

DELEGATED

**AGENDA NO
PLANNING COMMITTEE**

7th September 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

Update Report

Planning committee considered the application on the 6th July 2016 which was based upon the officers report presented to committee and which recommended approval subject to condition. In considering the proposal, Planning Committee raised a number of concerns which were partly in relation to the proximity of development to the northern site boundary and partly on the basis of there being only a single access serving the development. Committee requested that these matters be looked into further and for the application to be placed back to committee at a later date.

The applicant has sought to revise the proposed layout of the development to amend the position of properties along the northern boundary and has sought to comment further on the proposed access.

A consultation was undertaken on the revised information and responses received are summarised below;

Consultation responses

Councillor Mick Moore.
Councillor Ian Dalgarno

Mr Gary Wilson, 26 White House Road, Thornaby
Mr Paul Norman, 2 Barton Close, Thornaby
Mr Robert Crallan, 7 Charrington Avenue, Thornaby
Mr Anthony Mccue, 7 Burniston Drive, Thornaby
Mrs Kathleen Collier, 33 Liverton Crescent, Thornaby
Mrs Brenda Bean, 98 Bassleton Lane, Thornaby
Mr Jonathan Skidmore, 63 Marchlyn Crescent, Ingleby
Maureen and Mike Nicholson, 6 Ryton Close, Thornaby
Mr Robert Turner, 10 Cayton Drive, Thornaby
Mrs Eileen Skidmore, 25 Lockton Crescent, Thornaby
Mr Keith Skidmore, 25 Lockton Crescent, Thornaby
Mr & Mrs Smith, 35 Lockton Crescent, Thornaby

Summarised comments

The amendments have barely changed the scheme and there is still only one access being proposed. The committee told the developer that two accesses were desirable and that the developer should pursue this aim. The appeal Inspector was told there would be two accesses and they therefore have an obligation to do so otherwise they would be in breach of the appeal inspector. The Councils Highways officers initially requested a 2nd access and they should explain why they now support only a single access.

There is a lack of information regarding the capability of the existing roads to take the additional traffic particularly given there is already double parking due to the number of vehicles per household. Cars will have to park on pavements in the existing highways.

The access road is not suitable for the amount of traffic to the site. Cayton Drive is a narrow section of road and people park on the highway. Traffic congestion will be unacceptable. The scheme will also bring highway safety risk to elderly residents which live in the existing streets.

Consideration that the extent of vehicles estimated within the Technical Note submitted by the applicant underestimates the number of vehicles using the site. The number of vehicles is likely to be 3x what the technical note suggests.

The homes are still too close to existing properties.

There are far too many houses proposed for this small site. Properties are crammed along the southern site boundary with virtually no spaces between which will be out of keeping with the layout of the existing estate.

The committee put an obligation on the developer to amend the site plan so that there would be a much reduced impact on existing residents as recommended by the appeal Inspector.

The plan submitted showing existing extensions (google image) is too vague and it is not clear enough to see extensions properly. Although distances are shown on plan, they do not reflect distances from extensions.

The semi's on plots 2 and 3 will affect the outlook and privacy associated with 25 Lockton Crescent given the proximity and position of the dwelling and there being a utility door and bathroom window within that elevation.

The field is supposed to be part of the Tees Heritage Park. Development must not be at the expense of the environment.

Loss of green belt and destruction of flora and fauna ,Impact on protected tree,

Material Planning Considerations

Site layout changes

In considering options to amend the scheme, the applicant queried the ability to move the whole development further to the south which would be closer to the existing tree belt to the south of the site. Whilst this would have increased the distances between existing and proposed properties, officers had refused an earlier application on the grounds that it was too close to the tree belt and would prevent reasonable amenity being achieved and that it would affect the long term future of the tree belt. As such, officers were not prepared to support such a change.

Amendments to the site layout have sought to increase distances between existing and proposed properties, specifically, plots 42 and 45 as detailed on the revised site layout plan. The properties bordering the northern site boundary are all side on to existing properties and all achieve between 11 and 13.5m distance between the original rear elevations of existing properties and the side

elevations of the proposed properties. The arrangement proposed is compared to the arrangement as previously reported to committee at appendix. 1.

In relation to plots 4 and 5 to the north west corner of the site the side elevations of these properties are set approximately 2.5m in from the boundary and have a limited width of 2 storey elevation (only 6.7m) with the remaining part of that facing elevation being single storey with low height parapet roof which would assist in limiting the impacts of the scheme on the existing properties. Plot 42 is the same house type and is set 2m in from the boundary whilst plot 43 is set 5m in from the boundary. There are no side windows in this property type.

In relation to plot 3, this is shown having a hip roof, being set 2.5m in from the boundary and having a utility door at ground floor and small obscurely glazed bathroom window at first floor and the side elevation would achieve 12m from the original rear elevation of the nearest existing property. Plot 3 is also slightly offset from the original part of that dwelling all of which assists in limiting the overall impact of the dwelling.

Plots 44 and 45 achieve around 12.5m between the original rear elevation of existing dwellings and the proposed side elevations and are set in approximately 2.5m from the boundary between existing and proposed properties. The roofs to these properties would also be hipped and this would assist in reducing the impact on the extent to which the properties will affect sunlight into existing gardens and reduce the potential for being overbearing.

It is noted that a number of the existing properties beyond the northern boundary have been extended to the rear and these extensions will be in closer proximity to the proposed dwellings than the main part of those properties. However, given the distances achieved between elevations, given the proposed layout having side elevations facing existing properties, given there being significant gaps between properties along the northern boundary which the existing properties will be able to view between, along with the applicant having specified hip roofs being utilised for a number of the properties along the northern boundary, it remains to be considered that the proposed scheme, whilst a significant change to the current situation, would not be out of keeping with the relatively tight knit grain of the existing estate and would not result in significant undue overshadowing of existing properties and would not result in a significant and undue overbearing impact on existing properties.

Privacy is dealt with in the main report and subject to the imposition of a new boundary treatment between properties, reasonable amenity for existing and future residents would be achieved.

Access Arrangements

The applicant has submitted a highways note in response to concerns of Planning Committee over there being a single access serving the development. The Technical Note considers the geometry of the new road and accessibility for emergency vehicles.

The technical note advises that the proposed internal road has turning heads at either end, a 2m footpath to the southern side and that this arrangement allows for manoeuvring of large vehicles including emergency vehicles. In addition, visitor parking bays have been provided in two separate locations along the proposed internal highway and adjacent to other parking, with a total of 9 visitor spaces being provided. The submission indicates that based on 2011 statistics from the Office for National Statistics, the average car ownership for this ward is 1.02 cars per household.

The Technical Note advises that Cayton Drive and Liverton Crescent are 5.3m and 5.5m in width respectively and that this is sufficient to allow an emergency vehicle to pass even in the instance of there being a parked car/s within the street.

A large part of objectors concerns relate to the ability for vehicles to pass from the proposed dwellings through the existing streets citing existing parking problems such as double parking within the street. The proposed scheme has provided adequate parking within the site in order to provide for the future residents and these are all 'off street'. Furthermore, the street is of sufficient width to take additional on street parking should it be required. Any traffic generated will travel through the adjacent residential streets and the existing traffic / parking utilising those streets is an existing situation which the application for this scheme could not reasonably be expected to mitigate. Matters of obstruction to the free flow of traffic, whilst they may occur, should be dealt with under separate legislation. There is no indication that existing residents of Cayton Drive and Liverton Crescent cannot pass along these highways within their vehicles and in view of the proposed development not adding to existing parked traffic within these streets, the ability to pass along these highways should not worsen unless traffic numbers are so great that significant congestion would occur. The Highways, Transport and Environment Manager considers that the level of traffic generated would not result in significant congestion as detailed within the main report.

Other Matters

A number of other matters have been raised which are addressed in the main report or by virtue of their being an existing outline approval for the site.

Conclusion

That the application be determined in accordance with the recommendation within the main report subject to the amendment of approved plan references in order to reflect the latest plans submitted.

Appendix 1:

Site layout previously proposed at 6th July 2016 Committee



Current Site layout being considered

