

APPENDIX 5
HTDM COMMENTS FOR APPLICATION 17/0775/OUT

INTERNAL MEMORANDUM
Highways, Transport and Design

From: Highways, Transport and Design Manager
To: Planning Development Services Manager
FAO: Mrs Elaine Atkinson
CC: Planning Administration

Proposal: 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.	Date:	18/12/2017		
Location: Land Associated With Hunters Rest, Urlay Nook Road, Eaglescliffe.	Ref:	17/0775/OUT	Rev	7

HTD Consultation		Consultation Other	
Network Safety/ Connect Tees Valley		Community Transport	
Highways Network Management		Care for Your Area	
Design Services			

Executive Summary

Within the context of NPPF, the Highways, Transport and Design Manager can offer no objections to the outline planning application 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.

The impact of the proposed application on the highway network has been assessed by the applicant, within the Transport Assessment (TA) submitted in support of the proposed development, a supplementary Arcady model and also using the Council's Yarm Traffic Model. The assessments predict that with mitigation, that the residual cumulative adverse impact on the highways network would not be severe.

The mitigation measures identified, in order to make the development acceptable in highways terms are:

- Improvements to the A66 Elton interchange;
- Provision of a financial contribution of £60,065.52 towards car parking solutions within Yarm;
- A contribution towards the continuation of this bus service, secured against planning application 13/2184/OUT (Urlay Nook (Taylor Wimpey), for a further 5 year period.

The application also predicts that 'peak spreading' would occur as users stagger journey times to avoid traffic congestion.

Details of the proposed site access arrangements are shown on drawing ref. 1701801f, which will be subject to detailed design and will be secured via a s278 Agreement, are considered to be acceptable.

Approval		Date	Approval		Date	Approval		Date
UD Officer:	CE/SW MJP	24/08/17 15/12/17	Authorised:	PS	18/12/17	Authorised:		

APPENDIX 5
HTDM COMMENTS FOR APPLICATION 17/0775/OUT

An indicative site layout, drawing ref CAL020616 – 02 –G, has been submitted and this is considered to be broadly acceptable. The details of the site layout will be considered fully should this application be approved and proceed to Reserved Matters. The interaction between the proposed site and the adjoining approved development (15/2752/FUL) must be fully considered at Reserved Matters stage.

A Construction Management should be secured by planning condition to minimise the impact of any construction works on the public highway.

There are no landscape and visual objections to the proposed development although some amendments to the layout will be required however, it is considered that internal landscape matters may be resolved as part of any Reserved Matters application.

Any Reserved Matters application should also take account of the recommendation made with the submitted Landscape and Visual Review, which include:

- Opportunity to enhance existing hedgerows, hedgerow trees and specimen trees planting along the site boundaries, and utilise existing boundary planting to create a stronger landscape framework for development, and enhance Nelly Burdon Beck;
- Appropriate siting of the proposed built form and proposed boundary treatments to minimise adverse visual impacts through careful consideration of existing topography within the site;
- Retain the open character in the southeast corner of the site to respond to the existing landscape character;
- Improve public access through the site with additional Public Rights of Way.

The applicant has not provided sufficient detail regarding the management of surface water runoff from the proposed development and this information should be secured by condition.

Detailed comments and conditions are included below in Appendix 1 and 2 respectively.

Approval		Date	Approval		Date	Approval		Date
UD Officer:	CE/SW MJP	24/08/17 15/12/17	Authorised:	PS	18/12/17	Authorised:		

Appendix 1 - Detailed Comments

Highways Comments

The proposed development is an 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.

Traffic Impact

The applicant has submitted an initial Transport Assessment (TA) in support of the proposed development. However, at the request of the Local Highway Authority further assessments have been undertaken by the applicant which include:

- The impact of the proposed development at the A66 Elton Interchange;
- The impact of the proposed development on the wider highway network utilising the Council's Yarm model.

The findings of these further assessments have been submitted by the applicant in the form of 'Technical Notes' and Arcady traffic modelling which supplement the original TA. The Technical notes include details of additional traffic surveys which we carried out in November 2017. The Council have also undertaken additional surveys at this location, in order to validate the assessment.

The trip rates in the TA, which are based upon information derived from TRICS (national trip rate database), for the proposed development are shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Vehicle Trip Generation (for 130 dwellings)

	AM			PM		
	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Trip rate	0.155	0.413	0.568	0.388	0.237	0.625
Trips	20	54	74	50	31	81

The trip distributions, which utilise those previously approved for application 13/2184/OUT, are shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Trip Distribution

	Development Traffic Flows (PCU)	
	Weekday AM Peak Period	Weekday PM Peak Period
To A67 Westbound	16	9
To A67 Eastbound	38	21
From A67 Westbound	14	37
From A67 Eastbound	6	14

In order to assess the impact of the proposed development local capacity assessments have been undertaken at the following junctions:

Approval		Date	Approval		Date	Approval		Date
UD Officer:	CE/SW MJP	24/08/17 15/12/17	Authorised:	PS	18/12/17	Authorised:		

APPENDIX 5
HTDM COMMENTS FOR APPLICATION 17/0775/OUT

- Urlay Nook Road / Site Access;
- Urlay Nook Road / Durham Lane / Elton Lane / Tesco roundabout;
- A66 Elton Interchange.

Urlay Nook Road / Site Access – Junction Assessments - The initial assessment of this junction, which is included in Table 3 below, demonstrates that the proposed development would not have a severe impact at this junction.

Table 3 - Urlay Nook Road / Site Access Junction

2027 Base plus Development	Weekday AM Peak Hour		Weekday PM Peak Hour	
	RFC	Q	RFC	Q
A67 Eastbound	0.01	0.00	0.03	0.00
Site access	0.10	0.07	0.03	0.00

Urlay Nook Road / Durham Lane / Elton Lane / Tesco roundabout – Junction Assessments - The initial assessment of this junction, which is included in Table 4 below, demonstrates that the proposed development would not have a severe impact at this junction.

Table 4 - Urlay Nook Road / Durham Lane / Elton Lane / Tesco roundabout – Junction Assessments

Movement	Weekday AM Peak Hour		Weekday PM Peak Hour	
	RFC	Q	RFC	Q
2027 Base plus Committed				
Durham Lane	0.88	6.6	0.78	3.5
Elton Lane	0.02	0.0	0.03	0.0
Tesco	0.14	0.2	0.24	0.3
Urlay Nook Road (North)	0.46	0.8	0.49	0.9
Urlay Nook Road (South)	0.51	1.0	0.57	1.3
2027 Base plus Committed plus Development				
Durham Lane	0.90	7.4	0.82	4.2
Elton Lane	0.02	0.0	0.03	0.0
Tesco	0.14	0.2	0.25	0.3
Urlay Nook Road (North)	0.46	0.9	0.50	1.0
Urlay Nook Road (South)	0.54	1.2	0.58	1.4

A66 Elton Interchange – Junction Assessment - The initial assessment of this junction, which is included in Table 5 below, demonstrates that with suitable mitigation the proposed development would not have a severe impact at this junction.

It should be noted that whilst this interchange lies outside of the extent of the Yarm Traffic model it traffic is included within the West Stockton Aimsun Model (WesAM). Details of the 'Yarm Traffic Modelling' is covered overleaf.

Approval		Date	Approval		Date	Approval		Date
UD Officer:	CE/SW MJP	24/08/17 15/12/17	Authorised:	PS	18/12/17	Authorised:		

APPENDIX 5
HTDM COMMENTS FOR APPLICATION 17/0775/OUT

The proposed mitigation will bring forward a scheme that fully takes account of the extant permissions that are already reliant upon improvements at this junction namely:

- 11/2842/EIS (Allens West);
- 3/2184/OUT (Urlay Nook - Taylor Wimpey).

The works would further increase the length of the two lane entries to the A66 Elton Interchange junction at the following locations:

- Yarm Back Lane by 1.5m;
- Darlington Road (north roundabout) by 1.0m;
- Durham Lane by 4.0m.

These works, which take account of the works required by the extant approvals, will be secured through a s106 Agreement.

Table 5 – A66 Elton Interchange – Junction Assessments

Movement	Weekday AM Peak Hour		Weekday PM Peak Hour	
	RFC	Q	RFC	Q
2027 Base plus Committed				
Elton North – Yarm Back Lane	1.09	46.2	0.87	5.8
Elton North – Darlington Road	0.92	8.1	0.39	0.6
Elton North – Over Bridge	0.58	1.3	0.75	3.0
Elton North – A66 Eastbound Off Slip	0.19	0.2	0.34	0.5
Elton South – Over Bridge	0.36	0.6	0.27	0.4
Elton South – A66 Westbound Off Slip	0.40	0.7	0.72	2.6
Elton South – Durham Lane	0.77	3.3	0.83	4.5
Elton South – Darlington Road	0.23	0.3	0.31	0.4
2027 Base plus Committed plus Development				
Elton North – Yarm Back Lane	1.11	51.5	0.89	6.4
Elton North – Darlington Road	0.93	8.8	0.40	0.6
Elton North – Over Bridge	0.59	1.4	0.76	3.1
Elton North – A66 Eastbound Off Slip	0.19	0.2	0.34	0.5
Elton South – Over Bridge	0.36	0.6	0.27	0.4
Elton South – A66 Westbound Off Slip	0.40	0.7	0.73	2.7
Elton South – Durham Lane	0.79	3.7	0.88	6.3
Elton South – Darlington Road	0.23	0.3	0.34	0.5

Approval		Date	Approval		Date	Approval		Date
UD Officer:	CE/SW MJP	24/08/17 15/12/17	Authorised:	PS	18/12/17	Authorised:		

APPENDIX 5
HTDM COMMENTS FOR APPLICATION 17/0775/OUT

2027 Base plus Committed plus Development with Mitigation				
Elton North – Yarm Back Lane	1.09	45.5	0.87	5.6
Elton North – Darlington Road	0.92	7.9	0.39	0.6
Elton North – Over Bridge	0.59	1.4	0.76	3.1
Elton North – A66 Eastbound Off Slip	0.19	0.2	0.34	0.5
Elton South – Over Bridge	0.36	0.6	0.27	0.4
Elton South – A66 Westbound Off Slip	0.40	0.7	0.73	2.7
Elton South – Durham Lane	0.78	3.4	0.86	5.5
Elton South – Darlington Road	0.23	0.3	0.34	0.5

Yarm Traffic Modelling

The Yarm traffic modelling provides a more informed response regarding the impact of the development on the wider network, in the forecast year which assumes all dwellings associated with both the extant approvals and the proposed development(s) would be built out i.e. occupied, giving a worst case scenario, rather than reviewing each junction in isolation as undertaken in the TA.

Prior to assessing development impact the Yarm model (previously referred to as the YIBAM) was rebased and uses survey results from traffic surveys undertaken in November 2016. The current ‘approved’ situation, which includes the traffic associated with the committed developments such as the Tall Trees, Morley Carr Farm, Green Lane and Mount Leven, has then been added to produce a future base model.

As previously noted, additional traffic surveys were undertaken on Durham Lane associated with the WeSAM model. Whilst these surveys have informed the impact of the application on existing queue lengths at the A66 Elton Interchange, no wider traffic surveys have been undertaken as in support of this application in Yarm. This is because the Yarm survey data is only 12 months old and as such considered robust.

The existing traffic movements from the occupied houses from these extant developments was netted off from the future base model (so as to avoid double counting) before the development traffic associated with the proposed development of up to 130 houses was tested. This allowed a comparison to be made between the base situation (Committed Development) and future assessment scenarios with the additional traffic movements from the 130 houses.

A comparison of the results from each scenario, which are reported as journey times, has then been undertaken to ascertain the impact of the proposed development traffic for each scenario on the highway network which are included below in Table 6.

Table 6 - Journey Time Results

AM Peak 07:30 - 09:30

Route	Description	Com Dev	Com Dev + Sensitivity	Com Dev + Hunters Rest	<i>Diff to CD</i>	Com Dev + All	<i>Diff to CD</i>
1a	A67 Thirsk Road - A1044 Green Lane to Leven Road	05:53	05:21	05:44	-00:09	06:02	00:09

Approval		Date	Approval		Date	Approval		Date
UD Officer:	CE/SW MJP	24/08/17 15/12/17	Authorised:	PS	18/12/17	Authorised:		

APPENDIX 5
HTDM COMMENTS FOR APPLICATION 17/0775/OUT

1b	A67 The Spital - Leven Road to Worsall Road	06:30	06:51	06:49	00:19	06:44	00:13
1c	A67 High Street - Worsall Road to Bridge Street	03:49	04:05	04:04	00:15	04:04	00:15
Route 1 Total	A67 Northbound – A1044 Green Lane to Bridge Street	16:12	16:17	16:37	00:24	16:50	00:37
2a	A67 Urlay Nook Road - Durham Lane to A135	04:56	04:59	04:53	-00:03	05:06	00:10
2b	A67 High Street - A135 to Worsall Road	03:15	03:15	03:12	-00:03	03:18	00:04
2c	A67 The Spital - Worsall Road to Leven Road	00:51	00:50	00:51	-00:00	00:50	-00:01
2d	A67 Thirsk Road - Leven Road to A1044 Green Lane	01:22	01:17	01:26	00:03	01:24	00:02
2c	A67 - A1044 Green Lane to Kirklevington Hall Drive	00:51	00:50	00:51	-00:00	00:50	-00:01
Route 2 Total	A67 Southbound – A67/Urlay Nook Road Roundabout Kirklevington Hall Drive	11:15	11:11	11:12	-00:03	11:30	00:15
3a	Green Lane - Tall Trees to Yarm Rail Bridge	06:17	04:33	05:48	-00:29	06:11	-00:05
3b	Green Lane - Yarm Rail Bridge to A67	03:09	02:12	02:38	-00:32	03:07	-00:02
3c	A1044 Green Lane - A67 to Glaisdale Road	00:54	00:54	00:55	00:00	00:54	00:00
3d	A1044 Leven Bank Road - Glaisdale Road to Mount Leven Village	00:14	00:14	00:14	00:00	00:14	00:00
Route 3 Total	Green Lane / A1044 Eastbound – Tall Trees to Mount Leven Village	10:34	07:52	09:34	-01:00	10:27	-00:07
4a	A1044 Leven Bank Road - Mount Leven Village to Glaisdale Road	00:19	00:16	00:21	00:02	00:20	00:00
4b	A1044 Green Lane - Glaisdale Road to A67	02:09	01:52	02:31	00:21	02:34	00:25
4c	Green Lane -A67 to Yarm Rail Bridge	01:19	01:30	01:24	00:04	01:27	00:07
4d	Green Lane -Yarm Rail Bridge to Tall Trees	01:18	01:17	01:17	-00:00	01:17	-00:00
Route 4 Total	Green Lane / A1044 Westbound – Mount Leven Village to Tall Trees	05:06	04:56	05:33	00:28	05:38	00:32
Route 5 Total	Worsall Road Eastbound - Allerton Balk to A67 High Street	11:20	13:09	12:24	01:04	13:09	01:49
Route 6 Total	Leven Road Westbound – Kirk Road to A67 The Spital	04:45	05:01	05:07	00:22	05:25	00:39

PM Peak 16:00 - 18:00

Approval		Date	Approval		Date	Approval		Date
UD Officer:	CE/SW MJP	24/08/17 15/12/17	Authorised:	PS	18/12/17	Authorised:		

APPENDIX 5
HTDM COMMENTS FOR APPLICATION 17/0775/OUT

Route	Description	Com Dev	Com Dev + Sensitivity	Com Dev + Hunters Rest	Diff to CD	Com Dev + All	Diff to CD
1a	A67 Thirsk Road - A1044 Green Lane to Leven Road	02:50	02:31	03:29	00:39	02:38	-00:12
1b	A67 The Spital - Leven Road to Worsall Road	08:17	08:21	08:24	00:07	07:43	-00:34
1c	A67 High Street - Worsall Road to Bridge Street	04:31	04:43	04:46	00:15	04:49	00:18
Route 1 Total	A67 Northbound – A1044 Green Lane to Bridge Street	15:38	15:35	16:40	01:02	15:10	-00:28
2a	A67 Urlay Nook Road - Durham Lane to A135	11:50	12:34	12:10	00:20	12:29	00:39
2b	A67 High Street - A135 to Worsall Road	05:30	05:34	05:30	-00:01	05:39	00:09
2c	A67 The Spital - Worsall Road to Leven Road	00:52	00:52	00:52	-00:00	00:52	-00:00
2d	A67 Thirsk Road - Leven Road to A1044 Green Lane	01:16	01:21	01:27	00:10	01:19	00:02
2c	A67 - A1044 Green Lane to Kirklevington Hall Drive	00:52	00:52	00:52	-00:00	00:52	-00:00
Route 2 Total	A67 Southbound – A67/Urlay Nook Road Roundabout Kirklevington Hall Drive	20:20	21:13	20:50	00:30	21:10	00:50
3a	Green Lane - Tall Trees to Yarm Rail Bridge	01:40	01:58	01:43	00:03	01:36	-00:03
3b	Green Lane - Yarm Rail Bridge to A67	01:16	01:21	01:27	00:11	01:16	00:00
3c	A1044 Green Lane - A67 to Glaisdale Road	00:55	00:54	00:55	00:00	00:55	00:00
3d	A1044 Leven Bank Road - Glaisdale Road to Mount Leven Village	00:14	00:14	00:14	-00:00	00:14	00:00
Route 3 Total	Green Lane / A1044 Eastbound – Tall Trees to Mount Leven Village	04:05	04:27	04:19	00:14	04:02	-00:03
4a	A1044 Leven Bank Road - Mount Leven Village to Glaisdale Road	00:21	00:20	00:21	00:00	00:22	00:02
4b	A1044 Green Lane - Glaisdale Road to A67	01:27	01:44	01:37	00:10	01:24	-00:04
4c	Green Lane -A67 to Yarm Rail Bridge	02:43	02:42	02:39	-00:03	02:29	-00:14
4d	Green Lane -Yarm Rail Bridge to Tall Trees	01:16	01:16	01:16	00:00	01:16	-00:00
Route 4 Total	Green Lane / A1044 Westbound – Mount Leven Village to Tall Trees	05:47	06:01	05:54	00:07	05:31	-00:16
Route 5 Total	Worsall Road Eastbound - Allerton Balk to A67 High Street	07:08	07:04	06:52	-00:16	06:45	-00:22

Approval		Date	Approval		Date	Approval		Date
UD Officer:	CE/SW MJP	24/08/17 15/12/17	Authorised:	PS	18/12/17	Authorised:		

APPENDIX 5
HTDM COMMENTS FOR APPLICATION 17/0775/OUT

Route 6 Total	Leven Road Westbound – Kirk Road to A67 The Spital	01:45	01:44	01:45	-00:01	01:47	00:02
------------------	---	-------	-------	-------	--------	-------	-------

The results show that it cannot be demonstrated, within the context of NPPF, that the residual cumulative impact of the proposed development on the highways network would be severe. The results also predict that ‘peak spreading’ would occur as users stagger journey times to avoid traffic congestion.

The modelling also predicts that the proposed development will result in increased vehicular trips to Yarm High Street but that improvement of car parking within Yarm could mitigate this impact. This contribution together with a contribution to public transport is considered in greater detail overleaf.

Concerns have been raised by existing businesses within Yarm Town Centre and the Durham Lane Industrial Estate, regarding the capacity of the existing highway network. However, the applicant has demonstrated that with mitigation, including improved car parking provision in Yarm the impact of the proposed development on the highway network can be mitigated and as such an objection, in relation to highways impact, cannot be raised.

Yarm High Street – Car Parking

The proposed development will result in increased vehicular trips to Yarm High Street and it has previously been noted, should this application be approved, that a contribution would be required towards the improvement of car parking within Yarm. Yarm High Street is congested and therefore any increase in traffic in the area, as a result of development, is considered material and should be mitigated by a contribution towards off-street car parking.

A formula for calculating the car parking requirement, of 0.046 spaces per property, has been developed for sites within Yarm. Based on this formula the applicant would need to provide 6 car parking spaces within Yarm. If a car park cannot be provided a financial contribution of £60,065.52 (cost of £10,010.92 per space (based on figure quoted for 13/0776/EIS adjusted for Labor Price increases) should be sought towards car parking solutions within Yarm.

The applicant has confirmed that they are unable to provide the required car parking provision and as such a financial contribution of £60,065.52 towards car parking solutions within Yarm should be secured through a s106 Agreement.

Access

The proposed site would be accessed from the same location on Urlay Nook Road as the previously approved adjoining development (15/2752/FUL). The proposed site access, which is shown on drawing ref. 1701801f, would include:

- The provision of a 6m wide carriageway;
- The provision of 1.8m wide footways on either side of the carriageway;
- A visibility splay of 4.5m x 170m to the east.

The proposed site access arrangements, which will be subject to detailed design and will be secured via a s278 Agreement, are considered to be broadly acceptable.

Parking / Layout

Whilst the application is outline for erection of up to 130 no. dwellings with associated means of access the applicant has submitted an indicative site layout, drawing ref CAL020616 – 02 –G, and this is considered to be broadly in accordance with the Council’s Design Guide however, the

Approval		Date	Approval		Date	Approval		Date
UD Officer:	CE/SW MJP	24/08/17 15/12/17	Authorised:	PS	18/12/17	Authorised:		

APPENDIX 5
HTDM COMMENTS FOR APPLICATION 17/0775/OUT

interaction between the proposed site and the adjoining approved development (15/2752/FUL) must be fully considered, should the proposal be approved, at reserved matters stage.

Incurtilage car parking should be provided in accordance with SPD3: Parking Provision for Developments 2011, the applicant should note that the reduced provision applies only to social rented properties, and only if 'pepper potted' within the proposed development. Ideally an additional car parking space should be provided to increase the car parking provision for any social rented properties to two number. If the social rented properties are grouped together without a second space, this could result in drivers parking on-street. On-street parking would likely obstruct access to drives and obstruct manoeuvring for vehicles to the detriment of highway safety.

The applicant would need to enter into a Highways Act Section 38 Agreement, should the application be approved, for the highway and footpaths which are to become highway maintainable at the public expense. A highway adoption plan is requested to confirm which areas would become maintainable at the public expense.

Sustainable Connections

The proposed development would be reliant upon a bus service which has been secured for a 5 year period against planning application 13/2184/OUT (Urlay Nook (Taylor Wimpey)) which has not yet been implemented. In order to ensure that the site remains sustainable beyond this initial 5 year period, and taking account of the likely timescales for the build out the site, a contribution towards the continuation of this bus service for a further 5 year period is required.

This contribution, which would be over and above that secured against planning application 13/2184/OUT (Urlay Nook -Taylor Wimpey), should be secured through a s106 Agreement.

Construction Management Plan

Should the application be recommended for approval, the applicant needs to provide and agree a Construction Management Plan with the Highway Authority which should be secured by planning condition to minimise the impact of any construction works on the public highway.

Landscape and Visual Comments

The development for up to 130 dwellings is located on the south western edge of Eaglescliffe and is outside the limits to development. The site, currently pastoral land used for grazing and exercising horses, slopes relatively steeply down to the wooded Nelly Burdon Beck which is located outside of the application site to the south and west. As outlined in the pre-application consultation, the proposed development should be offset from the wooded beck valley by at least 10m to minimise the impact upon this green corridor. It appears that the application boundary has responded to this request and, in addition, is located outside of the current flood zones associated with the beck.

The application site abuts the eastern end of the allotments on Urlay Nook Road and has a short frontage along Urlay Nook Road which is bound by a gappy remnant hedgerow. Overhead lines associated with a line of pylons pass through the east of the site where the site abuts the existing housing on Valley Gardens. In addition, a permitted residential development site (application ref: 15/2752/FUL) is located to the east of the application site. The application site would share an access onto Urlay Nook Road with this permitted development site which appears to utilise the existing site access to Hunter's Rest Farm. This would minimise the impact on the existing planting along Urlay Nook Road, which should be maintained and protected during any construction works and should be enhanced with additional planting to help screen the development from the north and reflect the more substantial planting along Urlay Nook Road to the west.

Approval		Date	Approval		Date	Approval		Date
UD Officer:	CE/SW MJP	24/08/17 15/12/17	Authorised:	PS	18/12/17	Authorised:		

APPENDIX 5

HTDM COMMENTS FOR APPLICATION 17/0775/OUT

A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), has been prepared by AAH Planning Consultants in support of this application. The methodology outlined in the LVIA broadly follows the guidance set out in Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment 3rd Edition (GLVIA3) with the exception of the consideration of the sensitivity of the receptor which does not appear to have considered the value and susceptibility of the receptor. However, this is unlikely to alter the overall findings of the assessment.

The site is located in the West Stockton Rural Fringe Landscape Character Area (LCA), and, at a more detailed level, the Hunters Rest Farmland landscape unit. The LVIA demonstrates that, while the proposed development would result in a substantial change in character of the site, it would have a lesser effect on the wider West Stockton Rural Fringe Landscape Character Area. There are limited opportunities to view the proposed development from the wider area due in part to intervening topography, vegetation and built form. However, where views are possible it is likely that there will be a noticeable change to the view. It should be noted that it is possible to view the North York Moors across the site from Uraly Nook Road. Once the development is constructed this view is likely to be obscured by built form within the development site.

Site Layout

The proposed indicative site masterplan shows that an area of public open space (0.47ha) with a protected area for newts including a pond located in the north east of the site. A second area of public open space (0.72ha) is shown located in the east of the site below the overhead lines, with a third area of public open space (0.28ha) containing a large pond in the south of the application site. The open space provision on site is considered further under the Public Open Space heading below. However, given the sloping nature of the site, the Highways Transport and Design Manager would require agreement of a detailed design for the site setting housing back from the break of slope by a minimum of 10m, and a landscaped buffer including tree planting should be provided along this break of slope.

As overhead power lines cross the proposed open space in the east of the site confirmation should be gained from the operator that they accept the layout and usage of these fields for proposed open space and associated active recreation. National Grid has guidelines on layout: and that HSE document 43-8 gives guidelines as to what standoff distances are associated with pylons. There is a certain amount of publicly available information including the Energy Network Association Technical Specification 43–8 Overhead Line Clearances (www.energynetworks.org/electricity), National Grid’s Sense of Place guidance (<http://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/Senseofplace/Download/>) on development near power lines and HSE Guidance Note GS6 (<http://www.hse.gov.uk/pubns/g6.pdf>) which provides guidance on working near overhead lines. National Grid’s Plant Protection Team will, however, be able to best advise on these matters.

The proposed indicative site masterplan gives no indication of any Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) within the development. SuDs should be incorporated into the housing layout and provide for amenity benefit as well as flood storage. Permeable surfacing should also be considered where appropriate. Full details of how SuDs will be incorporated into the scheme should be provided as part of any reserved matters application.

The LVIA refers to additional planting along Nelly Burdon’s Beck as part of the mitigation for the site. Planting in this area would be welcomed to enhance the green corridor and reinforce the vegetation in this area; however, it must be designed to avoid conflict with the floodplain. As this area is outside of the application site this would have to be secured through a Grampian condition. Details on how this area will be maintained and how access for maintenance will be achieved should also be provided.

Approval		Date	Approval		Date	Approval		Date
UD Officer:	CE/SW MJP	24/08/17 15/12/17	Authorised:	PS	18/12/17	Authorised:		

APPENDIX 5
HTDM COMMENTS FOR APPLICATION 17/0775/OUT

Existing trees and hedge planting retained within the layout and around the perimeter of the application site should be given full protection in accordance with BS 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction.

As part of the reserved matters application, a full landscaped scheme will be required detailing hard and soft landscaping, boundary treatments, street furniture and lighting, as well as any proposed play equipment or seating in connection with the area of amenity space.

Public Open Space and Green Infrastructure.

The submitted evidence does not identify the size of housing types anticipated. As a detailed mix of units is not provided the Council have assumed a mix on the basis of similar adjacent new development to calculate the anticipated requirement of on-site open space provision required (17% 2 bed, 26% 3 bed, 45% 4 bed and 12% 5 bed). Based on this assumption of unit sizes (22no 2 bed, 34no 3 bed, 59no 4 bed and 15no 5 bed) the development will have a population of circa 457 people creating an on-site open space requirement of 0.635Ha.

The indicative Masterplan provided as part of the application identifies that three areas of public open space (POS) are to be provided totalling 1.47ha. Consideration is required as to whether these spaces fulfil the following as detailed within paragraphs 4.16 and 4.17 of the SPD:

“If the minimum acceptable size is met, amenity greenspace should be provided on site regardless of the existing level of provision as it is integral to the design quality of new development.....

It should be noted that the requirement for amenity space excludes land set aside purely to provide an attractive setting and/or landscaping function, which will normally be expected to be provided by developers in addition to that required under this standard, and as normal design requirements. Highway verges, utility corridors, sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) noise attenuation bunds and the open space provided as visibility splays will not be counted toward open space provision.”

Given the topography of this site this 0.635 ha of POS should be level ground and roughly square

If open space provision is not to be made on-site it would be appropriate to make contributions to off-site provision and improvements.

	Standard Charge per Person	Total Charge for Development
Open Space	£458.71	£209,630.47
Open Space Maintenance	£510.84	£233,453.88
	Total	£443,084.35

The amount required for off-site provision would be £443,084.35p, which would be defrayed on projects relevant to the development identified within the Green Infrastructure Delivery Plan, such as recreational facilities at St Margaret’s (PS3) or the development of the Preston Park masterplan (PA1).

All areas of POS will have to be maintained and managed in perpetuity. This may be through Title Transfer to SBC or through a management company or other appropriate organisations as deemed acceptable by the LA if not transferred to SBC.

Approval		Date	Approval		Date	Approval		Date
UD Officer:	CE/SW MJP	24/08/17 15/12/17	Authorised:	PS	18/12/17	Authorised:		

APPENDIX 5
HTDM COMMENTS FOR APPLICATION 17/0775/OUT

A condition should be added to any recommendation for approval that requires the reserved matters application to provide long term management proposals for the POS on this site for a period of 25 years.

The proposed footpath link around the western side of the development is welcomed, though the feasibility of developing a footpath link that is closer to the alignment of the beck should be explored. As this would be outside of the application site this would have to be secured through a Grampian condition. Furthermore, the feasibility of securing either pedestrian or cycle access to Seymour Crescent through this corridor should be explored.

The public open space at the eastern end of the development should be congruent and connected with the proposed open space included with the neighbouring development, planning ref no 15/2752/FUL, requiring an element of joint planning with the neighbouring developer.

The submitted Landscape and Visual Review document identifies a series of opportunities for the future development of the site under the heading of recommendations, however there is no explicit commitment to them. It is considered that these recommendations should be integral to the detailed design of the site for any Reserved Matters application.

These include:

- There is the opportunity to enhance existing hedgerows, hedgerow trees and specimen trees planting along the site boundaries to integrate proposed development and assist in breaking up proposed built form. Para 4.1;
- There is an opportunity to utilise existing boundary planting and tree planting to create a stronger landscape framework for development, incorporating proposed native hedgerow and specimen trees within the site to create a sense of place enhancing the local landscape character. Para 4.2;
- Appropriate siting of the proposed built form and proposed boundary treatments to minimise adverse visual impacts from isolated partial/glimpsed views from the east and southeast within the semi-rural landscape. Para 4.2;
- Careful consideration of existing topography within the site to assist in integrating the proposed development within the existing site context and help to screen views of the proposed development. Careful use of landform within the site will ensure proposed housing is sensitively integrated. Para 4.4;
- A more open character in the southeast corner of the site will be retained to respond to the existing landscape character of the surrounding rural/urban fringe of Egglecliffe. Para 4.5;
- There is an opportunity to improve public access through the site with additional Public Rights of Way. This would help to connect the site with the surrounding town and to create more connections with local open space and the NCN. Para 4.6;
- There is an opportunity to provide new hedgerow planting and tree planting to enhance the Nelly Burton Beck and also as part of the development to create new green corridors for amenity and habitat value. Para 4.7.

Flood Risk Management

The Drainage Strategy drawing No H76116-D-001 RevC indicates that SuDS features are to be used to control surface water flows from the proposed development, the storage structure appears to be located close to Flood Zone 2, and this could affect the performance of the surface water drainage system. SuDs features including storage structures must not be constructed

Approval		Date	Approval		Date	Approval		Date
UD Officer:	CE/SW MJP	24/08/17 15/12/17	Authorised:	PS	18/12/17	Authorised:		

APPENDIX 5
HTDM COMMENTS FOR APPLICATION 17/0775/OUT

within Flood Zones 2 and 3, also a fully surcharged outfall should be taken in to consideration when undertaking the detailed design.

The Environment Agencies Flood Maps highlight an area to the west of the site that is at risk of surface water flooding, the applicant must consider what effect the proposed development may have on neighbouring sites or properties.

The detailed design must highlight any flooding that is not contained within the system between the 1 in 30 year event and the 1 in 100+40%CC events, this should highlight the location, duration and depth of flooding that occurs, the detailed design must also consider flood flow path routes for events greater than 1 in 100 +40%CC.

Further information is required regarding the Suds structure, this should include, cross sections drawings, and layout drawings highlight the 1 in 30 year and 1 in 100+CC flood levels, all landscaping details including arrangement for access for maintenance.

The applicant has not provided sufficient detail regarding the management of surface water runoff from the proposed development and this information should be secured by condition.

Approval		Date	Approval		Date	Approval		Date
UD Officer:	CE/SW MJP	24/08/17 15/12/17	Authorised:	PS	18/12/17	Authorised:		

APPENDIX 5
HTDM COMMENTS FOR APPLICATION 17/0775/OUT

Appendix 2 – Conditions

FRM1		<p>The development hereby approved shall not be commenced on site, until a scheme of 'Surface Water Drainage and Management' for the implementation, maintenance and management of the sustainable drainage scheme has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented and thereafter managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details, the scheme shall include but not be restricted to providing the following details;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Detailed design of the surface water management system; ii. A build program and timetable for the provision of the critical surface water drainage infrastructure; iii. A management plan detailing how surface water runoff from the site will be managed during construction Phase; iv. Details of adoption responsibilities; v. Management plan for the Surface Water Drainage scheme and any maintenance and funding arrangement; <p>The building hereby approved shall not be brought into use until the approved 'Surface Water Drainage' scheme has been implemented and the approved scheme shall be maintained in accordance with the Surface Water Management scheme for the lifetime of the development.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the site is developed in a manner that will not increase the risk of surface water flooding to site or surrounding area, in accordance with the guidance within Core Strategy Development Plan Policy CS10 and the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>
FRM2		<p>The development permitted by this planning permission shall only be carried out in accordance with the mitigation measures contained with the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) ref no 59475 dated July 2017.</p> <p>The mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to the occupation and subsequently in accordance with the timing / phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme, or within any period as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the local planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: To prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage of / disposal of surface water from the site and to reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants</p>
FRM3		<p>No dwellings should be occupied until the surface water management system for the development or any phase of the development is in place and fully operational. A maintenance plan detailing how the surface water management system will be maintained during the construction phase must also be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Reason: To reduce flood risk during construction / development of the site</p>

Approval		Date	Approval		Date	Approval		Date
UD Officer:	CE/SW MJP	24/08/17 15/12/17	Authorised:	PS	18/12/17	Authorised:		

APPENDIX 5
HTDM COMMENTS FOR APPLICATION 17/0775/OUT

UDHC18b	Construction Management Plan	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) the site construction access(es) (ii) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors; (iii) loading and unloading of plant and materials; (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 HGVs; (x) measures to protect existing footpaths and verges; and a means of communication with local residents. <p>The approved Construction Management Plan shall be adhered to throughout the construction period.</p> <p>Reason In the interests of highway safety and visual amenity.</p>
UDHC18c	Site Construction Access	<p>No development shall take place (except for the purposes of constructing the initial site access) until that part of the access(es) extending 15 metres into the site from the carriageway of the existing highway has been made up and surfaced in accordance with the Councils Design Guide and Specification.</p> <p>Reason In the interests of highway safety.</p>
UDHC06d	Discharge of Surface Water	<p>The development hereby approved shall not be commenced on site, until a scheme of 'Surface Water Drainage and Management' for the implementation, maintenance and management of the sustainable drainage scheme has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented and thereafter managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details, The scheme shall include but not be restricted to providing the following details;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. Detailed design of the surface water management system II. A build program and timetable for the provision of the critical surface water drainage infrastructure III. A management plan detailing how surface water runoff from the site will be managed during construction Phase IV. Details of adoption responsibilities; V. Management plan for the Surface Water Drainage scheme and any maintenance and funding arrangement;

Approval		Date	Approval		Date	Approval		Date
UD Officer:	CE/SW MJP	24/08/17 15/12/17	Authorised:	PS	18/12/17	Authorised:		

APPENDIX 5
HTDM COMMENTS FOR APPLICATION 17/0775/OUT

		<p>The building hereby approved shall not be brought into use until the approved 'Surface Water Drainage' scheme has been implemented and the approved scheme shall be maintained in accordance with the Surface Water Management scheme for the lifetime of the development.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the site is developed in a manner that will not increase the risk of surface water flooding to site or surrounding area, in accordance with the guidance within Core Strategy Development Plan Policy CS10 and the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>
UDHC06i	Discharge of Surface Water	<p>The development permitted by this planning permission shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) 2017 Reference: H76116/FRA/001 Rev B dated 17th June</p> <p>Limiting the surface water run-off generated by the impermeable areas of the development up to and including the 100 year critical storm so that it will not exceed the run-off from the undeveloped site and not increase the risk of flooding off-site. This will be achieved by limiting surface water discharge from the development to 13.6l/sec</p> <p>The mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to the occupation and subsequently in accordance with the timing / phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme, or within any period as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the local planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: To prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage of / disposal of surface water from the site and to reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants.</p>
UDHC06h	Discharge of Surface Water	<p>No dwellings should be occupied until the surface water management system for the development or any phase of the development is in place and fully operational. A maintenance plan detailing how the surface water management system will be maintained during the construction phase must also be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Reason: To reduce flood risk during construction / development of the site</p>
	Discharge of Surface Water INFORMATIVE)	<p>Surface water discharges from this site shall be flow regulated to ensure that flooding problems elsewhere in the catchment are not exacerbated. The discharge rates from the site will be restricted to 13.6 l/sec with sufficient storage within the system to accommodate a 1 in 30 year storm. The design shall also ensure that storm water resulting from a 1 in 100 year event plus climate change surcharging the drainage system can be stored on site without risk to people or property and without overflowing into drains or watercourse. Full Micro Drainage design files (mdx files) including the catchment plan and 3D topographical survey must to be submitted for approval. The flow path of flood waters exiting the site as a result of a rainfall event exceeding the 1 in 100 year event plus climate change should also be provided.</p> <p>The layout of any proposed development and sustainable drainage system should be designed to mimic natural drainage flow paths, utilising</p>

Approval		Date	Approval		Date	Approval		Date
UD Officer:	CE/SW MJP	24/08/17 15/12/17	Authorised:	PS	18/12/17	Authorised:		

APPENDIX 5
HTDM COMMENTS FOR APPLICATION 17/0775/OUT

		<p>existing natural low-lying areas and conveyance paths where appropriate. This means considering the existing blue / green corridors across the proposed site and utilizing the natural low-lying areas for the surface water management system for the development. To mimic natural catchment process as closely as possible, a “management train” is required, it is fundamental to designing a successful SuDS system, it uses techniques in series to reduce pollution, flow rates and volumes. The detailed design must show flow routes, SuDS component section, sub-catchments, discharge and flow control locations, storage features and how SuDS integrate into the landscape</p> <p>An allowance of 10% should be included within the detailed surface water drainage design for “Urban Creep”,</p> <p>The developer will need to provide a detailed program including time table for the construction of the main surface water drainage infrastructure</p> <p>The proposed development must not increase the risk of surface water runoff from the site or cause any increased flood risk to neighbouring sites. Any increase in surface water generated by the proposed development or existing surface water / groundwater issues on the site must be alleviated by the installation of sustainable drainage system within the site.</p> <p>If the applicant proposes to discharge surface water into an ordinary watercourse a land drainage consent will be required from the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA). A land drainage consent is separate application that could take up to 8 weeks for completion and no works on the watercourse can proceed until consent has been approved by the LLFA.</p> <p>The updated guidance states the new allowances for climate change now require both +20% scenario and a +40% scenario. Therefore new surface water drainage scheme designed within the Flood Risk Assessment/Drainage Strategies require at least three sets of calculations;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 1 in 30 year event; 2. 1 in 100 year plus 20% climate change; 3. 1 in 100 year plus 40% climate change; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drainage systems can be designed to include a 20% allowance for climate change; • A sensitivity test against the 40% allowance is required to ensure that the additional runoff is wholly contained within the site and there is no increase in the rate of runoff discharged from the site. It must be demonstrated that there are no implications to people from the increased flood hazard (volume between 20% and 40% allowance). It is crucial that the additional runoff from the 40% is contained within the site and does not contribute to an increased flood risk to people/property/critical infrastructure/third parties elsewhere. • If the flows cannot be contained within the site without increasing risk to properties or main infrastructure a 40% allowance must be provided.
--	--	---

Approval		Date	Approval		Date	Approval		Date
UD Officer:	CE/SW MJP	24/08/17 15/12/17	Authorised:	PS	18/12/17	Authorised:		

APPENDIX 5
HTDM COMMENTS FOR APPLICATION 17/0775/OUT

		The applicant must consider local guidance detailed in the 'Tees Valley Local Standards for Sustainable Drainage'. It is recommended that the applicant contacts the Flood Risk Management Team at an early stage to discuss surface water management requirements and their proposed surface water drainage solution for this proposed development.
UDLV08	Retention of Existing Trees Shrubs and Hedges	<p>Notwithstanding the proposals detailed in the Design and Access Statement/ submitted plans (whichever is applicable) a plan shall be submitted identifying the trees to be retained on the site all trees indicated for retention shall be retained and maintained for a minimum period of 25 years from practical completion of the development. No tree, shrub or hedge shall be cut down, uprooted or destroyed, topped or lopped other than in accordance with the approved plans. Any tree, shrub or hedge or any tree, shrub or hedge planted as a replacement that dies or is removed, uprooted or destroyed or becomes seriously damaged or defective must be replaced by another of the same size and species unless directed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Reason: To protect the existing trees/shrubs and hedges on site that the Local Planning Authority consider to be an important visual amenity in the locality and should be appropriately maintained.</p>

Approval		Date	Approval		Date	Approval		Date
UD Officer:	CE/SW MJP	24/08/17 15/12/17	Authorised:	PS	18/12/17	Authorised:		