

**DELEGATED**

**AGENDA NO**

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**16 AUGUST 2017**

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

**16/1904/FUL**

**Yarm School, The Friarage, The Spital  
Erection of wooden pedestrian and cycle bridge.**

**Expiry Date : 2 December 2016**

**SUMMARY**

Full planning permission is sought for a bridge comprising a wooden ramp and wooden railings, spanning some 36m across the River Tees.

The applicant Yarm School has identified that a new bridge is required to provide safe and quick access to the Heritage Park for school activities.

The bridge will be managed and maintained by Yarm School and will be permanently accessible for public use.

A total of 253 comments have been received and are set out within the consultation section of this report. The objections raised relate primarily to the need for a bridge; impact on Tees Heritage Park, risk of anti-social behaviour; impact on residential amenity; traffic impact on Egglecliffe village and other matters.

The main planning considerations of this application are the compliance of the proposal with national and local planning policy, the impacts upon the character and appearance of the area, impact on the conservation area, highway safety, flood risk, ecology, archaeology and nature conservation and other material planning considerations.

The Council's Landscape Architect has considered the proposal and concluded that the bridge would introduce a new permanent built element on to the edge of a rural landscape. However, it is considered that the bridge design has been carefully considered to minimise its impact on local character and visual amenity. The submitted design has a low profile with a gentle arch, although it still allows a vessel to pass beneath. It has slender legs on low concrete supports, and appears as a light timber structure to minimise its visual impact.

It is considered that the proposal will not result in the coalescence of settlements and will not harm the openness or amenity value of the Green Wedge and would not detrimentally alter the character of the Tees Heritage Park.

The Heritage Park is served by an extensive network of paths, including the Teesdale Way, Thornaby Trail with cycleways running between Preston Park, Ingleby Barwick and Thornaby. The bridge will increase connectivity and accessibility to the Heritage Park thereby improving public access to the land and river and provide for greater opportunities for public recreation.

In terms of promoting tourism the proposals have also been designed to ensure that the river traffic can freely navigate the river.

In terms of crime and disorder, Cleveland Police have raised no issues in respect of the proposed development. The School has also stated that they will actively monitor both sides of the river, this will include CCTV monitoring on the school side.

In respect of disabled users, the proposed footbridge will meet all DDA requirements.

To minimise any adverse impact on the amenity of the residents, the bridge (excluding ramps) is set over 18.m approximately away from the residential properties at Atlas Wynd. It is considered that this separation distance is acceptable given the transitory nature of use and additional landscaping to further screen the bridge will also mitigate any potential impact.

Comments have been received stating that the applicant is pursuing a bridge to gain access to land for future expansion plans. In response it must be noted that this is a standalone proposal which must be considered on its own merits.

The application is accompanied by an Ecological Impact Assessment. The proposed development is not predicted to have any impacts on statutory/non-statutory sites.

A Flood Risk Assessment accompanies the application which confirms that it is highly unlikely that the proposed footbridge will have any significant impact on flood risk. The form and location of the bridge will result in minimal loss of floodplain storage and little/no impact on flood flow routes. The Environment Agency has fully considered the flood risk and has no objection to the proposal subject to appropriate controlling conditions.

In respect of archaeology, Tees Archaeology has considered the proposal and raises no objection to the planning application subject to an appropriate controlling condition.

The Highways, Transport and Design Manager has considered the proposal and raises no objection on highway grounds to the proposed development.

It is considered that whilst there would be an impact on the local highway network during the construction phase this impact can be managed through the agreement of a construction management plan. Post construction the bridge would positively contribute to the existing sustainable travel network of Yarm and Egglecliffe.

The applicant has submitted a construction method statement, in support of the proposed application, which sets out the measures that will be put in place during the construction phase to minimise the impact on the local highway network. The information provided within the construction method statement is considered to be acceptable however the final details are subject to a condition.

The impacts of the proposal have been considered against national and local planning guidance and the development as proposed is considered to be in line with general planning policies set out in the Development Plan. The proposal is also considered acceptable in terms of highway safety, does not adversely impact on the neighbouring properties and character of the Conservation Area, ecological habitat, archaeology, flooding and is recommended for approval with conditions as set out below.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

That planning application 16/1904/FUL be approved subject to the following conditions and informatives;

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

Plan Reference Number	Date on Plan
781-SD-00.01 REV B	8 December 2016
SD-10.01 REV J	21 April 2017

Reason: To define the consent.

- 02 No development shall commence until full details of proposed hard landscaping has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This will include all external finishing materials, finished levels, and all construction details confirming materials, colours, finishes and fixings. The scheme shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority and in accordance with the approved details within a period of 12 months from the date on which the development commenced or prior to the occupation of any part of the development. Any defects in materials or workmanship appearing within a period of 12 months from completion of the total development shall be made-good by the owner as soon as practicably possible.

Reason: To enable the LPA to control details of the proposed development, to ensure a high quality hard landscaping scheme is provided in the interests of visual amenity which contributes positively to local character of the area.

- 03 Notwithstanding the proposals detailed in the Design and Access Statement/ submitted plans, prior to the commencement of development, details of the enclosure shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such means of enclosure shall be erected before the development hereby approved is brought into use.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the locality.

- 04 Notwithstanding the proposals detailed in the Design and Access Statement/ submitted plans no development shall commence until an Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan is approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This must be in close accordance with:

1. BRITISH STANDARD 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations;
2. NJUG Guidelines For The Planning, Installation And Maintenance Of Utility Apparatus In Proximity To Trees (Issue 2) – Operatives Handbook 19th November 2007.

Any such scheme agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority shall be implemented prior to any equipment, machinery or materials being brought to site for use in the development and be maintained until all the equipment, machinery or surplus materials connected with the development have been removed from the site.

**Reason: To protect the all existing trees on and immediately adjacent to the site (within 10m) that the Local Planning Authority consider provide important amenity value in the locality.**

- 05 All ecological mitigation measures within the Ecological Impact Assessment, Footbridge at Yarm School, E3 Ecology Ltd shall be implemented in full in accordance with the advice and recommendations contained within the document.**

**Reason: To conserve protected species and their habitat**

- 06 If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted, and obtained written approval from the Local Planning Authority for, a remediation strategy detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.**

**Reason: Unexpected contamination may exist at the site which may pose a risk to human health and controlled waters**

- 07 Notwithstanding the submitted information details of the maintenance and management of the bridge shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of the development and shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme.**

**Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to control details of the development.**

- 08 Notwithstanding the submitted information the bridge shall remain open in perpetuity for the unencumbered use and enjoyment of the general public.**

**Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to control access of the development.**

- 09 No development shall take place, until a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The Construction Management Plan shall provide details of:**

- (i)the site construction access(es);**
- (ii)the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;**
- (iii)loading and unloading of plant and materials including any restrictions on delivery times;**
- (iv)storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;**
- (v)the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing,**
- (vi)measures to be taken to minimise the deposit of mud, grit and dirt on public highways by vehicles travelling to and from the site;**
- (vii)measures to control and monitor the emission of dust and dirt during construction;**
- (viii)a Site Waste Management Plan;**
- (ix)details of the routing of associated vehicles including any measures necessary to minimise the impact on other road users;**
- (x)measures to protect existing trees, footpaths and verges; and a means of communication with local residents.**

The approved Construction Management Plan shall be adhered to throughout the construction period.

Reason : In the interests of highway safety and visual amenity.

- 10 The development permitted by this planning permission shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) dated March 2017 and the following mitigation measures detailed within the FRA:

- The bridge soffit shall be set no lower than 8.73m AOD.

Reason : To ensure that channel capacity is not reduced during a flood event.

- 11 The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until such time as a scheme to ensure that the bank will be protected from scour has been submitted to, and approved in writing, by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be fully implemented and subsequently maintained, in accordance with the timing / phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme, or within any other period as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the bank is protected from the effects of scour caused by the piers.

- 12 Prior to commencement of development a detailed method statement for removing or the long-term management of invasive plants such as Himalayan balsam and Giant Hogweed (*Heracleum Mantegazzianum*) on the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The method statement shall include measures that will be used to prevent the spread of Himalayan balsam and/or Giant Hogweed during any operations e.g. mowing, strimming or soil movement. It shall also contain measures to ensure that any soils brought to the site are free of the seeds/root/stem of any invasive plant listed under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended. Development shall proceed in accordance with the approved method statement.

Reason: To prevent the spread of invasive plants such as Himalayan balsam and/ or giant hogweed which are invasive species.

- 13 A) No development shall take place until a programme of archaeological work including a Written Scheme of Investigation has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The scheme shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and:
1. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording
  2. The programme for post investigation assessment
  3. Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording
  4. Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation
  5. Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation
  6. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.
- B) No development shall take place other than in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (A).
- C) The development shall not be used until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under

**condition (A) and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured.**

**Reason: In the interests of the preservation of any archaeological remains.**

- 14 Notwithstanding the submitted information prior to the commencement of development the precise details of the bridge construction shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and implemented in accordance with the approved scheme.**

**Reason: To ensure a satisfactory form of development.**

- 15 No construction/building works shall be carried out except between the hours of 8.00am and 6.00pm on Mondays to Fridays and 9.00am and 1.00pm on Saturday and no Sunday or Bank Holiday working.**

**Reason: To ensure that the development does not prejudice the enjoyment of neighbouring occupiers of their properties.**

- 16 No development shall commence until full details of:**  
**(a) the proposed works/contractors' compound(s) (including any buildings, moveable structures, works, plant, machinery, access and provision for the storage of vehicles, equipment and/or materials); and**  
**(b) a scheme for the removal of the works/contractors' compound(s) and the restoration of the land on which it is situated are submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works/contractors' compound shall not be provided and used on the site other than in accordance with the approved details and shall be removed and the land on which it is situated restored in accordance with the approved details before use of the development hereby approved commences.**

**Reason: In the interests of highway safety and visual amenity.**

- 17 No development shall commence until full details of the number, location and type of life buoy's/tow lines to be provided shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The life buoy's/tow lines shall be installed prior to first use of the bridge and subsequently maintained.**

**Reason: To ensure a safe and secure environment**

#### **INFORMATIVE OF REASON FOR PLANNING APPROVAL**

Informative: Working Practices

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 gaining additional and revised information to assess the scheme and by the identification and imposition of appropriate planning conditions.

Informative : Canal & River Trust

The applicant/developer is advised to contact Alan Daines (0113 200 5713) in order to ensure that any necessary consents are obtained and that the works comply with the Canal & River Trust Code of Practice for Works affecting the Canal & River Trust.

## Informative: Environmental Permitting Regulations - Advice to Applicant

The proposed bridge crosses the River Tees which is designated as a 'main river' under the Environmental Permitting Regulations. If any works or structures are proposed, in, under, over or within 8 metres of the top of the bank/foreshore of the River Tees, you will need to apply for an environmental permit for flood risk activities.

### **BACKGROUND**

1. Yarm School was established in 1978 and moved into the Friarage in 1980. The school has recently invested in new facilities and is a leading independent school.
2. At present, access to the Tees Heritage Park from Yarm School, Yarm High Street and further south can only be achieved by crossing the River at Yarm Bridge and accessing the park through Church Road. The school states that this detour makes it unrealistic for the school, during the busy school curriculum day, to provide enough time to make educational use of the area and contends that the bridge is needed for the following reasons; safe and quick access and the benefits of a safe access route across the river would be shared with the wider community as part of the school's commitment to community engagement. It would also enable users of the Teesside Princess to access the Heritage Park as part of a day trip providing yet another amenity to those alighting in Yarm and that this would have the benefit of increasing footfall in Yarm itself and keeping visitors in the Town for longer, increasing opportunities for visitors and likelihood of their contribution to the local community and businesses.
3. The provision of a pedestrian footbridge formed part of planning application 12/2568/EIS which also sought consent for the creation of 11 playing pitches for Yarm School together with access for emergency/maintenance vehicles, two river pontoons, pavilion, enhancement of landscape and creation of public greenspace, enhancement of the Teesdale Way and footpath network and provision of a new public car park for Yarm Town Centre.
4. This application was considered by the Planning Committee in January 2013 and was refused by members for following reasons:
  1. *In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposed access to the site by construction work traffic and machinery via Egglecliffe village was unsatisfactory due to the restricted width of the access and proximity to a listed building and, further, the absence of control over the land, or likelihood of gaining control, over which the vehicles would be required to pass therefore the development could not take place.*
  2. *In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposed development will adversely affect the openness and amenity value of the Green Wedge by the introduction of maintained playing fields and the associated paraphernalia and associated noise contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS10(3)*
  3. *In the opinion of the local Planning Authority the proposed development is contrary to Saved Policy EN7 and Saved Policy EN24 of the Adopted Stockton on Tees Local Plan in that it is considered by virtue of the nature of the development it would harm the landscape value of the special landscape area of the Tees Valley which will not be permitted and harms the character and appearance of the Egglecliffe and Yarm Conservation Areas*
  4. *In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposed development is contrary to the Adopted Core Strategy policy CS6.3 in that it will adversely affect the quantity and quality of open space.*

5. This application is for the erection of the bridge only.

### **SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

6. The site is located on both banks of the River Tees, adjacent to Yarm School and is bounded to the north by Atlas Wynd and residential properties; to the south and west by Yarm School and to the east by the Tees Heritage Park and farmland.

7. The foundations of the western bank of the bridge are sited on open space within publically accessible school land adjacent to existing school buildings and properties on Atlas Wynd. The foundations of the eastern bank of the bridge are sited on managed arable farmland.

8. The Teesdale Way, long distance path runs adjacent to the River Tees and site.

9. The western bank of the pedestrian bridge over the River Tees is within the Yarm Conservation Area.

### **PROPOSAL**

10. The bridge will be a wooden structure, comprising a wooden ramp and wooden railings, spanning some 36m across the River Tees. A Clearance height is achieved under the bridge sufficient to allow the 'Teesside Princess' to pass.

11. Ramps will be provided where the bridge meets the western and eastern landing points to provide inclusive access and the footbridge is designed to adoptable standards and is DDA compliant. The bridge will be publically accessible.

12. A separation distance between the main bridge and the nearby Atlas Wynd properties will be over 18 metres.

### **CONSULTATIONS**

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

#### **SBC Highways Transport And Environment**

##### General Summary

Subject to the detailed comments and conditions included below the Highways, Transport and Design Manager has no objection to the proposed application for the erection of a wooden pedestrian and cycle bridge.

##### Highways Comments

The proposed development is for the erection of wooden pedestrian and cycle bridge. Whilst there would be an impact on the local highway network during the construction phase this impact can be managed through the agreement of a construction management plan. Post construction the bridge would positively contribute to the existing sustainable travel network of Yarm and Egglecliffe.

The applicant has submitted a construction method statement, in support of the proposed application, which sets out the measures that will be put in place during the construction phase to minimise the impact on the local highway network. The construction method statement provides details of the following:

- Duration of the proposed works;



- Access arrangements to the western bank of the river (including tracking information for a crane);
- Access arrangements to the eastern bank of the river;
- Location of the temporary site compound;
- Methodology for delivering materials to the site during the construction phase.

The information provided within the construction method statement is considered to be acceptable however; the final details should be secured and agreed by condition.

Post construction the bridge, which would provide a connection from Yarm to the Teesdale Way, would positively contribute to the existing sustainable travel network of Yarm and Egglecliffe.

In order to ensure this benefit is available in perpetuity, for this private structure, unencumbered use of the proposed bridge by the general public should be secured by condition.

### Landscape & Visual Comments

This application considers the construction of a new wooden pedestrian and cycle bridge to link Yarm with the Egglecliffe side of the river. The bridge is to be used primarily by Yarm School pupils for access to the area north of the river, but will be open and accessible to the public.

The landing site north of the river is a large arable field, described in the Stockton Borough Council Landscape Character Assessment as an area of high to medium landscape and visual sensitivity with a low capacity for appropriate development. The 2008 Stockton Council Open space audit describes the site as having a unique/irreplaceable informal landscape with good visual amenity. It is also part of the River Tees Corridor Character Area which is identified as river corridor dominated green space with a flat valley plain and sloping valley sides up to Egglecliffe village. The area is designated as Green Wedge separating the settlements of Egglecliffe and Yarm and is listed as a Special Landscape Area on account of its unique landscape character.

The area is important for informal recreation and contains the Teesdale Way, a long distance footpath which follows the River Tees, and the area is designated as part of the Tees Heritage Park. There are also permissive access rights for fisherman on the site.

The foremost landscape and visual impacts arising from the development would result from the creation of a new structure within the landscape. The bridge will be clearly visible from locations on the northern banks of the Tees, along the route of the Teesdale Way. Receptors would be pedestrians using the footpath through the rural landscape alongside the river. The proposed structure would be clearly visible spanning the river, and would appear as a new intervention in the landscape. More distant views of the structure may be possible from properties on the southern edge of Egglecliffe Village and potentially from the Roundhill area of Ingleby Barwick, although the impact on this view would be negligible.

From locations south of the river, within Yarm, the bridge would be clearly visible from within Yarm School, from residential properties facing the river at Atlas Wynd and Castle Dyke Wynd and also from the riverside footpath to Yarm Wharf. Residents living in the apartment block directly adjacent to the structure would have direct views of the bridge and ramp structure in close proximity although these would be filtered by the existing tree canopy.

A tree survey and arboricultural method statement have been submitted as part of the application. The Arboricultural Impact Assessment states that the bridge has been designed to provide as much protection as possible to the trees located on the Yarm side of the river. This identifies that three trees require removal to allow construction of the footbridge, but allows for retention of two good quality trees T163 Beech (Category A tree) and T164 Horse Chestnut (Category B tree), which the bridge passes between. These two important mature trees are to be retained as they form

a valuable contribution to the local landscape and should assist in the integration the proposed bridge into its surroundings. Some bridge footings would be required within the Root Protection Area. The submitted arboricultural method statement details the protection methods proposed, and provided its implementation is controlled by condition it is not considered that this development would cause significant loss or damage to the existing trees or hedges on site.

The bridge would introduce a new permanent built element on to the edge of a rural landscape. However, it is considered that the bridge design has been carefully considered to minimise its impact on local character and visual amenity. The submitted design has a low profile with a gentle arch, although it still allows existing river usage to continue. It has slender legs on low concrete supports, and appears as a light timber structure to minimise its visual impact. The ramps on the northern and southern banks are significant structures, but necessary to provide DDA compliant access. Existing trees on the southern bank, and shrub planting on the northern bank would provide some filtering of views of the ramps.

The current submission does not include for any lighting of the bridge structure either street lighting to aid movement during the hours of darkness or feature lighting of the structure.

It is not clear within the submitted information how the school boundary would be secured in relation to the new bridge structure. The location and style of boundary treatment requires greater detail and needs to be clearly indicated on a plan. The submitted plans also indicate that retaining walls will be implemented to form the access ramps to the bridge and retain existing ground levels. No details of the heights, materials or the appearance of the walls have been provided. However, it is considered that these details can be controlled by condition, should the application be approved.

The Construction Method Statement notes that 'rip-rap' stone revetment may be used on the embankments and around the bridge piers. However, it is considered that these details can be controlled by condition, should the application be approved.

#### Construction Impacts

During the construction period there is potential for significant but temporary landscape impacts on the area. These would primarily be footpath diversions, haul roads, temporary fencing, as well as construction traffic access noise and general movement. Some of these impacts such as the construction of the bridge are likely to be significant given the constraints of the site but in common with many such large projects they should be temporary in nature.

The construction of a large crane pad is required on the eastern embankment to lift the bridge structure into place. This would be acceptable as a temporary measure during construction, but must be completely removed and the area fully reinstated to grass on completion. Similarly the working area on the eastern embankment must also be restored to its original condition, due to the sensitive and highly visible location of the works.

The apparent and significant exception to the temporary nature of the impacts is the potential impact on the protected trees, namely the impact on roots and canopies. Information has been provided detailing how these impacts would be mitigated on site. However, the construction access route to the site passes close to trees T126 – T134 and Tree Groups 6 and 21, and tree protection measure may be required to protect these trees from large construction vehicles such as the Crane accessing the site. Therefore a condition regarding tree protection is included below, to request an updated arboricultural method statement once the construction methods and access routes are finalised.

#### Flood Risk Management

The River Tees is a main river and any proposed works on or near a main river may require Flood Risk Activity Environmental Permit from the Environment Agency. It is recommended that the applicant seeks advice from the Environment Agency.

There is a culvert outfall located within close proximity to the proposed footbridge, the exact route of the culverted watercourse should be investigated and the applicant must ensure that any proposed works does not impact on the existing culverted watercourse.

There are no further flood risk comments to make regarding this application.

Conditions: Construction Management Plan; Landscaping Hardworks; Enclosure; Tree Protection;

#### Egglescliffe & Eaglescliffe Parish Council

Egglescliffe & Eaglescliffe council objection to this proposal is unaltered by the new documents.

In addition, having perused Stockton Council's Draft Local Plan (DLP) it finds the proposed bridge in conflict to Map 20 within the document which very clearly shows a strategic wildlife corridor on the North bank of the river in Egglescliffe. The proposed bridge would establish a cycle route on that area which would surely have a detrimental impact on the wildlife corridor.

Policy SD4.14 says: "Support will be given to sustainable tourism proposals [in parks etc] Proposals should be of an appropriate scale having regard to the intrinsic character of the countryside, in particular the desire to protect and enhance the River Tees, Leven and Basselton Beck corridors as represented by the green wedge." This suggests that such areas are not suitable for cycle tracks which would be difficult to protect from inappropriate use by small motor bikes and such like. The proposed bridge would open up such a cycle track and the risk, if open 24/7, of it being used as an easy means of escape into dark countryside of persons committing ASB or worse in Yarm. The DLP says that it will support the objectives of the River Tees Heritage Park group but this application goes against those objectives and the parish council sincerely hopes that no sections of the DLP can be accepted in support of the proposal.

Egglescliffe & Eaglescliffe Council objects to this application on the following grounds:

There is no justification for having a cycle-friendly bridge to a public right of way which is not a bridleway nor a designated cycle path; there is also an issue with the access for construction traffic as the construction cannot be completed entirely from the Yarm side of the river and the bridge would provide a bolt hole for troublemakers escaping Yarm.

The applicant talks of providing access for walkers on the Teesdale Way to Yarm centre. However, the Teesdale Way crosses the A135 Yarm Rd at Yarm Bridge meaning that walkers already have a safe route to the High St should they desire it.

The applicant says "In addition, networks of informal tracks cross into Teesdale Heritage Park at a number of locations, including a vehicular track that runs south of Egglescliffe Village". Leaving aside the fact that the name of the Heritage Park is wrong, there is no network of paths which is accessible. Yet again the applicant seeks to imply that the Heritage Park is a public open space available for general use when in fact it is farm land with a linear public path. The vehicular track mentioned is understood to be a farm track with only permitted use by members of Yarm Angling Club and there is a public footpath marked by the finger post erected by this council during its centenary celebrations.

The parish council would like to be assured that the Environment Agency's comments are met and that the Agency is satisfied with the Flood Risk Assessment's conclusions and also points out the following inaccuracies:

- Section 11 of the Application Form refers to disposal of foul sewage to a main sewer, but without a connection to an existing drainage system. There is nothing evident in the proposed development which would send foul sewage into a sewer.
- In the Flood Risk Assessment (Executive Summary & Section 1) the Eggescliffe bank is described as "public open space" and pupils as now having "the mile journey to the existing facilities." This is not public open space - to become that a change-of-use application would be needed. There is merely a linear public footpath (part of the Teesdale Way). It is not clear what can be described as "existing facilities" for pupils on the Eggescliffe side
- That Assessment also envisages (Section 3.7 & Fig. 3-1) a possible "primary access/egress route for vehicles in an emergency to the dead end of Church Road, without specifying how such access would be gained from that highway.
- The Design & Access Statement says that the bridge would be to "adoptable standard". There would be "new public rights of way to be provided within or adjacent to the site" (Section 6 of the Application Form), although these are not specified. Presumably, the Applicant intends to dedicate a public right of way from the existing Yarm riverside path across the bridge to the Teesdale Way. Is there any guarantee that SBC as Highway Authority would adopt the bridge? If not, what guarantee would there be that it would be maintained in perpetuity so as to be safe for pedestrians & river traffic & not exacerbate flood risk?

#### Canal & River Trust (Former British Waterways)

Thank you for your consultation upon the amended plans documents submitted for the application above.

The Canal & River Trust (the Trust) is the guardian of 2,000 miles of historic waterways across England and Wales. We are among the largest charities in the UK. Our vision is that "living waterways transform places and enrich lives". We are a statutory consultee in the development management process.

The Trust has reviewed the application. This is our substantive response under the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

As highlighted in our previous responses, the main issues relevant to the Trust as statutory consultee on this application are with regards to:

- a) The impact of the proposed bridge upon navigational safety; and
- b) The impact on the character and appearance of the waterway corridor.

On the basis of on the information available within the additional information provided our advice is that suitably worded conditions are necessary to address matters concerning the ability of the bridge to withstand potential boat strikes, which is an important element of navigational safety. Our advice and comments are detailed below:

#### Impact on the navigational safety of the waterway

In relation to the proposed bridge, we note from the supporting information that the navigational clearance is sufficient to ensure that river craft, including the Teeside Princess, will be able to navigate under the bridge unheeded. We note the removal of the proposed pontoons, and recognise that this will remove the scope for them to trap debris which otherwise would create a potential navigation hazard.

There remains no confirmation to assure us that the loading impact of the river piers is sufficient to withstand collisions from river craft to ensure the safety of bridge and waterway users. Although conditions could be utilised to ask for these calculations, there needs to be a degree of confidence that the loading impact of the river piers as shown will be able to withstand collisions from river craft and floating debris prior to any determination that includes an approval of the outward appearance of the piers of the bridge, otherwise there is risk of a scheme being given permission where the design of the piers approved is not capable of meeting the condition requirements. As such, we recommend that either this information is provided during the application, or

(subject to approval by the local authority upon their considerations of the outward appearance) that any condition attached to a permission is worded to allow for the piers to be redesigned, and/or for fenders to be installed, as necessary in order to provide the suitable structural integrity to meet the above requirements should the existing designs not work in practice.

If a condition is utilised, details should be provided prior to the commencement of development. The Trust would wish to be consulted on these details once submitted.

Furthermore, as new bridges can attract unauthorised swimmers, the Applicant should include provision for the installation and maintenance of life buoys or tow lines at the bridge and we recommend these are secured by a remote locking mechanism. These could be secured by condition if the applicant has yet to finalise these details. We can provide further advice on this matter to the Applicant if required.

Impact on the character and appearance of the waterway corridor

We note that the proposals include the installation of wire mesh fencing upon the west side of the river. We are unsure of the purpose for this fencing. This design of fence has the potential to detract from the appearance of the waterway by adding a greater degree of artificial barriers along the riverbank, which would conflict with the aims of local Core Strategy policy 3 'Sustainable Living and Climate Change', where part 8 of the policy requires development to make a positive contribution to the local area.

We have previously commented with regards to concern over the proposed use of concrete bases to the footbridge.

We would recommend that the local authority considers the merits of the fences shown, and that an assessment is required to ensure that the benefits of its provision outweigh the visual harm it may cause. Similarly, we would recommend that the local authority consider the extent of the concrete bases to the footbridge that will be visible, and whether the visual impact of these can be justified as part of the necessity for bridge construction.

Although we consider that timber is an appropriate material for the bridge, it will be important to ensure that the bridge is properly maintained to ensure the visual appearance is retained.

We note that a condition was included in the officer's report for the refused scheme in 2013 (your ref: 12/2568/EIS) requiring that details of the maintenance and management of the pedestrian bridge should be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of the development, and thereafter carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Should the LPA approve the bridge, we consider that a similar suitably worded condition would be appropriate to ensure that the bridge is well maintained. Such an approach would be consistent with section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which requires good design of new development that adds to the quality of an area over the lifetime of the development.

Impact on the biodiversity of the waterway corridor

It is important that should the scheme be approved, the works do not have a negative impact on the biodiversity of the waterway corridor. As noted in our earlier response, we welcome the recommendations of the Ecological Impact Assessment report (E3 Ecology Ltd.); project no 2879). We note that it recommends that further survey work is required with regards to the avoidance and mitigation strategy, and the compensation strategy.

Therefore, we recommend that the local authority fully considers the survey works identified in the report to ensure that those matters identified are fully considered. This approach would be consistent with section 11 of the NPPF which seeks to conserve and enhance the natural environment; and local policy in the form of Core Strategy Policy 10 ('Environmental Protection and Enhancement' which requires that development will be integrated with the protection and enhancement of biodiversity, geodiversity and landscape.

Should planning permission be granted we request that the following informative is appended to the decision notice:

"The applicant/developer is advised to contact Alan Daines (0113 200 5713) in order to ensure that any necessary consents are obtained and that the works comply with the Canal & River Trust "Code of Practice for Works affecting the Canal & River Trust".

### Tees Archaeology

The proposed development is close to the site of the medieval Yarm Friary and its burial ground to the south, and the medieval town of Yarm to the north. Human remains and a sandstone revetment wall along with significant quantities of pottery and animal bone from the 13th century onwards were found immediately to the south in 2009.

The development site has a high potential for archaeological remains of the medieval period including human remains. I recommend that the developer provides archaeological mitigation during the development to ensure that an appropriate record of any remains is compiled to advance our understanding of the medieval archaeology of Yarm. This would take the form of archaeological monitoring of all ground disturbance during the development with the appropriate treatment of human remains if encountered. This is in line with the guidance provided in the NPPF (para. 141).

I recommend the following planning condition to secure the archaeological recording:-

Recording of a heritage asset through a programme of archaeological works

A) No development shall take place/commence until a programme of archaeological work including a Written Scheme of Investigation has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The scheme shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and:

1. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording
2. The programme for post investigation assessment
3. Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording
4. Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation
5. Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation
6. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.

B) No development shall take place other than in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (A).

C) The development shall not be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (A) and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured.

This condition is derived from a model recommended to the Planning Inspectorate by the Association of Local Government Archaeology Officers.

### Environmental Health Unit

I have no objection in principle to the development; however, I have requested this case be referred to the contaminated land officer for further comments.

I have no objection in principle to the development, subject to the imposition of the following conditions:

#### Construction/ Demolition Noise

I am concerned about the short-term environmental impact on the surrounding dwellings during construction/demolition, should the development be approved. My main concerns are potential noise, vibration and dust emissions from site operations and vehicles accessing the site. I would recommend working hours for all Construction/Demolition operations including delivery/removal of materials on/off site be restricted to 08:00 -18:00Hrs on weekdays, 09.00 -13:00Hrs on a Saturday and no Sunday or Bank Holiday working.

### Treatment of Invasive Plants

Prior to commencement of development a detailed method statement for removing or the long-term management of invasive plants such as Himalayan balsam and Giant Hogweed (*Heracleum Mantegazzianum*) on the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The method statement shall include measures that will be used to prevent the spread of Himalayan balsam and/or Giant Hogweed during any operations e.g. mowing, strimming or soil movement. It shall also contain measures to ensure that any soils brought to the site are free of the seeds/root/stem of any invasive plant listed under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended. Development shall proceed in accordance with the approved method statement.

Reason: To prevent the spread of invasive plants such as Himalayan balsam and/ or giant hogweed which are invasive species. Without this condition avoidable damage could be caused to the nature conservation value of the site contrary to National Planning Policy as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 109, which requires the planning system to aim to conserve and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible.

### Kirklevington and Castle Leavington Parish Council

Wish to object to the above planning application.

Firstly can we point out that the Teesdale Heritage Park is a recognised asset to Stockton Borough Council and on the SBC's own website a picture to demonstrate this is shown. Do you really want this asset to be spoilt and destroyed. This park is for everyone to use from the Borough of Stockton on Tees together with visitors to our borough. Schools throughout the borough take the opportunity to visit this park. Walking, exploring the river banks and seeing birds, animals and many plant species. <https://www.stockton.gov.uk/trees>

You also quote the following on your web site:

*We do our very best to ensure that council owned or adopted parks and open space are kept in great condition with regular grass cutting, weed management and planting schemes. We also take care of trees and woodland stock in public areas.*

Please also consider the following objections and concerns:

1. This planning application formed part of a previous application which was then refused by Stockton Borough Council
2. We have received no assurances that a further application (as previously presented to SBC) will not be applied for to included sports facilities and a pavilion on the Egglecliffe side of the river.
3. The floating pontoon is questionable with all the debris that floats along the river. Will it remain safe to use?
4. The bridge itself is of great concern to us as the following does not appear to have been considered:
  - The geology of both the river banks and the river beds - extensive pile driving will be required to secure the bridge.
  - The costs indicated to erect this bridge seems to be extremely conservative and accurate if the appropriate construction work is to be carried out.
  - Construction of any bridge would need to take into consideration the debris which already floats down the river i.e. trees etc. and the effect on the bridge itself.
  - The river floods regularly all year round and the banks of the river are continually water logged and difficult to walk along yet alone have a bridge footpath leading on to it on the Egglecliffe side.
  - It is stated that the bridge will be for pedestrians and cyclists. To cycle the river bank on the Egglecliffe side would only be possible on an off road cycle and pedestrians would need to wear, for most of the year, suitable walking boots. The suggestion that the bridge could also be used for wheelchair use is questionable as the bridge goes to nowhere and there is no suitable footpath on the Egglecliffe side of the river.

- Any footpaths/cycle paths placed on the banks of the river on the Eggescliffe side of the river would be totally out of keeping with the existing surroundings.
- Privacy for the residents of Minerva Mews in Yarm have not been considered.
- The possibility of parents dropping their children off in Eggescliffe village on a morning in order that they can walk over the bridge to the Yarm Independent School is a non-starter. Eggescliffe village is already heavily congested on a morning with children being dropped off at Eggescliffe C of E School (many children there are from out of area), The Playgroup in the Village Hall and Rosedene Nursery which is housed in the grounds of the school and The Church plus existing residents. It can take up to 15 minutes to exit Butts Lane most mornings having dropped children off. There is also extensive parking along Butts Lane, some of which is by parents dropping students off who attend Eggescliffe Comprehensive School in order that they can cross the road and walk to the school, which results in the road being single file from the Yarm Road end of Butts Lane to beyond the primary school.
- To access Eggescliffe village is along a single width road which has to be negotiated with extreme care.
- The safety of the bridge brings into question safeguarding. We are told that the bridge will not be lit at night. What happens in the winter months when it is dark on a morning and getting dark at night. Who will ensure that all children are kept safe.
- The bridge will become a magnet for anti-social behaviour which will affect all Yarm and Eggescliffe residents. Who will monitor it's safety? The Police, Stockton Borough Council's Enforcement Team.
- Can we be assured that all river craft will be able to negotiate under the bridge towards the jetty at Yarm behind Sainsbury's. We have already seen boats with sails sailing down towards the jetty.
- Where and when was the consultation carried out relating to this application. This application affects so many residents in Yarm, Eggescliffe, Eaglescliffe and beyond.

#### Spatial Planning & Regeneration

As you will be aware 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).

Policies of relevance to this application which are considered in detail in this response are:

' Saved Local Plan Policy EN24: Relates to new development within a conservation area

' Core Strategy Policy CS3(8): ".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"

As you will be aware the NPPF includes a presumption in favour of sustainable development which requires proposals in accordance with the development plan to be approved without delay. Where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, permission should be granted unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the NPPF, or specific policies in the NPPF indicate development should be restricted.

In addition to policies identified, the determination of the application should consider other planning policies and material considerations relating to the design of the development, amenity of residents, highway impact, amongst other things.



### Historic England

Thank you for your letter of 08 December 2016 notifying Historic England of the amended scheme for planning permission relating to the above site. Our specialist staff have considered the information received and we do not wish to offer any comments on this occasion.

### Northern Gas Networks

Northern Gas Networks has no objections to these proposals, however there may be apparatus in the area that may be at risk during construction works and should the planning application be approved, then we require the promoter of these works to contact us directly to discuss our requirements in detail. Should diversionary works be required these will be fully chargeable.

### Northumbrian Water Limited

Thank you for consulting Northumbrian Water on the above proposed development.

In making our response to the local planning authority Northumbrian Water will 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.

For information only

We can inform you that a Sewerage Rising Main crosses the site and may be affected by the proposed development. Northumbrian Water do not permit a building over or close to our apparatus and therefore we will be contacting the developer direct to establish the exact location of our assets and ensure any necessary diversion, relocation or protection measures required prior to the commencement of the development. We will be contacting the developer/agent directly in this matter, however, for planning purposes you should note that the presence of our assets may impact upon the layout of the scheme as it stands.

### Yarm Town Council

1. We believe that this construction will be of little benefit to residents, in fact it will be intrusive for residents such as those in Minerva Court.
2. This application includes a cycle way, however there are no cycle paths at either side of it.
3. The applicant gives assurances that the bridge will be suitable to accommodate current river traffic, however it will limit any future further development of river usage.
4. This unlit bridge is likely to be a centre for antisocial behaviour and could be a danger for late night revellers.
5. The Tees Heritage Park is an important asset to the area and this bridge will have a negative impact on it.
6. A wooden construction is out of keeping with the area and could quickly deteriorate if it does not have regular maintenance. We would hope that this would not have to be funded by council tax payers.
7. The Council is dismayed to see that this bridge appears to already be included in the draft local plan.

Yarm Town Council strongly objects to this application and its inclusion in the Local Plan.

### Friends Of Tees Heritage Park

The major argument to support the submission is its relationship with the Tees Heritage Park. Unfortunately there have been no consultations with the applicant or their agents to date and therefore we must base our comments purely on the information in the application relative to FTHP aims and objectives for the Heritage Park.

On the face of it, providing another access to the Heritage Park could encourage more people to use it and benefit local communities. However in this instance the access is being achieved

through construction of a significant structure in a particularly sensitive location between two Conservation areas, Yarm and Egglecliffe. It will also impact on the Teesdale Way and the rural aspect of this part of the Heritage Park.

In evaluating the proposal we have looked objectively at the potential advantages and disadvantages of the proposal as follows

#### Need for Bridge?

The proposed bridge will provide a new access for pedestrians to the Tees Heritage Park via the Teesdale Way. It will also enable a circular route from Yarm around the Egglecliffe Bank. The proposal refers to a pedestrian and cycle bridge, but the Teesdale Way is a public footpath, not a bridleway and cycling would not be permitted, so this reference should be removed from the application.

Although increased access to the Park is welcomed, the benefits of providing one at this particular location are very limited by the presence of the existing historic Yarm Bridge at the other end of the High Street. Yarm bridge is closer to the geographical centre of the

High Street, provides access to the Teesdale Way, upstream and downstream and links the communities of Yarm and Egglecliffe. Therefore it is difficult to see how the proposed bridge would offer a significant improvement for access to the Heritage Park for the wider community - apart from pupils at Yarm school. A new river crossing into the Heritage Park from the south bank would be much more beneficial situated further north in the vicinity of Preston Park and not close to an existing one as this one is.

The application refers to the benefits for the school by providing pupils with direct access onto the countryside for educational purposes. FTHP would naturally support this principle but would like to know more about how this would be developed bearing in mind access in this Part of the Heritage Park is restricted to the Teesdale Way. In our view much of the charm and intrinsic landscape value is the agricultural character of the land and should be preserved and maintained.

#### Visual impact on surroundings

The new access to the Heritage Park is to be achieved by the construction of a substantial and prominent bridge structure, which has to be high enough to permit a variety of river craft to pass underneath. Built in timber the bridge is well designed and in itself acceptable. However it is a highly visible location and alien to the natural landscape of the Egglecliffe bank. The submitted artists impression shows the bridge against the backdrop of a recent residential development in Yarm, and there are no views showing the structure relative to the very special character of the Egglecliffe church hillside or the rural background opposite the school. The bridge will also disrupt the currently uninterrupted view downriver from Yarm quayside locality, which is about to be improved and will become an increasingly busy hub for locals and visitors as river traffic and boating increases.

#### Current Overview

On balance, and from information so far available, FTHP is currently of the opinion that the advantages accruing from the bridge do not outweigh the visual intrusion into an area of special landscape character within the Park, and the application should not be permitted. We are also concerned at what the provision of the bridge might lead to in future, bearing in mind that it was originally intended to provide access to private school playing fields and facilities, which were vehemently opposed by FTHP and the community at the time.

We think everybody would find it helpful if the school could give assurances that there are no intentions to ever seek to use the Park for anything other than proposed in the application. Such a commitment would reinforce the arguments put forward in the submission that this is a sincere proposal to benefit the students and the local communities. On this basis we would be happy to discuss our thoughts with the applicant and/or their advisers to understand more the benefits being proposed generally and for pupils at the school. This will enable us to review and finalise our comments on the application if necessary.

The Tees Heritage Park is also one of the projects included the River Tees Rediscovered Partnership, a lottery funded scheme, which seeks to promote and enhance the river and its environs from Piercebridge to the estuary. Improving the Teesdale Way is also included as a project and the RTR team should be consulted at this stage.

In the circumstances we trust that the Council will accept further comments from FTHP prior to consideration by committee, if needed,

#### The Environment Agency

Thank you for referring the above application which we received amended plans 23 March 2017.

Having reviewed the supporting information I can advise that we are now in a position to withdraw our objection to the proposed development and recommend the following conditions:

#### Environment Agency position

The proposed development will only meet the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework if the following measure(s) as detailed in the Flood Risk Assessment submitted with this application are implemented and secured by way of a planning condition on any planning permission.

#### Condition 1

The development permitted by this planning permission shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) dated March 2017 and the following mitigation measures detailed within the FRA:

1. The bridge soffit shall be set no lower than 8.73m AOD.

#### Reason

1. To ensure that channel capacity is not reduced during a flood event.

#### Condition 2

The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until such time as a scheme to ensure that the bank will be protected from scour has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.

The scheme shall be fully implemented and subsequently maintained, in accordance with the timing / phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme, or within any other period as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the local planning authority.

#### Reason

To ensure that the bank is protected from the effects of scour caused by the piers and pontoons.

#### Environmental Permitting Regulations - Advice to Applicant

The proposed bridge crosses the River Tees which is designated as a 'main river' under the Environmental Permitting Regulations. If any works or structures are proposed, in, under, over or

within 8 metres of the top of the bank/foreshore of the River Tees, you will need to apply for an environmental permit for flood risk activities.

Your application must demonstrate that:

- there is no increase in flood risk either upstream or downstream during construction (e.g. cofferdams)
- works are carried out in such a way as to avoid unnecessary environmental damage

#### Further comments

Having assessed the additional information I can advise that we have no further comments to make. Our recommended condition and comments made in letter dated 3 May 2017, reference number NA/2016/113302/04-L01 still apply.

#### Natural England

Natural England has no comments to make on this application.

Natural England has not assessed this application for impacts on protected species. Natural England has published Standing Advice which you can use to assess impacts on protected species or you may wish to consult your own ecology services for advice.

Natural England and the Forestry Commission have also published standing advice on ancient woodland and veteran trees which you can use to assess any impacts on ancient woodland.

The lack of comment from Natural England does not imply that there are no impacts on the natural environment, but only that the application is not likely to result in significant impacts on statutory designated nature conservation sites or landscapes. It is for the local planning authority to determine whether or not this application is consistent with national and local policies on the natural environment. Other bodies and individuals may be able to provide information and advice on the environmental value of this site and the impacts of the proposal to assist the decision making process. We advise LPAs to obtain specialist ecological or other environmental advice when determining the environmental impacts of development.

#### The Ramblers Association

The Ramblers' Association thank the Council for consulting them on the above planning application.

We applaud the increased access to the public right of way network that this proposal might afford. We would point out that Eggescliffe Foot Path No. 1 (part of the Teesdale Way) is not a bridle way and therefore not suitable for bicycles.

Any future development on the north bank of the Tees following increased access to the rights of way network would not be looked on with favour by the Ramblers.

#### Further comments

Further to our comments in August 2016, we would emphasise that Eggescliffe Footpath No. 1 is not a bridle way and is not suitable for use by cyclists. Some method of inhibiting cyclists from using the bridge should be included in its design. Have you consulted Highways Dept.?

We note that the access for plant/machinery from Eggescliffe village to the site crosses FP No. 1. What precautions will the contractor take to avoid conflict with walkers?

The diversion, together with directions and precautions to be taken should be a condition of approval.

#### **PUBLICITY**

14. Local residents have been individually notified of the application and it has also been advertised on site.

15. 186 letters of objection and 64 letters of support were received from the following addresses. The full details of the objections can be viewed on line at the following web address <http://www.developmentmanagement.stockton.gov.uk/online-applications/>

Mrs Deanna Walker 2 Castle Dyke Wynd Yarm TS15 9DE  
Mrs Ann Bunyan Flat Pot and Glass Church Road Egglescliffe TS16 9DQ  
Ardent Consulting Engineers On Behalf Of The Minerva Mews Management Company Suite 207  
One Alie Street London E1 8DE  
Mrs Elizabeth Rusk 11 Coatham Vale Egglescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 0RA  
Mr Richard Crouch 7 Uldale Drive Egglescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9DW  
Mrs Joy Bullock 3 The Glen Egglescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9BX  
Mr Christopher Rusk 11 Coatham Vale Egglescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 0RA  
Mrs Jennifer Hunter-Smith 3 Goose Pasture Yarm TS15 9EP  
Mr Paul Waterson 4 West Mews Yarm TS15 9BN  
P M Turner 41 Goose Pasture Yarm TS15 9EP  
Mr Peter Farrage Tees Villa Aislaby Road Egglescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 0JJ  
Mr John Ollier 13 Limpton Gate Yarm TS15 9JA  
Mrs Caroline Paul 47 Coatham Vale Egglescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 0RA  
Mr Jim Wallace 15 Knowles Close Kirklevington Yarm TS15 9NL  
Mr Keith Duffell 39 Cennon Grove Ingleby Barwick Stockton-on-Tees TS17 5DB  
Mrs Phillippa Neave 5 Springfield Close Egglescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 0EW  
Dr Jean MacLeod High Farm House Carlton Village Carlton Stockton-on-Tees TS21 1EA  
Mr Benjamin Spencley 24 Rudby Close Yarm TS15 9RS  
Mrs Samantha Young 7 Brookwood Way Egglescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9ET  
Mrs Joanne Bishop 19 Newsam Crescent Egglescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 0EB  
Mr F Turner 35 Meadowfield Drive Egglescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 0HJ  
Mrs Philippa Wright 54 The Slayde Yarm TS15 9HZ  
Mrs Amy Morris 4 Hunters Green Egglescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 0NY  
Mrs Susan Saunders 7 Davison Close Wynyard Billingham TS22 5TE  
Mrs Zoe Wildsmith 6 Grisedale Crescent Egglescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9DS  
Mrs Mabyn Bassett 10 Atlas Wynd Yarm TS15 9AD  
Mr David Yuill The Mews Egglescliffe Hall Butts Lane Egglescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9BU  
Mr Peter Weeks 181 Darlington Lane Stockton-on-Tees Stockton-on-Tees TS19 0NF  
Mr Derek Copeland 21 Glaisdale Road Yarm TS15 9RN  
Mr Andy Young 7 Brookwood Way Egglescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9ET  
Mrs Caroline Buckley 11 Butts Lane Egglescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9BT  
Mrs Janice Graham 10 Battersby Close Yarm Stockton-on-Tees TS15 9RX  
Mrs Ruth Mazonas 1 St Martins Way Kirklevington Stockton-on-Tees TS15 9NR  
Mr John Coulson 34 Rigby House The Meadowings Yarm TS15 9QQ  
Mr Kash Patel The Coach House, Saltergill, Low Worsall, Yarm TS15 9PG  
Mr Neil Abbott 6 Eastbourne Avenue Egglescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9BZ  
Mr Neville Thompson 23 Tenby Way Egglescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9EQ  
Mrs Carolyn Casey 9 Kingsdale Close Yarm Stockton-on-Tees TS15 9UQ  
Mrs. Dyala Moon 17 Borrowdale Grove Egglescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9DU  
Mr B Atkinson 19 Dunbar Drive Egglescliffe Stockton On Tees  
Nicola Barham 5 Blackfriars Yarm Stockton On Tees  
Mrs Pamela Smailes 69 Beckwith Road Yarm TS15 9TG  
Brian Robinson 1 Church Close Egglescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9DH  
Dawn Robinson 1 Church Close Egglescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9DH  
Susan De Badgecoe 18 St Martins Way Kirklevington Yarm TS15 9NR  
Nigel De Badgecoe 18 St Martins Way Kirklevington Yarm TS15 9NR  
Mrs Valerie Robinson 60 Mount Leven Road Yarm TS15 9RJ

Mr M Buckley 11 Butts Lane Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9BT  
Mrs Catriona Britton 12 Cromer Court Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9EF  
Miss Elizabeth Williamson 1 Broomfield Avenue Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 0ET  
Mrs Angela Henderson 29 Dinsdale Drive Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9HQ  
Mrs Christine Mundy 28 Crosswell Park Ingleby Barwick Stockton-on-Tees TS17 5BE  
Mr Peter Weeks 181 Darlington Lane Stockton-on-Tees Stockton-on-Tees TS19 0NF  
Mr Kevin Reid 17 Dunbar Drive Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9EG  
Mrs L Arnold Waverley House Hornby Northallerton dl6 2jq  
Mr Noel Robinson Lane End Cottages Thirsk Road Kirklevington Stockton-on-Tees TS15 9LN  
Mrs Nova Robinson 2 Finchfield Close Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 0EY  
Mrs Beryl Clare 48 Grisedale Crescent Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9DT  
Mr Ian Reynolds 1 Wells Cottages Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9DA  
Dr Sam Franklin 4 Dinsdale Drive Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9HQ  
Mrs Anne Bulmer 4 Dinsdale Drive Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9HQ  
Mr Austin Gaunt 3 Rose Terrace Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9DD  
Mrs Carole Jones Greenabella Bentley Wynd Yarm Stockton-on-Tees TS15 9BS  
Mr THOMAS STEPHENSON 61 Grisedale Crescent Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9DT  
Mrs Jan Crouch 7 Uldale Drive, Egglecliffe, Stockton On Tees, TS16 9DW  
Richard J Crouch 7 Uldale Drive, Egglecliffe, Stockton On Tees, TS16 9DW  
Mr John Walker 2 Castle Dyke Wynd Yarm TS15 9DE  
Miss Johanna Barkwith 1 Albert Road Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 0DA  
Mrs D Wright 20 Atlas Wynd Yarm TS15 9AD  
Mr Anthony Huckwell St Annes Cottage The Green Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9DB  
Ms Stephanie Turner 5 Verralls Walk Lewes BN7 1LP  
Mr David Powell 17 Ash Grove Kirklevington Stockton-on-Tees TS15 9NQ  
Mrs Kate Fenny 523 Yarm Road Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9BG  
Mr Philip Johnson 1 Chaldron Way Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 0SD  
Mr Sean Ormesby 3 Eastbourne Avenue Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9BZ  
Mr N Beaumont 47 Goose Pasture Yarm TS15 9EP  
Mrs Rosemary Thompson 23 Tenby Way Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9EQ  
Mrs Christine Stephenson 1 Grisedale Crescent Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9DJ  
Mrs Vivienne Chadwick 1 Seymour Grove Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 0LB  
Mr Brian Bassett 2 St Martins Way Kirklevington Stockton-on-Tees TS15 9NR  
Mr Shane Sellers 2 Egglecliffe Court Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9BU  
Mrs Joanna Sellers 2 Egglecliffe Court Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9BU  
Mr Martin Hutchinson 6 Martindale Grove Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9DL  
Mr F Tranter 35 Meadowfield Drive Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 0HJ  
Mr Andrew Cargill Greenside The Green Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9DB  
Mr Colin Quinn 12 Turnberry Avenue Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9EH  
Helen Pickering 19 Church Road Egglecliffe Stockton On Tees TS16 9DQ  
D George 13 The Green Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9DB  
Mr Matthew Wright 4 Houghton Green Stockton-on-Tees TS19 8AJ  
Ms June Tulley 12 The Green Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9DB  
Mrs Nicky Weir 18 Grisedale Crescent Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9DS  
D A Inions 17 Church Road Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9DQ  
Gill Allen 4 St Martins Way Kirklevington Yarm TS15 9NR  
David & Brenda Francis 7 Goosepastures, Yarm, Stockton-on-Tees, TS15 9EP  
Mr Malcolm McArthur 2 Langdale Close Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9DN  
Mrs Angela Williams 35 Coatham Vale Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 0RA  
Mr Frederick Holmes 118 The Meadowings Yarm Stockton-on-Tees TS15 9QS  
Mr Matthew Wood 8 Butts Lane Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9BT  
Dr A McLee 3 The Green Kirklevington Yarm TS15 9NW  
Mrs S Street 20 Church Road Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9DQ  
M G Street 20 Church Road Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9DQ  
Mrs Jane Kendrew 8 Atlas Wynd Yarm TS15 9AD

Mr Michael Young 38 Sheepfoote Hill Yarm TS15 9QH  
Mr Lawrence Rosenberg 1 Eggescliffe Court Eggescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9BU  
Mr Alex Graham Keens Grange Keens Lane Othery TA7 0PU  
Mrs Dianne Geldard-Williams 27 The Front Middleton-One-Row Darlington DL2 1AS  
Ms Christine Franklin 21 Hird Road Yarm Stockton-on-Tees TS15 9DX  
Mrs Noree Rosenberg 1 Eggescliffe Court Eggescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9BU  
Rod Bell Flat 1 26 High Street Yarm TS15 9AE  
Jane Kendrew 8 Atlas Wynd Yarm TS15 9AD  
Charles Oyston 32 Castle Dyke Wynd Yarm TS15 9DE  
Ms Kim Webb 33 Atlas Wynd Yarm TS15 9AD  
Sarah Miall 20 Castle Dyke Wynd Yarm TS15 9DE  
Deanna and John Walker 2 Castle Dyke Wynd Yarm TS15 9DE  
Owner/Occupier 31 Castle Dyke Wynd Yarm TS15 9DE  
Mrs I Lee 29 Castle Dyke Wynd Yarm TS15 9DE  
Ms Dawn Walker 15 Castle Dyke Wynd Yarm TS15 9DE  
John Osbaldeston 1 Castle Dyke Wynd Yarm TS15 9DE  
Mr Kenneth Burns 24 Atlas Wynd Yarm TS15 9AD  
Mrs P M Turner 21 Atlas Wynd Yarm TS15 9AD  
Mr Jonathan Weeks 11 Atlas Wynd Yarm TS15 9AD  
Margaret Smith 10 Atlas Wynd Yarm TS15 9AD  
J F Higton 28 Atlas Wynd Yarm TS15 9AD  
Mr Tim Stokeld Nelson House The Old Rectory Butts Lane Eggescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9BU  
Ms Lesley Nicolson 1 Holmdene Yarm Stockton-on-Tees TS15 9BD  
H W And C Miall 3 Chapel Yard Yarm TS15 9AJ  
John Welch 11 Castle Dyke Wynd Yarm TS15 9DE  
Mr David Wright 20 Atlas Wynd Yarm TS15 9AD  
B Harvey 5 Uldale Drive Eggescliffe TS16 9DU  
Richard Lindsay 51 Goose Pasture Yarm TS15 9EP  
Mrs D Hodgson 45 Goose Pasture Yarm TS15 9EP  
Douglas Riley 37 Goose Pasture Yarm TS15 9EP  
Mrs Jane Beaumont 47 Goose Pasture Yarm TS15 9EP  
Mr Derrick Ashmead 43 Goose Pasture Yarm TS15 9EP  
Mr G B Graham 41 Goose Pasture Yarm TS15 9EP  
Mrs Victoria MacDonald 35 Goose Pasture Yarm TS15 9EP  
Dr W Johnson 2 Greenfield Drive Eaglescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 0HE  
Mr Andrew Wortley 43 Glaisdale Road Yarm Stockton-on-Tees TS15 9RN  
Mr Norman Douglas The Outlook Church Road Eggescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9DQ  
Mr Brian Plumb 4 Church Road Eggescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9DQ  
Mrs Jan Robinson 54 Mount Leven Road Yarm Stockton-on-Tees TS15 9RJ  
Mrs Krysia Ellenger White House Church Road Eggescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9DQ  
Mrs Rosalie Butler 10 Ash Grove Kirklevington Stockton-on-Tees TS15 9NQ  
Mr Ian Betts 39 Grisedale Crescent Eggescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9DS  
Mrs Dawn Hull 10 Grisedale Crescent Eggescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9DS  
Norman F Douglas The Outlook Church Road Eggescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9DQ  
Mr David Williams 35 Coatham Vale Eaglescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 0RA  
Mr James Bustard 1 Cross Row Eggescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9DE  
Mrs Rachel Wilkinson 1 Field View Mews Green Lane Yarm TS15 9EH  
Mrs Barbara Wegg Rosegate The Spital Yarm TS15 9EX  
Miss Katherine Williams 35 Coatham Vale Eaglescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 0RA  
Mrs Katherine Pickover 5 Dinsdale Drive Eaglescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9HQ  
Dr S. M. Pocock 25 Alberts Road, Eaglescliffe, Stockton On Tees, TS16 0DA  
Eggescliffe Area Residents Association 2 Eggescliffe Court Eggescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9BU  
Mr Simon Toseland 5 Borrowdale Grove Eggescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9DU

Mrs Moira Dunnakey 6 Scugdale Close Yarm TS15 9UG  
 Mr Ian Laurie 7 Langdale Close Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9DN  
 Mrs Sarah Harding Lane End Cottages Thirsk Road Kirklevington Stockton-on-Tees TS15 9LN  
 Mr John Mercer 1 - 10 Castle Dyke Wynd Yarm TS15 9DE  
 Mr Ian Forman 45 Forest Lane Kirklevington Yarm TS15 9NE  
 Mr A Fenny 523 Yarm Road Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9BG  
 Mr Mark Ellis Kirklands Church Road Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9DQ  
 Mr Stephen Ward 7 Westlands Kirklevington Stockton-on-Tees TS15 9NF  
 Mr Geoffrey Mundy 28 Crosswell Park Ingleby Barwick Stockton-on-Tees TS17 5BE  
 Mr John Close 11 Eastbourne Avenue Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9BZ  
 Timothy Mackfall 9 The Green Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9DB  
 Mrs Ann Rossiter 37 Dinsdale Drive Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9HQ  
 Jane Nicholls 19 Valley Gardens Egglecliffe TS16 0LY  
 Mr Robin Millman 3 Church Close Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9DH  
 Mr Timothy Weeks 6 Blenavon Court Yarm TS15 9AN  
 Miss Carly Weeks 6 Brewery Cottages Brewery Yard Yarm TS15 9AL  
 Mr Mike Lakinski 16 Church Road Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9DQ  
 Mrs Clare Matthews 37 thistlebarrow road bournemouth bh7 7al  
 Mrs Marjorie Simpson 15 Mayes Walk Yarm TS15 9TU  
 Mrs Linda Adamson 51 Seymour Grove Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 0LE  
 Paul Buckworth 15 Eastbourne Ave Egglecliffe  
 Mr Colin Cuthbert 9 Eastbourne Avenue Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9BZ  
 Miss Isabelle Fenny 523 Yarm Road Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9BG  
 Julie Maskell 1 Ivy Cottages Egglecliffe Stockton On Tees TS16 9DG  
 Mrs J P Harrison St Annes House The Green Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9DB  
 Dr A C Harrison St Annes House The Green Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9DB  
 Alan And Annie Barber Laneside Back Lane Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9BY  
 Peter Chadwick 1 Seymour Grove Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 0LB  
 Dr S M Pocock 25 Albert Road Egglecliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 0DA  
 Mr Steve Jones,53 Goose Pasture, Yarm TS15 9EP

16. The main concerns raised are summarised as follows: -

- Back land development
- Bridge not required, access is easy at present
- Prelude to more development which the area does not need
- Close proximity and impact on residential amenity
- Dangers for users next to river
- Unclear who will be responsible for the maintenance of the bridge
- Will only benefit Yarm School rather than the whole community
- There is no cycle lane on the opposite side of the bridge
- Bridge will interfere with the river flow and lead to flooding
- Tees Heritage Park would be dominated by pupils
- The tranquillity of the area will be spoilt
- Traffic in Butts Lane and Egglecliffe would increase due to parent drop off
- Devaluation of property
- Loss of privacy
- Visual impact
- Restrictions to river usage
- Weekend access to public denied
- No community benefit
- Protecting public interest
- Development not suitable for area
- Means of access
- Set precedent



- Traffic
- Bridge is unnecessary
- River flow
- Flood risk
- Overdevelopment of site
- Security of Eggescliffe
- Noise
- Lack of proposed lighting
- Disturbance
- Ulterior motive
- Loss of open space
- Conservation of nature
- Questioning of use (public or private)
- Easy access
- Disabled access
- Safety
- Intrusive
- Maintenance of bridge
- Affecting drainage
- Health
- Car parking issues
- River levels
- Detrimental to wildlife
- Loss of amenity
- Development unsuitable
- Anti-social behaviour
- Scale / size of development
- Residential amenity
- Unsuitable location
- Unneeded and Unwanted by community
- Impact on environment
- Vandalism
- River debris creating river blockage
- Ecological impact
- Loss of countryside
- Loss of view
- Creation of litter
- Limited cycle path
- Lack of consultation with community by applicant
- Impact on foot paths
- Impact to community
- Lack of consultation
- Concerns over construction
- Out of character
- Blockage of river
- Fly tipping
- Cycle paths in poor condition
- Unsustainable cycle route
- Ill considered
- Restrictive access
- Cycle usage
- No residential benefits
- Detrimental impact to landscape / heritage park
- Lack of cycle provision
- Unsuitable for cycling

- Loss of landscape
- Unsuitable for site
- Ulterior motive
- Erosion to river banks
- Lack of community consultation by applicant
- Bridge height
- Lack of impact survey
- Not justified for school use
- Already an existing bridge

17. Detailed comments from SK Transport Planning Ltd on behalf of Egglescliffe Area Residents Association (EARA) and Ardent Consulting Engineers on behalf of Minerva Mews Management Company are set out in full in the appendices.

18. Letters of support were received from the following addresses:-

Mrs Jane Guest 8 Whitehouse Wynd West Rounton Northallerton DL6 2LY  
 Mrs Susan Chambers 4 Taurus Close Stockton-on-Tees TS18 3UT  
 Ms Helen Gibson 3 Apsley Way Ingleby Barwick Stockton-on-Tees TS17 5GB  
 Mrs S Heward 39 Chaldron Way Eaglescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 0SD  
 Mr Josh Alexander 11 Spitalfields Yarm TS15 9HF  
 Mrs Merryn Ferguson 10 Friarswood Close Yarm TS15 9JG  
 Mr Andrew Gatenby 4 Tofts Close Low Worsall Yarm TS15 9QA  
 Mrs Laura Axtell The Wheatlands Village road Low worsall Ts15 9pj  
 Mr Tim Parker 3 Braeworth Close Yarm TS15 9SB  
 Mr Richard BurrIDGE Morgan Intakes Fryup yo21 2at  
 Mr Derek Andrew 19 Goose Pasture Yarm TS15 9EP  
 Dr Max Patrick 27 Hemingford Gardens Yarm TS15 9ST  
 Dr Aftab Bhatti 1 Foxton Close Yarm TS15 9RQ  
 Ms Catherine Evans 29 Neville Rd Darlington DL3 8HZ  
 Mr Nick Gray 54 Forest Lane Kirklevington Yarm TS15 9ND  
 Miss Lorna Routledge 13 Magnis Close Ingleby Barwick Stockton-on-Tees TS17 5NQ  
 P Heward Willow Tree House Appleton Wiske Northallerton North Yorkshire DL6 2AS  
 Mr Paul Grylls 9 Wynyard Woods Wynyard Billingham TS22 5GJ  
 Dr Sridharan Suresh 21 Portchester Close Ingleby Barwick Stockton-on-Tees TS17 5LQ  
 Mr Nicki Walters 20 linden close hutton rudby yarm TS15 0HX  
 Mr Tom Newman 11 Spitalfields Yarm TS15 9HF  
 Mr Ian Waller 17 Clockwood Gardens Yarm TS15 9RW  
 Mr Johannes Grundmann 35 Riversdene Stokesley Ts9 5DD  
 Mr Thomas Foster 515 Yarm Road Eaglescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9BG  
 Mrs Bev Jopling 14 Enterpen, Hutton Rudby Hutton Rudby Yarm TS15 0EJ  
 Mr Timothy Taylor 4 Elms Way Yarm TS15 9AZ  
 Mrs Victoria Gatenby 4 Tofts Close Low Worsall Yarm TS15 9QA  
 Mrs Sue Snape 34 Northfield Drive Stokesley TS9 5PF  
 Mrs J Hall 52 Cradoc Grove Ingleby Barwick Stockton-on-Tees TS17 5EE  
 Mr David Woodward The Gables Low Worsall Yarm TS15 9PJ  
 Dr Katherine France 4 Elms Way Yarm TS15 9AZ  
 Mrs Louise Kuvelker Wellfield house Stainton way Middlesbrough Ts8 9df  
 Mr Alastair Waite Woodcroft Clack Lane Osmotherley dl6 3pp  
 Mrs Marta Studholme 48 Mount Leven Road Yarm TS15 9RJ  
 Mrs Annette Drummond Prospect House Appleton Wiske Northallerton DL6 2AS  
 Dr Anirvan Banerjee 17B Doctors Lane Hutton Rudby TS15 0EQ  
 Ms Rachelle Lowes 12 Griffiths Close Yarm TS15 9TZ  
 Ms Helen Blakemore 14 Langton Lea High Shincliffe Durham DH1 2QF  
 Mr Tom Newman 11 Flounders House Old Station Mews Eaglescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 0GG

Mr Neil Parker Loxley Chase Aislaby Road Eaglescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 0JJ  
Dr Anne Blandford 5 Hawthorn Grove Yarm TS15 9EZ  
Dr Adrian Davies 40 The Grove, Marton-in-Cleveland Middlesbrough TS7 8AG  
Mr James Armitage Southcroft Avenue Steet High Shincliffe dh1 2pt  
Mr Bryan Littler 7 Magdalene Drive hart village Hartlepool TS273BU  
Ms Andrea Townsley 25 Castlereagh Wynyard Billingham TS22 5QF  
Ms Donna Morgan 21 Uldale Drive Egglescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9DW  
Ms SHARRON MEAGER 6 Hill View Ingleby Barwick Stockton-on-Tees TS17 5AH  
Mr Shaun Thompson 6 Darlington Road Heighington Newton Aycliffe DL5 6RB  
Mr Terry Hunton 12 Tenby Way Eaglescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9EQ  
Mr Josh Alexander 11 Flounders House Old Station Mews Eaglescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 0GG  
Mrs Gina Leary 2 Norderdale Close Yarm TS15 9UE  
Mrs Katia Lightfoot 18 Regency Park Ingleby Barwick Stockton-on-Tees TS17 0QR  
Mr Ian Burns 10 Eastbourne Avenue Egglescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 9BZ  
Dr Nigel Oakley 5 Hawthorn Grove Yarm TS15 9EZ  
Mr Timothy Taylor 10 Goose Garth Eaglescliffe Stockton-on-Tees TS16 0RQ  
Mr Arran Tulloch 10 Manor Drive Hilton Yarm TS15 9LE  
Mr Mike Sweeney 103 Marsh House Avenue Billingham TS23 2HW  
Mr Simon Foster 72 High Street Swainby Northallerton DL6 3DG  
Mr David Yates 16 St Trinians Drive RICHMOND DL10 7SS  
Mr Alan Goodall 27 Angrove Close Yarm Stockton-on-Tees TS15 9RR  
Mr Robert Knibbs 10 Newbiggin Richmond DL10 4DT  
Mr Ian Banks 15 Ryder Court Woodham Newton Aycliffe DL54PB  
Mr Dan Brookes 4 Arthur Street Great Ayton Middlesbrough TS9 6DD

19. The main support comments can be summarised as follows:-

- Necessary development
- Benefit to public
- Benefit the local landscape
- Improves Access to the Tees Heritage Park
- Increase tourist attraction of the town
- Beneficial to town economy
- Benefit to school and pupils
- The designs are in keeping with the area
- Preservation of open land / country side
- Alternative access to the high street
- Improvement to Yarm's amenities
- Improvement to exercise facilities / space
- Educational benefit to school children.
- Improved walks
- Improvement to cyclist access
- Improvement on house prices
- Health benefits

20. Representations were also received from the following addresses:-

Rivershack, K Dodd, Preston Park Museum and Grounds, Yarm Road, Eaglescliffe. Stockton on Tees;

(Summary) In principle we support any project to increase use of and access to the river corridor. However that support requests the clarification of the points below to ensure this bridge takes into account the seasonal weather conditions, current river users, and the future evolution of the river, whilst also mitigating risks for river users and pedestrians.

Mr Geoff Jones, 17 Goose Pasture, Yarm TS15 9EP  
(Summary) Clarification on access/ownership.

## **PLANNING POLICY**

21. 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.

### 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 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.

#### Saved Policy EN7

Development which harms the landscape value of the following special landscape area will not be permitted:-

(a) Leven Valley

(b) Tees Valley

(c) Wynyard Park.

#### Saved Policy EN24

New development within conservation areas will be permitted where:

(i) The siting and design of the proposal does not harm the character or appearance of the conservation area; and

(ii) The scale, mass, detailing and materials are appropriate to the character and appearance of the area

#### Saved Policy EN28

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

#### Saved Policy EN29

Development which will adversely affect the site, fabric or setting of a scheduled ancient monument 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.

### **MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

22. The main planning considerations of this application are the compliance of the proposal with national and local planning policy, the impacts upon the character and appearance of the area, impact on the conservation area and heritage, highway safety, flood risk, ecology and nature conservation, archaeology and other material planning considerations.

23. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), adopted March 2012, sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. NPPF states that great weight should be given to the need to create, expand or alter schools. It stresses that access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and wellbeing of communities. The NPPF also has a number of core planning principles including conserving and enhancing the natural environment and conserving heritage assets.

24. The proposed bridge would provide access to an area identified as part of the Tees Heritage Park. Core Strategy Policy CS10.7 supports initiatives to improve the quality of the environment in the area.

25. The bridge is also partly sited within the Yarm and Egglecliffe Conservation Areas. Saved Policies EN24, EN28, EN29 and EN30 which deal with new development in conservation areas and safeguarding the setting of listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments and archaeology will be material in the consideration of the application.

### Landscape and Visual Impact

26. The Council's Landscape Architect has considered the proposal and states that the landing site north of the river is a large arable field, described in the Stockton Borough Council Landscape Character Assessment as an area of high to medium landscape and visual sensitivity with a low capacity for appropriate development. The 2008 Stockton Council Open space audit describes the site as having a unique/irreplaceable informal landscape with good visual amenity. It is also part of the River Tees Corridor Character Area which is identified as river corridor dominated green space with a flat valley plain and sloping valley sides up to Egglecliffe village. The area is designated as Green Wedge separating the settlements of Egglecliffe and Yarm and is listed as a Special Landscape Area on account of its unique landscape character.

27. The area is important for informal recreation and contains the Teesdale Way, a long distance footpath which follows the River Tees, and the area is designated as part of the Tees Heritage Park. There are also permissive access rights for fisherman on the site.

28. The foremost landscape and visual impacts arising from the development would result from the creation of a new structure within the landscape. The bridge will be clearly visible from locations on the northern banks of the Tees, along the route of the Teesdale Way. Receptors will be pedestrians using the footpath through the rural landscape alongside the river. The proposed structure will be clearly visible spanning the river, and will appear as a new intervention in the landscape. More distant views of the structure may be possible from properties on the southern edge of Egglecliffe Village and potentially from the Roundhill area of Ingleby Barwick, although the impact on this view would be negligible.

28. From locations south of the river, within Yarm, the bridge will be clearly visible from within Yarm School, from residential properties facing the river at Atlas Wynd and Castle Dyke Wynd and also from the riverside footpath to Yarm Wharf.

29. A tree survey and arboricultural method statement have been submitted as part of the application. The Arboricultural Impact Assessment states that the bridge has been designed to provide as much protection as possible to the trees located on the Yarm side of the river. This identifies that three trees require removal to allow construction of the footbridge, but allows for retention of two good quality trees T163 Beech, category A tree and T164 Horse Chestnut category B tree, which the bridge passes between. These two important mature trees must be retained as they form a valuable contribution to the local landscape and should assist in the integration the proposed bridge into its surroundings. Some bridge footings will be required within the Root Protection Area. The submitted arboricultural method statement details the protection



methods proposed, and provided these are implemented and checked by the project arboriculturalist, it is not considered that this development would cause significant loss or damage to the existing trees or hedges on site.

30. The bridge would introduce a new permanent built element on to the edge of a rural landscape. However, it is considered that the bridge design has been carefully considered to minimise its impact on local character and visual amenity. The submitted design has a low profile with a gentle arch, although it still allows a vessel to pass beneath. It has slender legs on low concrete supports, and appears as a light timber structure to minimise its visual impact. The ramps on the northern and southern banks are necessary to provide DDA compliant access. Existing trees on the southern bank and shrub planting on the northern bank will provide some filtering of views of the ramps.

31. It is considered that the precise location and style of boundary treatment and retaining walls can be controlled by condition, should the application be approved.

32. In conclusion the Highways Transport & Design Manager has no objection to the proposal in landscape and visual impact terms subject to appropriate controlling conditions.

33. In terms of Policy CS10, it is considered that the proposal will not result in the coalescence of settlements and will not harm the openness or amenity value of the Green Wedge and would not detrimentally alter the character of the Tees Heritage Park.

34. The Heritage Park is served by an extensive network of paths, including the Teesdale Way, Thornaby Trail with cycleways running between Preston Park, Ingleby Barwick and Thornaby. The bridge will increase connectivity and accessibility to the Heritage Park thereby improving public access to the land and river and provide for greater opportunities for public recreation.

35. In terms of promoting tourism the proposals have also been designed to ensure that the river traffic can freely navigate the river.

### Heritage

36. Consideration has been given to the heritage assets that have the potential to be affected by the development proposal including the setting of the two conservation areas; Egglecliffe and Yarm and Listed Buildings; the setting of the scheduled Round Hill on the opposite side of the River Tees and the setting of the scheduled Yarm Bridge.

37. Whilst the proposed structure will be clearly visible spanning the river, and will appear as a new intervention in the landscape, it is considered that the bridge is of a high quality design, utilising natural materials for construction. The all timber design solution is considered appropriate for the Conservation Area and the material (Ekki hardwood) is both attractive and durable featuring neat morticed joints.

38. Historic England's specialist staff have considered the proposal and raise no objection. In their previous consideration of the proposed bridge, Historic England had stated that 'the proposed bridge offers the opportunity for an exciting addition to the landscape. The proposed design is a simple curve in timber which would weather down and develop an attractive patina'. On the basis of the present proposal this outcome will be achieved.

39. It is considered that the character and appearance of the Conservation Areas will not be negatively affected and the proposals would not detract from the setting of any listed buildings. It is considered that there will not be an adverse impact on heritage assets as a result of the proposals and the application will preserve and enhance the character of the conservation area and therefore

accords with saved policies EN24 and EN28. Furthermore it is considered that the proposal will not negatively impact on the character of the Tees Heritage Park.

### Other Matters

40. In terms of the pedestrian bridge, detailed construction matters are subject to a controlling condition requiring the submission of details prior to the commencement of construction.

41. In respect of adoption and maintenance, the bridge will be managed and maintained by Yarm School and will be permanently accessible for public use. The details of the maintenance and management of the pedestrian bridge are controlled by a condition.

42. In terms of crime and disorder, Cleveland Police have raised no issues in respect of the proposed development. The School has also stated that they will actively monitor both sides of the river, this will include CCTV monitoring on the school side.

43. In respect of disabled users, the proposed footbridge will meet all DDA requirements.

44. To minimise any adverse impact on the amenity of the residents, the bridge (excluding ramps) is set over 18.m approximately away from the residential properties at Atlas Wynd. It is considered that this separation distance is acceptable given the transitory nature of use and additional landscaping to further screen the bridge will also mitigate any potential impact.

45. Comments have been received stating that there is no need for a bridge. The applicant has identified that a new bridge is required to provide safe and quick access to the Heritage Park for school activities and nature conservation. The benefits of a safe access route across the river would be shared with the wider community as part of the school's commitment to community engagement. The proposal would give priority to pedestrian movements and would allow passage between Egglecliffe and Yarm on a traffic-free, quicker and more tranquil route.

46. The pontoons have been removed from the scheme following comments from the Canal and River Trust who perceived that they would pose an impact on the navigational safety of the river due to a potential build-up of debris.

47. Comments have been received stating that the applicant is pursuing a bridge to gain access to land for future expansion plans. In response it must be noted that this is a standalone proposal which must be considered on its own merits.

### Ecology and Nature Conservation

48. The application is accompanied by an Ecological Impact Assessment. The proposed development is not predicted to have any impacts on statutory/non-statutory sites. There may be limited temporary impacts on bats using the river as a foraging and commuting habitat, however as no lighting or night time working is proposed and no trees with a significant risk of supporting roosting bats are to be lost or pruned, no significant impacts are envisaged. No impacts on badger or water vole are envisaged as neither species has been recorded within the survey area. Appropriate mitigation measures are proposed and Natural England has examined the proposal and raises no objection.

### Flood Risk

49. A Flood Risk Assessment accompanies the application which confirms that it is highly unlikely that the proposed footbridge will have any significant impact on flood risk. The form and location of the bridge will result in minimal loss of floodplain storage and little/no impact on flood flow routes.

50. Comments have been made by consultants representing Minerva Mews Management Company with regards to Flood Risk and state that the proposed bridge would increase flood risk elsewhere and is therefore not compliant with the requirements of the NPPF. These comments have been shared with the Environment Agency who have fully considered the flood risk and have no objection to the proposal subject to appropriate controlling conditions and therefore do not support the representations.

51. In terms of site contamination, Environmental Health has no objection to the proposal subject to appropriate controlling conditions. Accordingly the proposal does not conflict with Planning Guidance in respect of contaminated land.

52. In respect of archaeology, Tees Archaeology has considered the proposal and raises no objection to the planning application subject to an appropriate controlling condition.

### Means of Access, Parking and Traffic Issues

53. The Highways, Transport and Design Manager has considered the proposal and raises no objection on highway grounds to the proposed development.

54. It is considered that whilst there would be an impact on the local highway network during the construction phase this impact can be managed through the agreement of a construction management plan. Post construction the bridge would positively contribute to the existing sustainable travel network of Yarm and Egglecliffe. In order to ensure this benefit is available in perpetuity, for this private structure, unencumbered use of the proposed bridge by the general public is secured by condition.

55. The applicant has submitted a construction method statement, in support of the proposed application, which sets out the measures that will be put in place during the construction phase to minimise the impact on the local highway network. The construction method statement provides details of the following:

- Duration of the proposed works;
- Access arrangements to the western bank of the river (including tracking information for a crane);
- Access arrangements to the eastern bank of the river;
- Location of the temporary site compound;
- Methodology for delivering materials to the site during the construction phase.

56. Detailed comments from SK Transport Planning Ltd on behalf of Egglecliffe Area Residents Association (EARA) raising concerns about highway impact and safety have been shared with the Highways, Transport and Design Manager who have fully considered the proposal and the information provided within the construction method statement and do not support the representations.

### **CONCLUSION**

57. The proposed development has been considered in the context of the consultee and consultation responses. External consultees have confirmed that they are satisfied with the information submitted adequately addresses the impacts of the proposal and identifies appropriate mitigation.

58. The impacts of the proposal have been considered against national and local planning guidance and the development as proposed is considered to be in line with general planning policies set out in the Development Plan, is acceptable in terms of highway safety, does not adversely impact on the neighbouring properties and character of the Conservation Area, Heritage assets, ecological habitat, archaeology, flooding and is recommended for approval with conditions.

**Director of Economic Growth and Development Services  
Contact Officer Mr Gregory Archer Telephone No 01642 526052**

**WARD AND WARD COUNCILLORS**

**Ward Yarm**  
**Ward Councillor(s) Councillor Tony Hampton**  
**Ward Councillor(s) Councillor Elsi Hampton**  
**Ward Councillor(s) Councillor Julia Whitehill**

**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