the aims and objectives of the Heritage Park as referred to in the Council's Core Strategy and current policies, by virtue of inappropriate appearance, density and lack of any proposals for landscape/access integration with the Tees Heritage Park.

Environmental Health Unit

I have no additional comments to make to the above application following my original comments under application 15/1466/OUT.

Spatial Planning & Regeneration

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires an application for planning permission to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan, unless the material considerations surrounding the proposal indicate otherwise. The development plan for Stockton on Tees Borough is made up of policies from the adopted Core Strategy (2010) and saved policies from Local Plan Alteration Number One (2006). The principle of residential development at this location has been accepted.

Highways, Transport and Environment

This application is for Reserved Matters approval (appearance, landscaping, layout, access and scale) for the erection of 45 No. dwellings, access from Cayton Drive and ancillary works pursuant to outline planning consent 15/1466/OUT. The principle of the development has been agreed as part of the outline planning consent (15/1466/OUT).

In terms of access the applicant is proposing a single point of access to be taken from Cayton Drive. When considering the Outline application (15/1466/OUT) Highways, Transport and Environment requested that the site should be served from two points of access, Cayton Drive and Middleton Avenue, in order to minimise the development traffic utilising each access point. Whilst it is not possible to provide a second point of access from Middleton Drive, due to land ownership issues, the proposed access from Cayton Drive is suitable for serving the scale of development. Highways, Transport and Environment are therefore unable to raise a highways objection, to the proposed development, in relation to the means of access.

This memorandum takes account of the Proposed Site Plan ref: 1614/001C and having reviewed the latest plans Highways, Transport & Environment considers that the proposals submitted are acceptable in terms of appearance, layout, access and scale. However, the amendments requested in relation to landscaping have not been fully implemented and the proposals are less than desirable. Therefore in order to ensure an appropriate landscaping scheme is delivered the final details, which should include additional tree planting, should be secured by condition.

Head of Housing

Provided details of the extent of affordable housing required for the site.

Northumbrian Water Limited

In our previous comments relating to the outline permission of the site (ref: 15/1466/OUT) we raised concerns with the proposed developments proximity to our existing sewage pumping station (SPS). As mentioned, all SPS emit unpleasant odours and noise at certain times during their operation and that we would require more detail in order to assess the impact the SPS may have on the proposed development

The proposed layout of the site has taken into consideration the existing SPS by ensuring that closest dwelling is in excess of 15 metres from the SPS. We can therefore confirm we have no objections to the appearance, landscaping, layout, access & scale of the proposal.

Northern Gas Networks

Standardised comments of no objections but there may be apparatus in the area and the developer should make contact with them.

PUBLICITY

Neighbours were notified and comments received are summarised below :-

116 objections, 1 supporter

Andy Jones, 17 Lockton Crescent Thornaby
 S A O'Hara, 28 Picton Crescent Thornaby
 Mrs Maureen Leonard, 6 Carlton Drive Thornaby
 N Deacon, 31 Kintyre Drive Thornaby
 Mrs Nyla A Osborne, 21 Burniston Drive Thornaby
 Mrs M Cliff, 3 Burniston Drive Thornaby
 Matthew William Johnson, 35 Kintyre Drive Thornaby
 Edna Pickering, 31 Liverton Crescent Thornaby
 Henry Westwood, 15 Liverton Crescent Thornaby
 Mr Dick Wardell, 12 Liverton Crescent Thornaby
 Michael Hutchinson, 19 Lockton Crescent Thornaby
 Nicole Jones, 17 Lockton Crescent Thornaby
 Gordon Hobbs, 47 Lockton Crescent Thornaby
 H L Palin, 37 Lockton Crescent Thornaby
 David Brown, 19 Liverton Crescent Thornaby
 Mrs Colleen Simpson, 16 Liverton Crescent Thornaby
 Mrs Burke, 10 Liverton Crescent Thornaby
 Edith Brown, 8 Liverton Crescent Thornaby
 Mr Martin Blackburn, 16 Burniston Drive Thornaby
 Mr Eric Jack Elliott, 1 Middleton Avenue Thornaby
 Charles Colin Appleby, 12 Burniston Drive Thornaby
 Neil And Eileen Petty, 8 Bader Avenue Thornaby
 Mr And Mrs Carr, 10 Middleton Avenue Thornaby
 James Anthony And Jennifer Miller, 18 Lockton
 Crescent Thornaby
 Mr And Mrs G Jones, 16 Lockton Crescent Thornaby
 Mrs M J Pearson, 14 Lockton Crescent Thornaby
 Mrs Barbara Taylor, 10 Lockton Crescent Thornaby
 John Malcolm Legg, 9 Lockton Crescent Thornaby
 Mr And Mrs J R Salt, 8 Lockton Crescent Thornaby
 Miss Cheryl Burton, 7 Lockton Crescent Thornaby
 Mr And Mrs Rudd, 19 Burniston Drive Thornaby
 Ken And Ann Gardner , 3 Lockton Crescent Thornaby
 Mrs P Williams, 33 Chesterton Avenue Thornaby
 Mrs Doreen Riley, 9 Liverton Crescent Thornaby
 Julie Collier, 10 Bracknell Road Thornaby
 Mr And Mrs Thwaites, 22 Middleton Avenue Thornaby
 Barbara Tyan, 19 Scampton Close Thornaby
 Lawrence Collier, 33 Liverton Crescent Thornaby
 Darren Collier, 10 Bracknell Road Thornaby
 Geoffrey Riley, 9 Liverton Crescent Thornaby
 Ron And Gillian Hill, 102 Bassleton Lane Thornaby
 Anne Snelling, 10 Bader Avenue Thornaby
 Miss Jay Collier, 55 Church Field Way Ingleby Barwick
 Mrs Susan Collier, 55 Church Field Way Ingleby
 Barwick
 Eileen Skidmore, 25 Lockton Crescent Thornaby
 Susan Simms, 19 Liverton Crescent Thornaby
 Peter Simms, 19 Liverton Crescent Thornaby
 Christine Brown, 19 Liverton Crescent Thornaby
 Jacqueline Henderson, 61 Bassleton Lane Thornaby
 Gavin Collier, 55 Church Field Way Ingleby Barwick

 Mr Keith Butler, 30 Kintyre Drive Thornaby
 Mr Kenneth Gettings, 91 Bassleton Lane Thornaby
 Miss Helen O'Connell, 5 Liverton Crescent Thornaby
 Anthony McCue, 7 Burniston Drive Thornaby
 Mr Ronald Brown, 27 Liverton Crescent Thornaby
 Matt Morgan, 21 Liverton Crescent Thornaby
 Miss Stephanie Graham, 12 Cayton Drive Thornaby
 Mr John Allison, 17 Burniston Drive Thornaby
 Mrs Jean Dodds, 11 Burniston Drive Thornaby

Mr Robert Turner, 10 Cayton Drive Thornaby
 Mr Robert newton, 29 Lockton Crescent Thornaby
 Mrs Kathleen Collier, 33 Liverton Crescent Thornaby
 Ms Emma Chapman, 29 Liverton Crescent Thornaby
 Mr David Flewker, 1 Liverton Crescent Thornaby
 Joan Imeson, 24 Bader Avenue Thornaby
 Mr Christopher agar, 1 Lockton Crescent Thornaby
 Mr Leslie Fothergill, 22 Lockton Crescent Thornaby
 Mr Raymond Pinnegar, 9 Barton Close Thornaby
 Mr Michael McGahon, 4 Barton Close Thornaby
 Mr Kaashif Latif, 31 Lockton Crescent Thornaby
 Mr Robert crallan, 7 Charrington Avenue Thornaby
 Mr Jonathan Skidmore, 63 Marchlyn Crescent Ingleby
 Barwick
 M Ethrington, 33 Kintyre Drive Thornaby
 Catherine Ansell, 2 Cayton Drive Thornaby
 Mr Gordon Cooper, 23 Liverton Crescent Thornaby
 Mr Gregory Havelaar, 8 Cayton Drive Thornaby
 Mrs Rachel Wilkinson, 7 Barkston Avenue Thornaby
 Mr Michael Degnan, 11 Liverton Crescent Thornaby
 Mrs Christine Mundy, 28 Crosswell Park Ingleby
 Barwick
 Mrs Valerie Lowe, 3 Lockton Crescent Thornaby
 Brent & Christine Smith, 35 Lockton Crescent Thornaby
 Jean Higgin, 20 Charrington Avenue Thornaby
 Mr Paul Webster, 33 Lockton Crescent Thornaby
 Mr Keith Brittain, 51 Bader Avenue Thornaby
 Mr Michael Spink, 6 Middleton Avenue Thornaby
 Mr K Skidmore, 25 Lockton Crescent Thornaby
 Miss Caroline Tyerman, 23 Axton Close Thornaby
 Ms Jan Jobling, 14 Carlton Drive Thornaby
 Mrs Dorothy Cooper, 32 Kinderton Grove Norton
 Mr Peter Coffield, 5 Axton Close Thornaby
 Mrs Lynn Cooper, 23 Liverton Crescent Thornaby
 Mrs carol Wilkinson, 5 Kintyre Drive Thornaby
 Miss Izabelle Cooper-Charlton, 23 Liverton Crescent
 Thornaby
 Miss Bethany Kerr, 25 Liverton Crescent Thornaby
 Mr Steve O'Toole, 121 Wolsingham Drive Thornaby
 Mrs Jean taylor, 3 Cayton Drive Thornaby
 Miss Kimberley Kerr, 25 Liverton Crescent Thornaby
 Mrs Rosemarie Turner, 10 Cayton Drive Thornaby
 Miss Pamela Cooper, 23 Liverton Crescent Thornaby
 Miss Lily Cooper-Charlton, 23 Liverton Crescent
 Thornaby
 Mrs Andrea Kirkwood, 12 Lulsgate Thornaby
 Mr Ben Kirkwood, 12 Lulsgate Thornaby
 Mrs Julie Havelaar, 8 Cayton Drive Thornaby
 Mr Kenneth Instone, 19 Barwick Fields Ingleby Barwick
 Miss Jessica Kirkwood, 12 Lulsgate Thornaby
 Miss Jean Stockley, 1 Ryton Close Thornaby
 Mr GARY WILSON, 26 White House Road Thornaby
 Mr Paul Wilson, 27 Lockton Crescent Thornaby
 Mr Jeffrey Kerr, 25 Liverton Crescent Thornaby
 Mrs P Norman, 9 Kintyre Drive Thornaby
 Mr Anthony Maguire, 78 Bassleton Lane Thornaby
 Mr Kaashif Latif, 31 Lockton Crescent Thornaby
 Mr Alex McQuade, 20 Kintyre Drive Thornaby
 Mrs Annette Kerr, 25 Liverton Crescent Thornaby
 Miss Laura McIntosh, 27 Lockton Crescent Thornaby
 Mr Ian / Janice Hume, 17 Liverton Crescent Thornaby

- Principle of development, loss of green space, impact on wildlife,

- The proposed plan does not appear to include extension to gardens,
- The proposed plans do not show the extension to existing properties,
- Will there be a boundary fence erected between my garden and the new properties.
- The separation distances proposed are not acceptable,
- Object in relation to Highway Safety.
- In previous applications Highways have commented that the site should have two access points. Surely the same should apply to this latest application.
- The result of the close proximity will be significant overshadowing, loss of light and loss of privacy.
- Cayton Drive is a small cul-de-sac which itself is accessed from Burniston Drive or Liverton Crescent all of which are minor residential roads. Neither Cayton nor Burniston are designed to cope with the additional traffic that would be brought by this development.
- It is completely unacceptable that existing residents should be subject to a significant increase in traffic volume, noise and pollution.
- The outline planning application proposed the development would include open spaces to include trees and shrubs to benefit wildlife and landscape. There are no public open spaces shown on the site plan.
- Due to the tightness and overcrowding of the development there also appears to be a lack of additional car parking.
- Loss of light and privacy.
- I have recently moved from a property who's neighbour had been allowed to build an extension 3ft from my back fence. It completely blocked out the light to my garden and was extremely oppressive when using my garden space so much so that I resorted to moving. It is unacceptable to feel that because a gable end does not have a window that it is not going to have a huge detrimental affect on those people living in Liverton.
- The only road into the site is via Bader avenue, there is a school which is situated on the corner of Bader ave and Thornaby road this is a busy traffic area and also children have to cross Bader Ave to gain access, surely more traffic would exacerbate the situation, have you considered that Middleton ave which runs toward the proposed site, could be opened up, where there is currently a dead end and adjoined to Thornaby road, this would solve the traffic congestion issue on Bader ave,
- Noise, traffic and the light from these houses,
- The street lights on a night will be light pollution so no more looking at the night sky
- Proximity of new dwellings to existing ones, proximity to ends of gardens,
- The proposed entrance to the site is right opposite our front door and is currently where we park our vehicles so to avoid blocking the T junction at the end of Liverton crescent.
- Impacts of construction phase and construction traffic.
- The traffic at the top of Bader Avenue is already congested on a morning due to a variety of estates accessing main roads and other parts of Thornaby by a main route, adding this extra development will add to this congestion.
- The proposed site is a Green wedge which forms part of the Tees Heritage Park and should be protected from development for housing.
- These are narrow residential streets which would see a big increase in traffic flow causing noise and nuisance for the existing residents in the area.
- There have been a number of previous applications to develop on this site and all have been successfully challenged this raises a question mark over how this application has been allowed to progress to this stage.
- This is green wedge land and part of the Tees Heritage area which should not be developed on.
- This proposed development is out of character with the surrounding area and would impact the current residents.
- The high density of the development means that the proposed properties over shadow the current properties

- The development is overbearing in relation to the properties already there. The loss of existing views from neighbouring properties will adversely affect the residential amenity of neighbouring owners.
- A solution to these very real concerns over traffic would be to open the junction off Thornaby Road that was partly formed when the Harewood Estate was developed. This would service Harewood and the new development from Middleton Avenue, which could then be blocked off at the end of the existing houses. The new junction could be managed by the traffic signals already in place at the Thornaby Road/ Cunningham Drive junction.
- 11 of the properties on Lockton and Liverton Crescents have rear extensions which are not shown on document 001A. The significance is that many of the existing properties are much closer to the proposed new houses than illustrated.
- Also all the existing properties have low roofs the new development seems to have very tall roofs again not in keeping with existing properties. This would make the new development out of scale and out of character with existing properties and be a potential eyesore especially for residents of Liverton crescent.
- Over-crowding in the schools in the area already without extending the local population
- There are no proposals to preserve and maintain the ancient hedgerow along the northern boundary, or provide a landscaping screen to protect the amenities of existing houses.
- Poor drainage in our area already
- Very little space appears to be allowed for car parking. Even if young families move into these houses at first, in years to come the children will become drivers and, including parents cars there could very easily be 3+ cars per house. Very few of the houses have double drives. There will need to be a lot of manoeuvring of cars on these single drives and some will have to park on the road. Future needs should be considered.

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

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.

Local Planning Policy

The following planning policies are considered to be relevant to the consideration of this application.

Saved Policy HO3 of the adopted Stockton on Tees Local Plan

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.

Core Strategy Policy 2 (CS2) - Sustainable Transport and Travel

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.

Core Strategy Policy 3 (CS3) - Sustainable Living and Climate Change

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.

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

6. The principle of residential development on the site was established on appeal under an earlier application. This proposal now seeks permission for the reserved matters of the access, layout, scale, appearance and landscaping of the development. A number of objections have been made in respect to the principle of development, the loss of green wedge and the loss of a site within the Tees Heritage Park. As the principle of developing the site has been established, these matters are not able to be taken into account in determining this application.
7. The reserved matters details are considered as follows;

Proposed access

8. The development would be served by a single point of access to be taken from Cayton Drive. When considering the outline application, Highways, Transport and Environment requested that the site should be served from two points of access, one off Cayton Drive and one off Middleton Avenue. This has been referred to by objectors. This would have minimised development traffic utilising each access point. The applicant has advised that it is not possible to provide a second point of access from Middleton Drive due to land ownership issues. Highways Transport and Environment have considered the proposal to serve the site via a single access from Cayton Drive and consider it to be acceptable.

9. The Highways, Transport & Environment team also considers that the proposals submitted are acceptable in terms of the internal layout which details appropriate levels of parking, private drives and visitor parking spaces.

Site layout including impacts on surrounding properties

10. The layout of housing is shown taking a relatively linear form which is due to the linear nature of the site itself. The access is taken from Cayton Drive which splits in an east to west direction and forms two cul de sacs. Properties would front onto the new highway along its southern side whilst retaining sufficient distance from the tree belt to its southern boundary to prevent undue impacts on the amenity of future occupiers given this is a maturing tree belt which will gain height and density.
11. Internally, properties are spaced from one another in a manner common to modern housing layouts. Tandem parking is provided to the side of a number of properties which creates greater gaps between dwellings than would otherwise be achieved and will allow the tree belt to the rear to be more visible from within the site. A footpath has been provided along the southern side of the internal highway and a service strip adjacent to the northern side along with grass and planting out-with fenced boundaries. This will assist in limiting the extent of hard surfacing and maximise the amount of green space within the site which is considered will result in a positive street scene appearance.
12. The development abuts existing properties along its northern edge. Residents have raised objection to the proximity of the development to their boundaries and have advised that the applicants plan does not show or take into account existing extensions to the existing properties and consider that this development will unduly affect their privacy and amenity. The applicant is not bound to survey all of the adjacent properties in submitting their application and their reliance has been on Ordnance Survey mapping which is general practice. The case officer has however visited the site and viewed all of the existing properties adjacent to the northern edge of the site. A number of mainly single storey extensions have been constructed to the rear of properties in both Liverton Crescent and Lockton Crescent backing onto the site. These properties are slightly higher than the application site which itself slopes down in a southerly direction. A number of these properties also have low height boundaries, giving a relatively open outlook to the rear. With regards to fencing, permitted development rights exist for fencing of up to 2m in height to be provided along the boundary which would result in loss of views across the site from the ground floor rooms of existing properties. Notwithstanding this, loss of a view is not a material planning consideration. The impacts of the imposition of a new boundary between the development and existing properties therefore carries limited weight.
13. The site layout proposes 9 properties siding onto the northern edge of development adjacent to existing residential boundaries, all of which are positioned 11+m from the main rear elevations of existing properties, although it is recognised that some extensions are closer. The applicant has agreed to hip the roofs to these properties which will limit the bulk of the properties at roof line and has also agreed and detailed on plan several of these properties moving slightly further away from the existing boundaries. Windows and doors within the side elevations will be limited to bathrooms / en-suites and utilities and should not cause undue impacts on privacy and amenity for occupiers of existing properties. A condition is recommended to control the levels of properties within the site to prevent any being notably raised above existing ground levels.
14. The Friends of Tees Heritage Park have raised objection to the schemes layout, suggesting that the development does not take the opportunity to provide an imaginative design approach, which could benefit the new occupiers and existing local residents if the housing turned its face to the valley with open front gardens and a more informal layout. Whilst

noted, a semi mature wooded area lies to the southern side of the development and trees within that have a mature height of 20+metres. Whilst facing out over a valley would have its benefits to occupiers, facing onto a tree belt at close quarters is considered would be less than ideal. It is also considered that the proposed layout does not undermine the use or landscape value of the adjacent land to the south given its wooded form.

Scale of development

15. The proposal shows 45 properties, all of which are 2 storey. The residential area to the north is largely made up of 2 storey properties and of a similar density to those being proposed, having private drives to the front and private gardens to the rear. The scale of development is considered to be in keeping with its surroundings.

Appearance of development

16. As mentioned elsewhere in the report, the internal street scene will be relatively green and portray a positive aspect to the development. The houses will be limited in height to 2 storey and gaps are achieved between buildings on the south side which will allow views of the wooded area beyond to be achieved. Properties are a mix of house types, varying in widths / depths, some with and some without garages, some off private drives and a mix of hip and gable roofs. In view of these matters it is considered that the development will be suitable in appearance for its location. A condition is recommended to agree the external materials of the properties and the design of boundary treatments.

Landscaping of the Site

17. The site layout is shown having green space to the front and side of properties lining the internal highway, which should provide a positive access into the site and green aspect throughout. Blocks of driveways have been broken up by landscaping to prevent long unbroken areas of hard stand. The Highways, Transport and Environment Team have advised that additional tree planting should be provided in key positions and a condition is recommended to achieve this which will gain benefit to greening the street scene.
18. Comment has been raised about the presence of existing hedges and boundary treatments to the rear of existing properties and the possible impacts on these. The proposed plans show a 1.8m high close boarded fence forming the boundary between properties and this would be either immediately adjacent to the existing boundaries or a replacement to existing boundaries, the latter of which would require individual owners agreements.
19. There are two trees within the site which will be retained as part of this proposal and the proposed layout adequately takes account of their presence. Objection has been raised that a semi ancient hedgerow would be removed from the site. Ancient hedgerows need to achieve specific criteria to be considered as such and hedgerow removal does not require permission in certain circumstances, including where they are less than 20m in length and where they adjoin a residential boundary. The hedgerows within the site are not protected / ancient hedgerows.

Other Matters

20. Northern Gas Networks have advised that they have no objections but there may be apparatus in the area and the developer should make contact with them. An informative has been recommended to address this.
21. Northumbrian Water have advised that they have no objections to the scheme, considering the nearest house to be sufficiently distanced from the adjacent sewage pumping station.

22. The Head of Housing has commented on the extent of affordable housing for the site which is dealt with under the outline approval and which formed part of the Section 106 Agreement for that development.

CONCLUSION

23. The proposed development is considered to represent a suitable layout which is in keeping with its surroundings, provides adequate access and which would not unduly impact on nearby residential properties in terms of privacy or amenity. It is recommended that the application be approved with conditions for the reasons specified above.

Director of Economic Growth and Development Services
Contact Officer Mr Andrew Glossop Telephone No 01642 527796

WARD AND WARD COUNCILLORS

Ward	Village
Ward Councillor	Councillor Ian Dalgarno
Ward Councillor	Councillor Mick Moore

IMPLICATIONS

Financial Implications:

There are no known financial implications in determining this application.

Environmental Implications:

The environmental implications of developing the site were largely matters for the outline approval. The proposed layout assists in protecting the longevity of the trees on the southern site boundary. Green space will exist throughout the estate although in an entirely different form that that existing. There are no known notable environmental implications in determining this application.

Human Rights Implications:

The provisions of the European Convention of Human Rights 1950 have been taken into account in the preparation of this report. Comments received have all been taken into account although many relate to the principle of development which has already been established and are therefore not material to the consideration of the reserved matters. The proposed layout reasonably takes into account the implications on existing properties.

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. The site access and road layout are considered to be safe and the proposal would be served by the existing footpath network which is considered to be capable of taking the additional demand created by this scheme. There are no known community safety issues associated with the development.

Background Papers

Stockton on Tees Local Plan Adopted 1997

Core Strategy – 2010

Emerging

Regeneration and Environment Local Plan – Publication February 2015.

Supplementary Planning Documents

SPD1 – Sustainable Design Guide

SPD3 – Parking Provision for Developments