

DELEGATED

**AGENDA NO
PLANNING COMMITTEE**

27th February 2018

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

17/1020/FUL

1-2 Aislaby Road, Eaglescliffe, Stockton-on-Tees

**Erection of 5no terraced dwellings, 1no detached dwelling, associated access and parking
(demolition of existing buildings)**

Expiry Date 14 June 2017

SUMMARY

The application site forms two semi-detached, two storey properties and the associated garden areas. The two properties face directly onto Aislaby Road. Residential properties surround the site to on all sides although there are various changes in levels within the immediate area.

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a total of 6no. dwellings on the site, with the existing buildings being demolished. The proposal would feature 5no. properties in a terraced form fronting onto Aislaby Road and the associated garden areas to the north of the dwellings. A further single detached property is also proposed within the northern part of the site.

The proposed terraced block would feature two and a half storey dwellings (i.e rooms in the roof space) with the associated dormer windows. They are designed to reflect the typography of the land and incorporate a mix of brickwork and render. The proposed detached property would also be of a two storey design with its main frontage being orientated out towards Yarm Road (A67). Access to a rear parking court is provided through an archway from Aislaby Road to a shared parking court located between the terraced buildings and detached dwelling.

A total of twenty two objections have been received with matters such as; access and visibility; insufficient car parking; the development being out of character for the area; overdevelopment of the plot; and the impact on residential amenity; being raised;

The main planning considerations of this application are its compliance with national and local planning guidance and the associated impacts of the development on the character of the surrounding area; the amenity of neighbouring occupiers; access and highway safety and features of an archaeological interest.

Asset out within the report and whilst acknowledging the objection received to the proposal, the principle of residential development on the site is considered to be acceptable given its location within the settle limits.

The proposal will replace the two existing dwellings and introduce a terraced development onto Aislaby Road as well as a property facing out onto Uray Nook Road (A67). The scheme is considered to be visually acceptable and will be in keeping with the characteristics of the surrounding area, with the type of accommodation being that which can be expected from a modern housing development.

The associated separation distances will also ensure that acceptable standards of residential amenity for both neighbouring occupiers as well as future residents of the development will be provided. The associated access and parking provision also accords with Council Guidance.

The proposed development is therefore considered to be acceptable in planning terms and is recommended for approval subject to the recommendation set out below;

RECOMMENDATION

That planning application 17/1020/FUL be approved subject to the applicant entering into a s.106 agreement in accordance with the Heads of Terms below and the following conditions and informatives;

Approved Plans;

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

Plan Reference Number	Date on Plan
1677/01	12 April 2017
1677/02	12 April 2017
1677/03 A	14 September 2017
1677/04 B	14 September 2017
1677/05 A	14 September 2017
1677/06 A	14 September 2017
1677/07 A	14 September 2017
1677/08 B	14 September 2017
MBGD1705/SLP REV A	6 December 2017
01	6 December 2017

Reason: To define the consent.

Materials;

02 Notwithstanding any description of the materials in the application no above ground construction shall be commenced until precise details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external walls and roofs of the building(s) have been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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

Means of Enclosure;

03 All means of enclosure associated with the development hereby approved, including the boundary along the South View frontage, shall be in accordance with a scheme to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority before the development commences. Such means of enclosure shall be erected fully before the development hereby approved is occupied.

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

External lighting;

04 Notwithstanding the submitted information, full details of all external lighting of the buildings and car-parking areas together with its colour means of shielding and alignment shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority before such lighting is provided. The lighting shall be provided in

accordance with the agreed details before the development is occupied and shall thereafter be retained in its approved form.

Reason: To avoid light pollution in the interests of the visual amenities of the area.

Site levels;

- 05 Notwithstanding the submitted information provided in this application, details of the proposed site levels and finished floor levels shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of the development. The development shall be carried out in accordance with those details thereafter.

Reason: To define the consent

Drainage;

- 06 Development shall not commence until a detailed scheme for the disposal of foul and surface water from the development hereby approved has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Northumbrian Water and the Lead Local Flood Authority. Thereafter the development shall take place in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding from any sources in accordance with the NPPF.

Construction management plan;

- 07 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
 - (vii) dirt on public highways by vehicles travelling to and from the site;
 - (viii) measures to control and monitor the emission of dust and dirt during construction;
 - (ix) a Site Waste Management Plan;
 - (x) details of the routing of associated HGVs including any measures necessary to minimise the impact on other road users;
 - (xi) measures to protect existing 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.

Hard and Soft Landscaping works;

- 08 Notwithstanding the submitted details, a detailed scheme for hard and soft landscaping details shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the development hereby approved is occupied. Such a scheme shall include details of all hard surfacing materials and the soft landscaping scheme shall include tree and/or shrub planting in broad accordance with those

principle outlined on drawing MBGD1705/SLP REV A (received 6 December 2017)
The soft planting scheme shall also specify types and species, layout contouring and surfacing of all open space areas. All hard and soft landscaping 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.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory landscaping to improve the appearance of the site in the interests of visual amenity.

Hours of construction/demolition activity;

- 09 ***No construction/demolition activity or deliveries shall take place on the premises before 8.00 a.m. on weekdays and 8.30 am on Saturdays nor after 6.00 pm on weekdays and 1.00 pm on Saturdays (nor at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays).***

Reason; To avoid excessive noise and disturbance to the occupiers of nearby premises.

Recording of a heritage asset through a programme of archaeological works;

- 10 **A) No demolition 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 demolition 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.

Reason: To ensure that no accidental damage is caused to features of archaeological interest

Visibility splays;

11. **Visibility splays of 2.4m x 35m to the west and 2.4m x 30m to the east shall be provided at the site entrance, these shall be retained and remain unobstructed at all times with no structure or planting above 0.6m in height being placed or positioned between the line of the visibility splay and the highway.**

Reason: To ensure adequate visibility is provided in the interests of highway safety.

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.**

Reason: To adequately control the level of development on the site to a degree by which the principle of the permission is based.

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

HEADS OF TERMS

- Applicant to enter into a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) – for no waiting along Aislaby Road

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

1. The application site forms two semi-detached, two storey properties and the associated garden areas. The two properties face directly onto Aislaby Road with only a very small front garden between the highway and front elevation of the property.
2. Residential properties surround the site to the south and east (albeit set at a slightly lower level) and to the west is a block of flats (old Station Mews) which is also at a lower level. To the north at a higher level than the application site are the residential properties of 1-5 Railway Cottages, whilst the Cleveland Bay lies to the north-east.
3. In general the land rises steeply both from east to west and from south to north.

PROPOSAL

4. Planning permission is sought for the erection of a total of 6no. dwellings on the site, with the existing buildings being demolished. The proposal would feature 5no. properties in a terraced form fronting onto Aislaby Road and the associated garden areas to the north of the dwellings. A further single detached property is also proposed within the northern part of the site.
5. The proposed terraced block would feature two and a half storey dwellings (i.e. rooms in the roof space) with the associated dormer windows. They are designed to reflect the topography of the land and incorporate a mix of brickwork and render to further help break up the overall massing of the structures. Elements of the design also take influence from the surrounding area with aspects of detailing incorporating chimneys, feature eaves and headers and bay windows.
6. The proposed detached property would also be of a two storey design and follow a similar design to that of the terraced block. Its main frontage would be orientated out towards Yarm Road (A67) and be seen in the context of the adjacent terrace of three properties.

7. Access is provided through an archway from Aislaby Road to a shared parking court located between the terraced buildings and detached dwelling.

CONSULTATIONS

8. The following Consultations were notified and any comments received are set out below (in summary):-

Egglescliffe & Egglescliffe Parish Council - The parish council strongly objects to the application having concerns related to the increased amount of traffic on Aislaby Road given the proximity to and poor line of sight at the humped railway bridge. The parish council also questions the feasibility of constructing a development of this size on Aislaby Road given the disruption it would cause.

Tees Archaeology – comment that 1 And 2 Aislaby Road appear to be late 18th century or early 19th century in date. They are shown on the 1841 Egglescliffe Tithes plan and early Ordnance Survey maps as two adjoining buildings, with extensions added to the north in the 19th century. The buildings can be considered to be a heritage asset of local interest (NPPF Annex 2). However they have been substantially altered and have no objection in principle to their demolition.

As the buildings will be demolished it would be reasonable to request that the developer provides a historic building survey as a record. This would involve a suitably qualified professional carrying out a photographic, written and drawn survey of the two houses and producing a report which presents the results alongside historical research. This should be made publicly accessible in line with the advice given in the NPPF para 141. The historic building recording could be secured by means of a condition.

Historic England - On the basis of the information available to date, we do not wish to offer any comments. We suggest that you seek the views of your specialist conservation and archaeological advisers, as relevant.

Environmental Health Unit - no objection in principle to the development, subject to the imposition of a planning condition to control construction/demolition noise including delivery/removal of materials to 08:00 - 18:00Hrs on weekdays, 09.00 - 13:00Hrs on a Saturday and no Sunday or Bank Holiday working.

Spatial Planning & Regeneration – 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.

Although the Council can demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land, this is based on the housing requirement of the emerging Local Plan and can only be given limited weight at this stage. The proposal must be assessed in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development and the determination of the application should consider relevant planning policies and material considerations including those relating to the design of the development, amenity of residents, any impacts on the historic and natural environment, highway impact, amongst other things.

Northern Gas Networks - 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 – The planning application does not provide sufficient detail with regards to the management of foul and surface water from the development for Northumbrian Water to be able to assess our capacity to treat the flows from the development. We would therefore request the following condition:

CONDITION: Development shall not commence until a detailed scheme for the disposal of foul and surface water from the development hereby approved has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Northumbrian Water and the Lead Local Flood Authority. Thereafter the development shall take place in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To prevent the increased risk of flooding from any sources in accordance with the NPPF.

Highways Transport & Design Manager – The Highways Transport and Design Manager has no objections to the development, subject to the comments below.

Highways Comments

Re: revised plan 1677/03 A

The revised plan shows the proposed access relocated west along Aislaby Road. The applicant has carried out speed surveys in 2 locations on Aislaby Road which demonstrate 85th percentile speeds of 25.8mph eastbound and 23.2mph westbound. In accordance with Manual for Streets (MfS) this allows the required visibility splays to be reduced to 2.4m x 35m west and 2.4m x 30m east. The applicant has demonstrated the required visibility splays on plan both horizontally and vertically can be achieved on site. A condition should be attached to any permission granted requiring that visibility splays of 2.4m x 35m west and 2.4m x 30m east be retained thereafter and that nothing be planted or constructed within the visibility splays above 0.6m in height.

A further condition should be attached requiring a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to be brought into use prior to the occupation of the proposed development to prevent 'no waiting at any time'. The applicant is to meet any and all associated costs associated with the introduction of the TRO.

In accordance with SPD3: Parking Provision for Developments 2011, 2 incurtilage car parking spaces are provided for each 3-bedroom house. As no additional car parking could be provided a condition should be attached to any permission granted that permitted development rights must be removed.

Given the constraints of the site a construction traffic management plan should be obtained by a pre commencement condition.

Informative: the applicant should contact Transport Strategy and Road Safety EGDS@stockton.gov.uk regarding the introduction of 'no waiting at any time' restrictions.

Landscape & Visual Comments

The proposed development is located on Aislaby Road where the road rises up from Yarm Road to cross the railway line. The site is located against the boundary of the Egglecliffe Conservation area, but is not included within it. The proposal allows for a terrace of five dwellings on Aislaby Road, with a single traditional dwelling at the rear of the site, accessed through the new terrace.

The railway cutting runs along the western edge of the site, although a number of apartment blocks are situated within the cutting at a lower level than the proposed dwellings. The site is separated from the dwellings by a steep wooded embankment. North of the site is a row of residential properties which run at 90 degrees to the site, and face onto Urlay Nook Road. These properties are elevated above the road and slightly higher than the development site. East of the site is Tees Villa, a two storey characterful dwelling which is situated at the corner of Yarm Road and Aislaby Road, and at a lower level than the development site. Tees Villa and its gardens are located within the Egglecliffe Conservation Area. The conservation area boundary runs along the centre of Aislaby Road and contains all of the properties to the south below the development site.

The proposal allows for five tall narrow townhouses in a terrace on Aislaby Road, with vehicular access through to the rear of the plot via a tunnel within the terrace. The proposed dwellings will be elevated above the road level, with a step up to the front door. The proposed dwellings are two and a half storeys. The highest dwelling at the western end of the terrace is likely to be the tallest structure locally. Based on the submitted drawing ref: 1677/08B the roof height will be 9.5m above the road, with the chimney height at 10.5m above the road. This is a reduction of 1.4m when compared to the original submitted development where the maximum chimney height was 11.9m above the road. The reduced height of the current proposals is visually more acceptable. The existing dwelling on this site is located to the eastern end of the plot at the lowest part of the site and is only two storeys.

From a distance the block will have the appearance of 6 dwellings on the frontage. It is considered that the plot may appear overdeveloped due to the narrow width of the properties, their height above the road, and the proximity to the eastern and western boundaries when viewed from the road.

The terraced properties will all benefit from a small rear garden, and parking for two vehicles within the shared parking court to the rear. From outside the site, there will be views of the garden boundaries, and there may be views to vehicle parking areas. The site plan includes some indicative planting to the site boundary which may provide some screening to the rear of the development at maturity. The proposed garage block has now been omitted from the development. There are significant level changes on the site, and it is likely that retaining walls will be required to the rear of the site to form useable areas for parking and garden space. It is considered that details of boundary treatments including retaining walls and fencing are required to fully understand the visual impacts from Urlay Nook Road. The Design and Access Statement indicates that views may be mitigated by soft landscaping, but as noted above, no details have been provided.

The single dwelling is located at the rear of the plot, accessed from Aislaby Road through the terrace. This house would be clearly visible to receptors using the A67 Urlay Nook Road, and Yarm Road near the Cleveland Bay Public House on journeys to and from Yarm. The site is also visible from parts of the Egglecliffe Conservation Area, with the sloping site gradients exacerbating this situation. The layout of the dwelling reflects the style of the adjacent railway terrace, but does not match its orientation, or building line and is located at a lower level.

An arboricultural assessment has been provided. This indicates that the development of House 5 as identified on the landscape proposals (western end of building block) will encroach into the root protection zone of trees T1 and T2. The assessment states that the trees are of poor quality and that any impacts will be of no further detriment to the trees. A tree protection plan and method statement has been provided, and this is acceptable. Some new tree planting should be incorporated into the layout to further soften the development and offset any future loss of these poor quality trees.

Hard and soft landscape details including boundary treatments and retaining walls have previously been requested to ensure that an appropriate treatment is given to the site, and particularly the road frontage of the development. This has still not been provided. The current landscape drawing (MBGD1705/SLP Rev. A) shows a variety of treatments to the road frontage (turf, artificial grass and gravel). A consistent approach to front of the properties is required to unify the development. As previously commented dwellings in this location, and in such close proximity to the Conservation Area, should reflect the local building style and character of other properties in the vicinity. It is considered that an appropriate front boundary treatment must be provided, such as a low wall and railing similar to the existing property on the site. Sensitive treatment of the access to each dwelling should also be considered and details provided. However this may be conditioned.

While a general landscape proposal document has been provided, along with some generic plant schedules and options, no fixed plans have been provided. A detailed planting plan will be required indicating the location of planting beds, planting schedules indicating species, numbers, stock type and planting densities. However this may also be conditioned.

Further information is still required, as outlined above, but this may be secured by condition. Based on the information currently provided there are no objections to this application on landscape and visual grounds.

PUBLICITY

9. Neighbours were notified and site/press advert displayed to give wider publicity. A total of twenty two objections to the scheme have been received. Those comments which have been received are set out below (in summary);

Objections:

- Access is unsuitable given it is concealed, Aislaby Road is narrow at this section and adjacent a hump backed bridge
- Visibility splays are considered to be inadequate
- Traffic collisions regularly occur in the area
- No footpath/pedestrian safety
- Insufficient parking provided/no visitor parking
- Traffic survey is flawed as any reduction in on street parking will increase speeds
- Reductions in visibility splays should not be accepted
- Existing parking problems in the area
- Additional traffic would be disruptive and dangerous
- Over development on the site
- Proposals would dominate the area
- Terrace is considered to be visually overpowering
- Harms Eaglescliffe conservation area
- Roof pitches differ to those in the surrounding area
- Visual intrusion/impact on character of the area due to height and associated levels, particularly at a gateway to Yarm
- No landscape visual impact assessment has been carried out
- Back land development
- Loss of privacy to neighbours
- Impact on wildlife
- Request for a site visit
- Past refusal for a domestic driveway repeatedly refused (refs; 11/0017/FUL and 08/1501/FUL).
- No details of demolition of the properties or how retaining wall will be retained/replaced
- Inappropriate drainage and increased flood risk

Objectors:

1. Mr Neil Parker - Loxley Chase Aislaby Road
2. Mrs Rachel Nesbitt - 27 Mayfield Crescent Eaglescliffe
3. Claire and Adrian Lawrence - 12 West Street Yarm
4. Drs Charlotte and Mike Fearn - 5 Egglestone Drive Eaglescliffe
5. Mrs Clare and Thomas Butchart - 32 Formby Walk Eaglescliffe
6. Mr Jason Hadlow (on behalf of Yarm residents association) - 46 Spitalfields Yarm
7. Mr Ian Scott - 7 Mulberry Wynd Stockton
8. Mr Alan Farrage - 51 Forest Lane Kirklevington
9. David Wyness - Willow Cottage Aislaby Road
10. Mr Liam Knight - Station Cottage Aislaby Road
11. Dr Isabel Castro - 1 Meynell House Old Station Mews
12. Mr Peter Farrage - Tees Villa Aislaby Road
13. Mr E Rupert Booth - Yarm Station House Aislaby Road
14. Susan Stokes - River View Aislaby Road
15. Mr Neil Shoesmith - 10 Portland Close Eaglescliffe
16. Miss Katherine Dale - 2 Whinfall Avenue Eaglescliffe
17. Mrs Helen McGuinness - 2 The Courtyard Aislaby Road
18. Mr Rupert Lewis - Manor House Darlington Road
19. Mrs Sarah Marrison - 11 Moorhouse Estate Stockton-on-Tees
20. Mr Nathan Oxnard - 39 Earlsdon Avenue Middlesbrough
21. Mrs Joy Bullock - 3 The Glen Egglecliffe
22. Mr Stephen and Mary Vipond - Prospect Cottage Aislaby Road

PLANNING POLICY

10. 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

11. 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

12. 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.

3. The number of parking spaces provided in new developments will be in accordance with standards set out in the Tees Valley Highway Design Guide. Further guidance will be set out in a new Supplementary Planning Document.

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

8. Additionally, in designing new development, proposals will:

- _ Make a positive contribution to the local area, by protecting and enhancing important environmental assets, biodiversity and geodiversity, responding positively to existing features of natural, historic, archaeological or local character, including hedges and trees, and including the provision of high quality public open space;
- _ Be designed with safety in mind, incorporating Secure by Design and Park Mark standards, as appropriate;
- _ Incorporate 'long life and loose fit' buildings, allowing buildings to be adaptable to changing needs. By 2013, all new homes will be built to Lifetime Homes Standards;
- _ Seek to safeguard the diverse cultural heritage of the Borough, including buildings, features, sites and areas of national importance and local significance. Opportunities will be taken to constructively and imaginatively incorporate heritage assets in redevelopment schemes, employing where appropriate contemporary design solutions.

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.

Saved Policy HO3

Within the limits of development, residential development may be permitted provided that:

- (i) The land is not specifically allocated for another use; and
- (ii) The land is not underneath electricity lines; and
- (iii) It does not result in the loss of a site which is used for recreational purposes; and
- (iv) It is sympathetic to the character of the locality and takes account of and accommodates important features within the site; and
- (v) It does not result in an unacceptable loss of amenity to adjacent land users; and
- (vi) Satisfactory arrangements can be made for access and parking.

Saved Policy EN28

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

Saved Policy EN30

Development which affects sites of Archaeological interest will not be permitted unless;

An investigation of the site has been undertaken

An assessment has been made of the impact of the development upon remain; and where appropriate;

Provision has been made for preservation 'in situ'.

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

13. The main planning considerations of this application are its compliance with national and local planning guidance and the associated impacts of the development on the character of the surrounding area; the amenity of neighbouring occupiers; access and highway safety and features of an archaeological interest.

Principle of development;

14. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the governments objectives for the planning system and the need to achieve sustainable development. It defines sustainable

development as having three dimensions - economic, social and environmental. It also goes on to set out a number of core planning principles one of which is the need to identify and meet housing needs as well as to respond positively to wider opportunities for economic growth.

15. In terms of local policy designations, the application site is situated within the limits to development and forms part of the western edge of Eggescliffe. The site is however outside of the Eggescliffe Conservation area and has no specific heritage designations which offer the site any special considerations. Whilst saved policy H03 permits housing within the development limits providing that various criteria are met.
16. Although at present the Council is able to demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land, this is based on the housing requirement of the emerging Local Plan which is due to be heard at examination in public later in the year. However, given outstanding objections to the housing requirements at this stage it can only be given limited weight. The proposal must be assessed in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The provision of additional housing therefore offers weight in favour of the proposal.
17. In view of the above, the principle of additional residential properties within the area is considered to be acceptable subject to those material planning considerations set out within the report below;

Visual impacts/character;

18. The sounding area is made up of a wide variety of properties which vary both in scale and design and means there is no definitive character. The majority of the buildings are two storey although some are dormer bungalows with rooms in the roof space, whilst dormer windows are also present. Although the existing properties have an element of charm, some significant modifications have resulted in a change in the overall character of the two properties. Nevertheless the demolition of the existing buildings and replacement with the proposal will increase the extent of build frontage along this section of Aislaby Road.
19. The proposed scale of the dwellings are considered to be appropriate and although would they would follow the typography of the land the varying heights would help to break up the massing and such arrangements are not an uncommon feature where there are significant changes in levels. The use of both brickwork and render would further help break up the overall massing of the structures. In addition certain design features also take influence from the surrounding area with aspects of detailing incorporating chimneys, feature window sills/headers and bay windows. Overall the appearance of the proposed dwellings are therefore considered to be appropriate for the surrounding area and would not result in such significant harm that it would justify a refusal of the scheme.
20. Although a number of objectors raised concerns about the impacts of the development on the surrounding area and historic environment, the site actually lies just outside of Eggescliffe Conservation Area and the buildings are not listed. Therefore the site has no special protections. The site itself lies well away from any listed buildings with the nearest buildings or structures being either Layfield House to the north (grade II) or Yarm Bridge (grade II*) the proposal is not considered to have a detrimental impact on the setting of this listed building and additionally Historic England have not offered any comments on the proposals. As a result the proposal is in accordance with saved policy EN28 of the adopted local plan.
21. The Council's Landscape architects have considered the proposal and noted the changing levels within the surrounding area and that the western most dwelling is likely to become the tallest structure locally, albeit that it has been reduced from the original proposal. It is also commented that the single dwelling at the rear of the plot, would be clearly visible to receptors using the A67 Uray Nook Road, and Yarm Road albeit that the layout and design of the dwelling would reflect the style of the adjacent railway terrace. Planning conditions are

recommended regarding hard and soft landscaping details as well as means of enclosure and overall on balance the proposed scheme is considered to be acceptable.

Amenity;

22. Concerns from objectors and local residents over a loss of privacy, daylight and overlooking are noted, however, with regards to the proposed site layout, the internal separation distances from the main elevations of the proposed dwellings predominately meet or exceed the minimum separation distance of 21 metres between habitable rooms. Consequently the proposed layout is considered to be acceptable and will ensure that future residents of the proposed development will have a satisfactory level of residential amenity.
23. Externally the front of the proposed terraced dwellings would be at a similar distance from the front elevations of those properties directly opposite, whilst additional properties are proposed they would all be situated to the north and not result in any loss of light. The separation distance would also be approximately 23 metres and even allowing for the change in levels, it is considered that acceptable levels of residential amenity can be retained for those neighbours directly opposite, additionally the existing hedgerow will also provide some screening for some of the neighbouring dwellings.
24. The detached dwelling would have a blank elevation adjacent to no. 1 Railway Cottage, except for a partially glazed door at ground floor. The main front and rear elevations facing east and west respectively. Although side windows will serve a conservatory in the southern elevation these are at ground floor and would be sit approximately 35 metres from the rear elevations of the proposed dwellings to Tees Villa to the south. In view of these factors the proposed dwelling is therefore not considered to adversely impact on the residential amenity (privacy, loss of light or appearing overbearing) of these dwellings (1 Railway Cottage or Tees Villa).
25. The overall layout and design is considered to be in keeping with the tighter urban grain and higher forms of housing density that are present within the surrounding area and is considered broadly in keeping with the general pattern of development. The scheme also allows for amenity space for each of the proposed dwellings. In view of the separation distances, areas of private amenity space and associated landscaping, it is considered that the level of proposed development can be adequately accommodated and would not be considered an over-development of the site.
26. It is accepted that if the application were to be approved that there could potentially be some issues with noise and disturbance during construction, however, this would only be a temporary issue and the hours of construction could be restricted via a planning condition to provide a reasonable level amenity during this time and would therefore not warrant a reason for refusal.

Highway Safety;

27. A significant majority of objectors raise concerns with regards to highway safety, particularly as a result of the location of the site access, available visibility splays, proximity to the hump back bridge and the narrow nature of Aislaby Road. Whilst such comments have been noted, the Highways, Transport and Design Manager have considered these aspects as part of their overall assessment.
28. It is considered that the revised plan (relocating the access further west along Aislaby Road) as well as the accompanying speed surveys allow for a reduction in the visibility splays and therefore the proposed access and associated horizontal and vertical visibility splays are considered to be acceptable. A planning condition is however suggested that the visibility splays should be retained thereafter with nothing above 0.6m being placed within the visibility splays, this would include the requirement for a 'no waiting' restriction. A condition can be imposed to control the visibility splay whilst a planning obligation can be required to secure the 'no waiting restriction'.

29. Despite the objections received the parking provision is provided in accordance with the Council's adopted guidance. Whilst no planning condition can be imposed to prevent any additional bedrooms being created, permitted development rights can be removed to prevent an extension and alteration being constructed which may help to create additional spaces or increase the overall parking requirements for each property.

Drainage/Flood risk;

30. Whilst comments have been made in relation to inappropriate drainage and flood risk issues no objections to the scheme have been received from any statutory consultees and therefore a planning condition is recommended to require the applicant to submit final details of both surface water and foul drainage.

Features of Archaeological Interest;

31. Tees Archaeology have commented that although the properties will likely have been constructed in the late 18th to early 19th century they have been substantially altered and have no objection in principle to their demolition. However given their age and as they are deemed to be a historic asset a request for a historic building survey is made. In view of these circumstances it is deemed reasonable to seek that the buildings are surveyed and recorded and a planning condition is recommended accordingly. The proposal is therefore not considered to adversely affect any archaeological features.

Residual Matters;

32. An objector has raised concerns regarding the general impact on wildlife from the development of the garden area. Whilst noted, the planning system can only consider impacts on species which are protected in law. At present there is no evidence before the local planning authority that the site accommodates or supports any protected species and therefore the proposal site is considered to be of limited ecological value.

33. Whilst a number of objectors have requested that a site visit is made by planning committee, no formal request from any of the Local Ward Councillors has been received. As with all planning applications a site visit is made by the case officer and a series of photographs are taken to provide context of the site as part of any committee presentation.

34. Whilst reference is made to recent refusals for a domestic access on a nearby site are noted, these particular cases referred to relate to Tees Villa which lies to the east and closer to the junction of Aislaby Road and Old Station Mews as well as the A67. Only one of those applications was refused (the other being withdrawn) and the issue with a new driveway arrangement was due to the proximity to the junction and also the lack of sight lines. Despite the objections on this issue, each application is assessed on its own individual merits and as detailed elsewhere in the report in this instance the proposed access arrangements are considered to be acceptable.

35. Details of how any shared walls are to be protected or replaced fall outside of the planning system and are civil issues between landowners. Such matters would therefore either be a building regulation matter or would be covered under the party wall act and need relevant agreements by each landowner.

CONCLUSION

36. In view of the above considerations and whilst acknowledging the objection received, the principle of residential development on the site is considered to be acceptable. This proposal will replace the two existing dwellings and introduce a terraced development onto Aislaby Road as well as a property facing out onto Uraly Nook Road (A67). The scheme is considered to be visually acceptable and will be in keeping with the characteristics of the surrounding area, with the type of accommodation being that which can be expected from a modern housing

development. The associated separation distances will also ensure that acceptable standards of residential amenity for both neighbouring occupiers as well as future residents of the development will be provided. The associated access and parking provision also accords with Council Guidance.

37. The proposed development is therefore considered to be acceptable in planning terms and is recommended for approval subject to the heads of terms above and those conditions set out in this report.

Director of Economic Growth and Development
Contact Officer Mr Simon Grundy Telephone No 01642 528550

WARD AND WARD COUNCILLORS

Ward	Eaglescliffe
Ward Councillor(s)	Councillor Phillip Dennis
Ward Councillor(s)	Councillor Stefan Houghton
Ward Councillor(s)	Councillor Laura Tunney

IMPLICATIONS

Financial Implications:

There are no known financial implications in determining this application although the proposal could contribute financially towards associated infrastructure should the application be approved as detailed in the report.

Environmental Implications:

The assessment of the application has taken into account the impacts on the character and appearance of the area (including adjacent conservation area) as well as impacts on adjoining properties and it is considered that there would be no significant impacts as detailed within the 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

Stockton on Tees Local Plan Adopted 1997
Core Strategy – 2010

Emerging

Local Plan – Publication Draft December 2017.

Supplementary Planning Documents

SPD1 – Sustainable Design Guide
SPD3 – Parking Provision for Developments
SPD4 – Conservation and Historic Environment Folder
SPD6 – Planning Obligations