

Planning Committee

A meeting of Planning Committee was held on Wednesday, 17th January, 2018.

Present: Cllr Norma Stephenson O.B.E(Chairman), Cllr Mick Stoker(Vice-Chairman), Cllr Helen Atkinson, Cllr Derrick Brown, Cllr Carol Clark, Cllr Sally Ann Watson(Sub Cllr Lynn Hall), Cllr Elsi Hampton, Cllr Tony Hampton, Cllr David Harrington, Cllr Eileen Johnson, Cllr Paul Kirton, Cllr Marilyn Surtees, Cllr Mrs Sylvia Walmsley, Cllr David Wilburn

Officers: Bob Cowell, Simon Grundy, Stephanie Landles, Peter Shovlin, Joanne Roberts (EG&DS), Julie Butcher (HR,L&C), Sarah Whaley (A,D&ES)

Also in attendance: Applicants, Agents, Members of the Public

Apologies: Cllr Lynn Hall

P Evacuation Procedure

77/17

The Evacuation procedure was noted.

P Declarations of Interest

78/17

P Minutes from the Planning Committee meetings which were held on the 8th and 29th November 2017.

79/17

Consideration was given to the draft minutes of the Planning Committee meetings which were held on the 8th and 29th November 2017 for approval and signature.

RESOLVED that the minutes be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

P 17/0919/REM

80/17

**Land at Grid Reference 445164 513182, Low Lane, High Leven
Reserved matters application for the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale, for residential development of 53 no. dwellings.**

Consideration was given to a report on planning application 17/0919/REM Land at Grid Reference 445164 513182, Low Lane, High Leven.

The Planning application was deferred at the planning committee meeting which was held on the 29th November 2017 where Members advised that the applicant should seek to address all outstanding matters including an alternative route to the existing bridleway. Since that committee meeting the applicant and landowner were now proposing to move the entire bridleway to the south of the development site to enable a continuous route to run outside of the proposed residential development site and revised drawings had been provided to demonstrate this. An extract of a revised masterplan had also been submitted to demonstrate the route and how it would lie adjacent to an area of public open space, the principle of the revised route was considered to be acceptable although the final approval of any revisions to the masterplan would be dealt with outside of this application under condition 5 of the outline approval.

Permission was sought under reserved matters for a residential development of

53 properties. The proposed dwellings would consist of a mix of 2, 3 & 4 bedroom terraced, semi-detached and detached properties. 8 of the proposed dwellings were to be affordable units.

The consultees that had been notified and the comments that had been received were detailed within the main report.

Neighbours were notified and the comments received were detailed within the main report.

The planning policies and material planning considerations that were relevant to the consideration of the application were contained within the main report.

The Planning Officers report concluded that in view of the all of the considerations contained within the main report and whilst acknowledging those objections received, the principle of residential development on the site had been established as part of the outline planning applications.

The scheme was considered to be visually acceptable and was in keeping with the characteristics that could be expected from a modern housing estate. Provision for adequate landscaping including trees and hedging was also made and the separation distances provided would ensure that acceptable standards of residential amenity for both neighbouring occupiers as well as future residents of the development would be delivered. The access arrangements remained acceptable and sufficient curtilage parking was provided.

Members were presented with an update report which since the original report detailed a revised plan which provided minor amendments to the landscaping area to the south where the bridleway was proposed to be diverted through. The revised detail did not change any of the material planning considerations as outlined in the committee report and the recommendation and suggested conditions remained as detailed within the original planning report except for condition 4. Landscaping of open space.

The Applicant attended the meeting and was given the opportunity to make representation. Their comments could be summarised as follows:

- The Applicant fully supported the Officers recommendation.
- Members were informed that the Applicant had opened a new division in Darlington, if the proposed application was approved this would be the first planning consent for that division.
- Since the last planning committee which considered the proposed application, the applicant explained that they had worked hard with officers of Stockton Borough Council and the Land Owner to resolve outstanding issues, in particular those which effected public right of way.
- It was highlighted that the bridleway was to be formerly diverted onto a new alignment to the south of the scheme. The route which had the full support of officers would benefit from an attractive landscape setting and designed to accommodate horses.

- A segregated 3 metre wide route through the development would retain a safe and attractive passage through the scheme for all other users.
- Ornamental trees and landscaping was proposed throughout the estate and also an ecological landscape buffer to Bassleton Beck.
- There was to be 8 affordable homes provided, and an estimated £84,000 per annum in additional Council Tax receipts and a central government new homes bonus of approximately £500,000.
- The Applicant requested that the Committee approve the application.

Members were given the opportunity to ask questions/make comments on the application and these could be summarised as follows:

- Clarification was sought as to the number of storey's some of the proposed dwellings would be.
- Concerns were raised relating to drainage on the proposed site, in terms of the possible impact this may have on an ongoing issue regarding a culvert at Manor Gardens.
- Members commended officers on the job they had done since the original proposal last year, in particular the buffer and separation distance from existing homes, however the homes themselves did seem to appear a little monochrome and not as aesthetically pleasing as other developers.

Officers were given the opportunity to respond to comments/issues raised by Members. Their responses could be summarised as follows:

- Where clarification was sought re the number of storeys of one of the house designs, Officers explained that there was a bedroom in the roof of the proposed design which Officers considered to be a 2.5 storey house although the actual scale was the same as a 2 storey home.
- In terms of the issues raised regarding to the culvert at Manor Gardens, Officers acknowledged that there had been difficulties at Manor Gardens however there was now a resolution in place. The proposed development would have its own surface water attenuation scheme which would run out to the north of the site and would not contribute to the existing ponds which were part of the Manor Gardens development. The drainage scheme would be put in as the development progressed but would be in place before the dwellings were occupied.

A vote then took place and the application was approved.

RESOLVED that planning application 17/0919/REM be approved subject to the following conditions and informative;

Approved plans;

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

| Plan Reference Number | Date on Plan |
|-----------------------|------------------|
| IB/643/STD/00/001 | 31 March 2017 |
| IB/643/STD/25/01 | 31 March 2017 |
| IB/643/STD/25/02 | 31 March 2017 |
| IB/643/STD/25/03 | 31 March 2017 |
| IB/643/STD/25/04 | 31 March 2017 |
| IB/802B/STD/00/001 | 31 March 2017 |
| IB/802B/STD/25/01 | 31 March 2017 |
| IB/802B/STD/25/02 | 31 March 2017 |
| IB/802B/STD/25/03 | 31 March 2017 |
| IB/802B/STD/25/04 | 31 March 2017 |
| IB/802C/STD/00/001 | 31 March 2017 |
| IB/802C/STD/25/01 | 31 March 2017 |
| IB/802C/STD/25/02 | 31 March 2017 |
| IB/802C/STD/25/03 | 31 March 2017 |
| IB/802C/STD/25/04 | 31 March 2017 |
| IB/1057/STD/00S/001 | 20 November 2017 |
| IB/1057/STD/25S/01 | 20 November 2017 |
| IB/1057/STD/25S/02 | 20 November 2017 |
| IB/1057/STD/25S/03 | 20 November 2017 |
| IB/1057/STD/25S/04 | 20 November 2017 |
| IB/1327/STD/00/001 | 31 March 2017 |
| IB/1327/STD/25/01 | 31 March 2017 |
| IB/1327/STD/25/02 | 31 March 2017 |
| IB/1327/STD/25/03 | 31 March 2017 |
| IB/1327/STD/25/04 | 31 March 2017 |
| IB/1542/STD/00/001 | 31 March 2017 |
| IB/1336/STD/25/01 | 31 March 2017 |
| IB/1336/STD/25/02 | 31 March 2017 |
| IB/1336/STD/25/03 | 31 March 2017 |
| IB/1336/STD/25/04 | 31 March 2017 |
| IB/1546/STD/00/001 | 31 March 2017 |
| IB/1546/STD/25/01 | 31 March 2017 |
| IB/1546/STD/25/02 | 31 March 2017 |
| IB/1546/STD/25/03 | 31 March 2017 |
| IB/1546/STD/25/04 | 31 March 2017 |
| IB/1550/STD/00/001 | 31 March 2017 |
| IB/1550/STD/25/01 | 31 March 2017 |
| IB/1550/STD/25/02 | 31 March 2017 |
| IB/1550/STD/25/03 | 31 March 2017 |
| IB/1550/STD/25/04 | 31 March 2017 |
| 1617-24-P02 REV K | 3 January 2017 |
| 1617-24-P03 REV k | 3 January 2017 |
| 1617-24-P01 REV X | 3 January 2017 |
| LDS406 01 REV E | 8 November 2017 |
| 1617-24-P01 REV QA | 30 October 2017 |
| 001 C | 29 June 2017 |

Materials;

02 Notwithstanding the submitted details in the application, the external walls and roofs shall not be commenced until precise details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external walls and roofs of the hereby approved dwellings have been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Thereafter the development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved detail.

Existing and Proposed Site levels;

03 Notwithstanding the information submitted as part of the application details of the existing and proposed site levels and finished floor levels shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development.

Landscaping of open space;

04 Notwithstanding the information submitted within this application, the requirements of the open space strategy (Condition 5 of planning application 14/0562/OUT) shall include full details of the landscaping and maintenance arrangements for the area to the immediate south of the development hereby approved development. Such a scheme shall be in full accordance with the agreed planting principles plan (drawing 1835_53 Rev E; received 15 January 2018)

Planting details;

05 A detailed planting scheme in accordance with those landscaping principles submitted and agreed as part of this application (drawing SBC001), shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the first dwelling. Such a scheme shall specify final tree/shrub types and species, stock size, numbers and densities and the associated long term maintenance arrangements. The works shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the occupation of the buildings or the completion of the development whichever is the sooner and any trees or plants which within a period of five years from the date of planting die, are removed, become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Boundary treatments;

06 Details of the external appearance and materials of all means of enclosure as detailed on drawing 687-BEL-1617-24-P02K shall be submitted to and be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority prior to the occupation of the hereby approved development. Such means of enclosure as agreed shall be erected before the hereby approved store is brought into use.

Hard Landscaping;

06 Notwithstanding any description contained within this application, prior to the first occupation of the hereby approved development full details of hard landscape works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and implemented in accordance with the approved details. These details shall include car parking layouts; other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials and construction methods; minor artefacts and structures (e.g. incidental buildings and street furniture); and the associated maintenance of any street furniture or related structures.

Removal of PD Rights - All Householder;

07 Notwithstanding the provisions of classes A, B, C, D & E of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted

Development) Order 1995 as amended by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (No.2) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order), the buildings hereby approved shall not be extended or altered in any way, nor any ancillary buildings or means of enclosure erected within the curtilage without the written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

Public Rights of Way;

08 No material operation as defined in Section 56 (4) (a)-(e) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 shall be carried out to begin the development pursuant to this planning permission until a detailed scheme for the diversion of the existing public right of way, in broad accordance with drawing 1835_55 (Appletons; dated 8th January 2018) has been submitted to and been agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall specify the proposed route for the replacement Public Right of Way; proposed construction methods including surfacing materials, gradients and associated signage; protection of the existing bridleway during construction (or the temporary closure if deemed appropriate); together with a timetable for phasing/implementation and how any associated costs/compensation for the diversion will be met. The scheme shall be implemented in full accordance with those agreed details and no obstruction to or building over the bridleway shall commence until the existing Public Right of Way has been diverted and is operational.

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 seeking a revised scheme to overcome issues and by the identification and imposition of appropriate planning conditions

Informative: Bridleway

The applicant is advised that it is an offense to disturb or obstruct a public right of way. Therefore no part of the existing bridleway can be dug up or built over until the new a new bridleway has been agreed through a legal order and that alternative route is operational.

**P
81/17**

17/1704/FUL

**Land at Low Lane, Ingleby Barwick,
Erection of 2 no. detached dwellings with associated access and
landscaping**

Consideration was given to a report on planning application 17/1704/FUL Land at Low Lane, Ingleby Barwick.

The planning application was deferred at the planning committee meeting which was held on the 29th November 2017 where Members advised that the applicant should seek to address all outstanding matters including an alternative route to the existing bridleway which related to the accompanying application 17/0919/REM. Since that committee meeting the applicant and landowner were now proposing to move the entire bridleway to the south of the development site. However this did not affect the details provided for this application.

Planning permission was sought for the erection of two dwellings (plots 52 and 53) which formed part of the next phase of housing development on the Low Lane site which would provide a total of 55no. dwellings. The proposed dwellings were the Oak and Peony house types which provided four and three bedrooms respectively.

The consultees that had been notified and the comments that had been received were detailed within the main report.

Neighbours were notified and the comments received were detailed within the main report.

The planning policies and material planning considerations that were relevant to the consideration of the application were contained within the main report.

The Planning Officers report concluded that in view of the considerations contained within the main report and whilst acknowledging the objection received, the principle of residential development on the site had been established as part of the outline planning application.

The proposal for two dwellings would form and be read as part of a large housing development and the scheme was considered to be visually acceptable and in keeping with the characteristics that could be expected from a modern housing estate. The associated separation distances would also ensure that acceptable standards of residential amenity for both neighbouring occupiers as well as future residents of the development would be provided. The associated access and parking provision also accorded with Council Guidance.

The proposed development was therefore considered to be acceptable in planning terms and was recommended for approval subject to those conditions set out in the main report and the expiry of the consultation period.

Members discussed application 17/0919/REM and 17/1704/FUL as a whole as it was part of the same development. All comments / questions and points of clarification were contained within the minutes of item 17/0919/REM Land at Grid Reference 445164 513182, Low Lane, High Leven.

Members did however vote on each item separately.

A vote then took place and the application was approved.

RESOLVED that planning application 17/1704/FUL be approved subject to the following conditions and informative;

Approved Plans;

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

| Plan Reference Number | Date on Plan |
|-----------------------|-----------------|
| LDS406-02 | 30 October 2017 |
| IB/1057/STD/25/03 | 30 October 2017 |
| 1617-24-P05 REV A | 30 October 2017 |

| | |
|--------------------|-----------------|
| 1617-24-P04 REV B | 30 October 2017 |
| IB/1057/STD/00/001 | 30 October 2017 |
| IB/1057/STD/25/04 | 30 October 2017 |
| 687 BEL 003 | 28 June 2017 |
| A/PLCGA/00/001A | 28 June 2017 |
| IB/1327/STD25/01 | 28 June 2017 |
| IB/1327/STD/25/02 | 28 June 2017 |
| IB/1327/STD/25/03 | 28 June 2017 |
| IB/1327/STD/25/04 | 28 June 2017 |
| IB/1327/STD/00/001 | 28 June 2017 |
| IB/1057/STD/25/01 | 30 October 2017 |
| IB/1057/STD/25/02 | 30 October 2017 |

Materials:

02 Notwithstanding any description of the materials in the application, precise details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external walls and roofs of the building(s) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the construction of the external walls and roofs of the building(s).

Soft landscaping details;

03 All soft landscaping works shall be carried out in accordance with drawing LDS406-02 and include provision for a root director where trees are located adjacent to the adopted highway. The works shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the occupation of the buildings or the completion of the development whichever is the sooner and any trees or plants which within a period of five years from the date of planting die, are removed, become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Hard landscape details;

05 Notwithstanding any description contained within this application, prior to the occupation of the hereby approved development full details of hard landscape works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and implemented in accordance with the approved details. These details shall include car parking layouts; other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials and construction methods; minor artefacts and structures (e.g. incidental buildings and street furniture).

Means of enclosure;

06 All means of enclosure associated with the development hereby approved shall be in accordance with drawing 1617-24-P05 Rev A Such means of enclosure as agreed shall be erected before the development hereby approved is first occupied.

Site and floor levels;

07 Notwithstanding the information submitted as part of the application details of the proposed site levels and finished floor levels shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development.

Construction activity;

08 No construction activity or deliveries shall take place except between the hours of 0800 and 1800 on Monday to Friday and 0900 and 1300 on Saturdays. There shall be no construction activity on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Archaeological Features;

09 No development shall take place until a programme of archaeological works has been implemented in accordance with a written scheme of investigation, which has been first submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Surface Water Drainage;

10 No development on the separate school or housing elements of the development shall take place until a scheme for the management of surface water during the construction phase and thereafter, including sustainable drainage measures, specific to that element of the scheme (school or housing) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Surface water run-off from the site shall be limited to 42l/s. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details..

Unexpected land contamination

11 In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified, works must be halted on that part of the site affected by the unexpected contamination and it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken to the extent specified by the Local Planning Authority prior to resumption of the works. Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme, a verification report must be submitted in writing and approval by the Local Planning Authority.

Removal of PD Rights - All Householder

12 Notwithstanding the provisions of classes A, B, C, D & E of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 as amended by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (No.2) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order), the buildings hereby approved shall not be extended or altered in any way, nor any ancillary buildings or means of enclosure erected within the curtilage without the written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

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 seeking a revised scheme to overcome issues and by the identification and imposition of appropriate planning conditions.

**P
82/17**

17/0775/OUT

**Land Associated With Hunters Rest, Urlay Nook Road, Eaglescliffe
Outline planning permission with some matters reserved (appearance,
landscaping, layout and scale) for the erection up to 130 dwellings,
associated infrastructure including access road and public open space.**

Consideration was given to planning application 17/0775/OUT Land Associated With Hunters Rest, Urlay Nook Road, Eaglescliffe.

Outline planning permission was sought for the erection of up to 130 dwellings (including affordable housing) with the provision of on-site public open space. Access would be taken from Urlay Nook Road with all other matters reserved for later consideration.

A Hybrid Planning permission was approved on the adjacent site for 21 dwellings and outline permission for a further 2 dwellings which utilised the same access.

The consultees that had been notified and the comments that had been received were detailed within the main report.

Neighbours were notified and the comments received were detailed within the main report.

The planning policies and material planning considerations that were relevant to the consideration of the application were contained within the main report.

The Planning Officers report concluded that the development was an unallocated site located outside the established limits to development and such a proposal would normally be resisted unless material considerations indicated otherwise having regard to the development plan. However the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework makes clear that housing applications were to be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. It was considered that there were important material benefits arising from the proposed development and there were not any adverse impacts from the proposed development that would significantly or demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the framework taken as a whole.

Other material considerations had been considered in detail and the development as proposed was considered to be acceptable in terms of visual impact and highway safety, it did not adversely impact on neighbouring properties, archaeology or the ecological habitat and flooding

It was considered that in the planning balance, although this proposal was out-with the limits for development, there were no designations on site and the Council was unable to demonstrate harm which significantly and demonstrably outweighed the benefits of the development when weighing up the contribution of new housing against the visual impacts on the open character of the countryside.

For the reasons stated within the main report it was recommended that the application be Approved with Conditions and subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement as detailed within the Heads of Terms.

Members were presented with an update report which since the original committee report detailed additional comments received from Highways England. The latest comments related to the A66 Elton Interchange and did not

change the officer's recommendation as the developer had responded to Highways England's comments and provided Technical Note 4 which appeared to address the points made. Full details could be viewed within the attached update report.

In addition 2 new objections had been received however they had raised no new issues which had not already been addressed within the main report.

The report made reference to a riding school however this had not been in operation for a number of years and was a privately rented property with the tenant's horses being grazed on the land.

An objector attended the meeting and was given the opportunity to make representation. His comments could be summarised as follows:

- Concerns were raised in relation to highways issues, traffic generation, vehicular access and highway safety.
- The objector explained the current issues faced by residents trying to exit Coatham Vale on to Urray Nook Road due to backed up traffic on Durham Lane and Yarm High Street.
- Traffic had increased significantly since the Sadlers View phase 1 development had been completed with phase 2 still to come.
- It was expected that with the surrounding areas of Yarm and Kirklevingtons current and future developments, traffic within the vicinity would continue to increase which would impact on traffic safety issues especially near local schools.
- The Objector also made representation on behalf of another local resident who had suffered a brain injury resulting in severe migraines due to noise levels, which would be expected to increase due to additional traffic. The resident had not been informed of the proposed development when he bought his home in October 2017.

The Applicants Agent attended the meeting and was given the opportunity to make representation. His comments could be summarised as follows:

- 23 houses had already been granted planning permission and the additional proposal would utilise the same access point.
- Although the Council were now in a position to demonstrate a 5 year housing supply, this should be given limited weight until the Local Plan was adopted.
- It was highlighted that the NPPF was clear that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development.
- The site was on the edge of the settlement limits of Eaglescliffe and was therefore in walking and cycling distance of many shops and services. The site was not located within any green belt or any protected landscape designation, nor was it in a flood zone.

- The proposal also sought to protect the local listed Hunters Rest Farmhouse.
- The site was well contained set against existing built form and would not adversely affect the character of the area or the residential amenity of surrounding properties.
- The developer had worked with the Local Authority for over 8 months to ensure any impact on the local highway network would be effectively mitigated.
- Up to 25% of affordable housing would be provided with a contribution towards recreational open space and financial contribution towards highway network and education.
- Employment opportunities would be created within the construction industry.
- Additional residents would come to the area contributing to the local economy.
- There had been extensive discussions with the developer and Stockton Borough Councils Highways Officers which included the following;
 - 1, The design of the proposed access junction with visibility splays to Council requirements.
 - 2, Assessment also included the impact of the development at Urray Nook Road, Durham Lane and Tesco's roundabout, which showed that there would not be a severe impact at that junction.
 - 3, The impact at the A66 / Elton interchange was also assessed, for which up to date traffic surveys were carried out and it had been agreed with Highways Officers that by increasing the proposed lengths in two lane approaches to the interchange on Yarm Back Lane, Darlington Road North and Durham Lane, the impact of the traffic would be mitigated.
- As stated within the committee report it could not be demonstrated from the Yarm traffic model that the residual community impact would be severe.
- The developer had proposed to make financial contributions to car parking solutions within Yarm and to continuing a bus service.

Members were given the opportunity to ask questions/make comments on the application and these could be summarised as follows:

- Concerns were raised in relation to traffic impact especially at Tesco's roundabout close to Eggescliffe Comprehensive School.
- Comments were made in relation to the mitigation measures detailed within the main report, such as the A66 Elton interchange and the provision of £60,065.52 towards car parking solutions within Yarm. Members raised questions as to where this would be located as there was very limited space in Yarm for car parking.
- Concerns were also raised in relation to traffic congestion impacting on

accessing all local traffic network routes, such as the A66, A19 and A67.

- Brief discussion took place over peak spreading and staggered journeys and whether it was expected that residents would be expected to travel at unusual times of the day and night to avoid congestion.
- Comments were made as to why the site was a green field site and not a brown field site.
- Members asked if there had been a full model of the traffic impact assessment either by the authority or the applicant.
- Reference was made to the main committee report which detailed that the applicant had not provided sufficient details regarding the management of surface water flows from the development. In addition a comment had been received from Northumbrian Water stating that the applicant had not provided sufficient detail regarding management of foul and surface water from the development, therefore Northumbrian Water suggested a planning condition that nothing could commence until, if approved, that information had been provided. Members made reference to Appendix 5 of the main report highlighting conditions FRM1, FRM3 relating to surface water drainage and management and the lack of information provided.

Officers were given the opportunity to respond to comments/issues raised by Members. Their responses could be summarised as follows:

- In relation to traffic concerns Officers explained that access to traffic network routes had been assessed and the access did work. A previous assessment had not taken into account the wider impact such as Elton, however further surveys had now been undertaken in that area and there was an increased associated risk with the proposed development, however the particular traffic impact in Elton could be mitigated by the flaring which had been highlighted within the main report. It was accepted that there was existing congestion around The Cleveland Bay Public House which did cause tail backs to Tesco, however the traffic distribution associated with the proposed development was heading towards the A66 and A67. A lot of the traffic was predicted to head towards the A67 Long Newton rather than the A19. It was expected residents would avoid those routes as those routes were avoided now, and people would peak spread, which was a fact which had to be taken into consideration.
- A contribution had been sought towards the bus service which had been secured for 10 years.
- It was highlighted that there had only been one traffic injury at the Tesco roundabout in recent years and therefore on that basis it was not considered that the development would add any particular risk in terms of highway safety.

In terms of car parking solutions, the authority was working with local businesses and certain development sites, which were, at this stage commercially sensitive and confidential, however these would hopefully be brought forward in the near future. Any increase in car parking would lead to the traffic flow in Yarm High Street being increased which in turn should reduce the impact back at the Tesco roundabout.

- It was explained to Members that there was a full traffic model for Yarm and West Stockton however there was a gap in terms of how it reached and met Elton Interchange as it was a direct road and therefore traffic which went in came out the other side. What Officers did not have currently was a fully rebased model. Survey work was carried out in November and congestion was higher than expected. The model was being rebased currently and would be rebased in February 2018, as such the developer took it upon themselves to do further modelling of the Elton Interchange model. Highways Officers considered the applicants testing sufficient for the proposed application, however the current model was not up to date.

A motion was proposed that the application be deferred to a future meeting of the Planning Committee due to a lack of information.

A vote took place and the motion was carried.

RESOLVED that 17/0775/OUT

Land Associated With Hunters Rest, Urray Nook Road, Eaglescliffe Outline planning permission with some matters reserved (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) for the erection up to 130 dwellings, associated infrastructure including access road and public open space, be deferred to a future meeting of the Planning Committee.

**P
83/17** **1. Appeal - Paul Daggett - 44 Marchlyn Crescent, Ingleby Barwick,
Stockton-On-Tees, TS17 5DP
17/0367/FUL - DISMISSED**

The Appeals were noted.

**P
84/17** **1. Appeal - P And M Properties - Land West Of Fleet Bridge Road,
Chesham Grove, Norton
16/0389/OUT - DISMISSED**

The Appeals were noted.