

# Planning Committee

A meeting of Planning Committee was held on Wednesday, 21st March, 2018.

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

**Officers:** Greg Archer, Bob Cowell, Simon Grundy, Joanne Roberts, Peter Shovlin, Sam Tidy (EG&DS), Julie Butcher (HR,L&C) Sarah Whaley (A,D&ES)

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

**Apologies:** Cllr Mick Stoker

**P**        **Evacuation Procedure**  
**99/17**

The Evacuation Procedure was noted.

**P**        **Declarations of Interest**  
**100/17**

There were no declarations of interest.

**P**        **Draft minutes from the Planning Committee meeting which was held on**  
**101/17**    **the 7th February 2018**

Consideration was given to the Draft Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting which was held on the 7th February 2018 for approval and signature.

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

**P**        **17/1020/FUL**  
**102/17**    **1-2 Aislaby Road, Eaglescliffe, Stockton-on-Tees**  
**Erection of 5no terraced dwellings, 1no detached dwelling, associated**  
**access and parking (demolition of existing buildings)**

Consideration was given to a report on planning application 17/1020/FUL 1-2 Aislaby Road, Eaglescliffe, Stockton-on-Tees.

The application site formed two semi-detached, two storey properties and associated garden areas. The two properties faced directly onto Aislaby Road. Residential properties surrounded the site on all sides although there were various changes in levels within the immediate area.

Planning permission was 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 was also proposed within the northern part of the site.

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

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

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

In view of the above considerations and whilst acknowledging the objection received, the principle of residential development on the site was considered to be acceptable. The proposal would replace the two existing dwellings and introduce a terraced development onto Aislaby Road as well as a property facing out onto Urray Nook Road (A67). The scheme was considered to be visually acceptable and would be in keeping with the characteristics of the surrounding area, with the type of accommodation being that which could be expected from a modern housing development. The associated separation distances would also ensure that acceptable standards of residential amenity for both neighbouring occupiers as well as future residents of the development would be provided. The associated access and parking provision also accorded with Council Guidance.

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

- There was one objector in attendance at the meeting who wished to make representation. His comments could be summarised as follows;
- The objector lived in the neighbouring property to the proposed development and requested that the Committee made a site visit prior to making a decision, as he felt the plans presented did not reflect adequately the topography of the area.
- Although it was mentioned in passing within the report of the high elevation of the site, it was felt that the committee needed to see for themselves the contour of the land to enable them to see how imposing the proposed accommodation over 3 floors would be.
- The proposed detached property at the rear of the development would be overlooking the objectors' property, which did not look as intrusive on paper as it was not easy to see the high elevation of the property on the plans. A site visit would highlight the detrimental impact and lost amenity to the objector should the proposal go ahead.
- The objector felt that the proposed vehicle access would require destruction of his garden wall.
- The proposed drawings showed a footpath in excess of 1 metre wide, however in reality the distance between the road and the objectors garden wall was only half that distance.
- It was felt that the reduced site lines stated could not be achieved and a site visit would allow Members to establish that fact.

- The site lines on the drawings did not finish on the edge of the pavement which the objector believed to be normal practice, however the lines extended beyond that to an arbitrary line drawn in the road.

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

- Clarity was sought in relation to the comments made by the objector regarding his garden wall and the footpath.

- The current cottages on the proposed site looked derelict and the new proposal was seen as an improvement.

- Members asked what consideration the Councils Engineer had given to the objectors comment in relation to the fact the topography impacted on the proposed development being overbearing on his house.

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

- Issues raised regarding the garden wall was a civil issue between the developer and property owner. Clearly the property owner did not want their wall to be damaged or removed. The property owner would have the control to prevent that from happening which would need to be agreed with the developer and property owner.

- Officers explained the area where the photograph was taken which showed the incline on Aislaby Road.

- Officers also explained to the Committee that one of the Councils engineers had been on site and measured the site lines. The site line missed the objectors' wall. There was no such thing as an arbitrary line. The position of the access had been measured and the extent of that into the property which would create the necessary site line, and this would either fall within the adopted highway or land within the applicants' ownership. If there was a discrepancy in the drawings due to a difference between the ordnance survey map and the deeds then this may well be a planning matter.

- Where issues were raised in relation to the topography and the overbearing of the proposed development, Officers confirmed this was a planning matter not an engineering matter. The case officer had made the judgement from the site visit and plans that the separation distances between the proposed housing and neighbouring houses were in excess of the minimum requirements. It was considered there was enough distance to protect resident's amenity.

A vote then took place and the application was approved.

RESOLVED 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

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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).

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.

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.

Removal of PD Rights - All Householder

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

#### INFORMATIVE OF REASON FOR PLANNING APPROVAL

Informative: Working Practices

The Local Planning Authority has worked in a positive and proactive manner and sought solutions to problems arising in dealing with the planning application by seeking a revised scheme to overcome issues and by the identification and imposition of appropriate planning conditions

#### HEADS OF TERMS

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

**P 17/2912/FUL**  
**103/17 Land East Of Jasper Grove, Morrison Street, Stillington**  
**Residential Development comprising 55 dwellings with associated access.**

Consideration was given to a report on planning application 17/2912/FUL Land East Of Jasper Grove, Morrison Street, and Stillington.

Planning permission was sought for 55 dwellings on an existing paddock area in Stillington.

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

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

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

The Planning Officers report concluded that the nature and scale of the development was acceptable and it was considered that the site could satisfactorily accommodate the proposal without any undue impact on the amenity of any adjacent neighbours and the layout was acceptable in terms of highway safety and was in accordance with policies in the Development Plan identified within the main report.

The NPPF made clear that housing applications were to be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. It was considered that there were important material benefits arising from the proposed development and there were not any adverse impacts from the proposed development that would significantly or demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the framework taken as a whole.

Other material considerations had been considered in detail and it was recommended that the application be approved for the reasons specified within the main report.

The Chair agreed that Members be presented with additional information from the Chairman of Stillington and Whitton Parish Council detailing their objections. Full details were attached to the main report.

- Objectors were in attendance at the meeting and given the opportunity to make representation. Their comments could be summarised as follows;
- The Chairman of Stillington and Whitton Parish Council read out the objections which had been distributed to Members at the beginning of the meeting detailing Stillington and Whitton Parish Councils concerns.
- A resident of Jasper Grove who resided immediately next to the proposed access explained to the Committee that when he bought his home approximately 20 years ago from plans, the plans indicated that Jasper Grove should have been a cul-de-sac. That information was also on the Shepherd Homes sales brochure, the application which was approved by Stockton's Planning Committee and on the resident's deeds. On completion of the site it became clear that Shepherd Homes had left a gap where no.9 should have been built at the insistence of the Landowner. This was confirmed by Shepherd Homes to the objectors' solicitor. How could this be right that Stockton Borough

Councils Planning Committee approve Jasper Grove as a cul-de-sac for it then to become a through road?

- Concerns were raised relating to the developer stating in their first transport statement that access was already approved as a reserved matter. The previous outline approval was only granted because access was a reserved matter and the developer at the time was told that they should go away and consider an alternative access.
- Changing a cul-de-sac to a through road was not a minor inconvenience, the fundamental change would affect the way residents in Jasper Grove lived day to day, from having the odd car pass to having approximately 200 car journeys per day.
- Denying the access point needn't stop the development going ahead. The developer had already proposed alternative access on the opposite side of the development. The alternative access would also pacify all other objections raised.
- Jasper Grove was not a legitimate access for the proposed development.
- Concerns were raised relating to accidents where a number of cars were dented on regular occasions.
- During the winter months some residents had had to push their cars off Jasper Grove due to a small incline, this would be exacerbated if there were to be another 200 car journeys per day with the possibility of increasing accidents.
- It was felt that trust and integrity had been called into question due to the fact that residents had moved into a cul-de-sac which was now about to be undone.
- Residents had been led to believe that they would be subjected to construction traffic and all the associated paraphernalia for up to 5 years, which was a ludicrously long time to live with.

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

- It was highlighted that the proposed application would have been a reserved matters application but for the one additional dwelling included in the scheme.
- It was a site which was being relied upon to deliver the 5 year housing supply, and was included in the new Local Plan which was to be examined in the near future.
- 8 units of much needed affordable housing were included within the proposal.
- The numbers of units had been reduced to address officer concerns about design and layout of the site. The proposal was acceptable to all except for the Parish Council and local neighbours.
- Most of the concerns raised were related to highways matters, in particular parking during drop off and pick up times at the local school. The Applicant did

not recognise the concerns which had been reported by objectors although it was acknowledged that it was a very busy area during drop off and pick up times. The arguments put forward were originally put forward when consent for the development of the site was granted, nothing had fundamentally changed. It was accepted that from time to time parents may not park their cars as thoughtfully as they should however this was a matter for enforcement. The applicant did not believe that the development would exacerbate the issue around parking. There was a pedestrian link straight in front of the school and residents of the proposed development would be expected to walk as it would be easier than getting in their cars.

- Where concerns had been raised in connection to flooding, Northumbrian Water the Environment Agency and the Councils own flood advisors were satisfied that they were happy with the proposal.

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

- In terms of access, when the application was at the outline planning stage it was considered that the access from Jasper Grove onto Morrison Street was safe and an access which complied with the Councils design guide and all necessary regulations. Regarding current proposal it was still considered that the access was suitable to meet the needs of the application, both in terms of its highway capacity and in terms of safety, it met all the standards required of Stockton Borough Council.

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

- Questions were raised as to whether alternative access had been investigated at the outline planning stage, and if not would there be any issues if the access was changed now?

- The number of plots on the site was queried as the drawings seemed to show 57 however the application stated 55.

- The development itself was not in question nor was the design of the houses, however there were serious concerns relating to the access. It was clear on the plans that there was a house missing as the numbering went from 7 to 11, which seemed to confirm Jasper Grove was originally a cul-de-sac. Since outline planning was sought the village had changed substantially, there was no reason why the access could not be moved to the top of the development.

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

- In terms of investigating alternative access at this stage, plots 16 and 17 would be lost however there would also be the possibility of removing a further plot. If a roundabout was to be introduced it would take up a large area of land, however as no drawings had been submitted with a roundabout, this had not been assessed. The proposed scheme was deemed acceptable.

- The proposed access was not uncommon and quite characteristic of any

housing development.

- Officers confirmed that 55 dwellings was the total number of units on the proposed site.

- Officers recognised resident's feelings in relation to the plot which had been left however this had no bearing on the suitability of the access which had been considered fully. The provision of a roundabout as an alternative could have an impact on the viability and deliverability of the scheme which had been put forward to contribute to the Councils 5 year housing supply. It was a key site in terms of delivering housing and the Councils Engineers were completely satisfied with the access.

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

A vote took place and the motion was carried.

RESOLVED that planning application 17/2912/FUL  
Land East Of Jasper Grove, Morrison Street, Stillington Residential  
Development comprising 55 dwellings with associated access be deferred to a  
future meeting of the Planning Committee for the applicant to explore the  
provision of an alternative access before determining the application.

**P 17/2735/REM**  
**104/17 Summerville Farm, Durham Road, Stockton-on-Tees**  
**Reserved matters application for access, appearance, landscaping, layout**  
**and scale of residential development of 340 dwellings.**

Consideration was given to a report on planning application 17/2735/REM  
Summerville Farm, Durham Road, Stockton-on-Tees.

Planning approval was sought under a reserved matters application for the  
provision of 340 dwellings. The proposed dwellings would consist of a mix of 2,  
3 & 4 bedroom properties which included a range of terraced, semi-detached  
and detached properties.

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

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

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

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

The scheme was considered to be visually acceptable and was in keeping with the characteristics that could be expected from a modern housing estate and also those characteristics from the surrounding area.

Provision for adequate landscaping including trees and hedging was also made and the separation distances provided would ensure that acceptable standards of residential amenity for both neighbouring occupiers as well as future residents of the development were delivered. The access arrangements remained acceptable and sufficient in curtilage parking was provided.

- Objectors were in attendance at the meeting and given the opportunity to make representation. Their comments could be summarised as follows;

- An objector who had come along to represent his daughter who lived at Beverley Lodge raised concerns relating to the drawings of the proposed site where it seemed that a lot more houses had been compressed in and around Beverley Lodge and Harrowgate Cottage. Clarity was sought as to why this seemed to be the case.

- Concerns were raised in relation to the lack of pepper potting the affordable homes across the development, therefore lacking equality and diversity for those residents living in the affordable homes by pushing them all into one corner.

- Clarity was sought as to what provisions had been put in place regarding perimeter fences / boundaries. New properties were highlighted as having fences on the plans however there didn't appear to be any for existing properties.

- Questions were raised as to whether security would be installed along the cycle path which ran alongside Beverley Lodge such as CCTV, lighting etc.

- Questions were raised as to whether air pollution had been addressed especially along the access road to Beverley Lodge as this was already a particularly busy road without the addition of the development.

- The Stockton Representative for the Ramblers Association, Cleveland Ramblers Group addressed the Committee highlighting concerns in relation to rights of way, particularly footpath 47 which was north of the proposed development and along the A177 which was a single 50mph carriageway. It was understood that there may be land ownership issues, however it was thought at the very least to expect a proper footpath along the A177 to the start of footpath 47.

- A resident from Harrowgate Cottage addressed the Committee and explained that one of the reasons she bought the cottage was down to the nice open views. Whilst it was appreciated that developments were needed the original proposal gave an artist's impression which showed a good buffer zone of landscaping and that there were to be no houses right up to the boundary of Harrowgate Cottage, however that was no longer the case as the plan had changed quite significantly. Harrowgate Cottage and Beverley Lodge had houses right up to their boundary. There were 6 car parking spaces proposed directly in front of Harrowgate Cottage Lounge. There was also a proposed

dwelling which would be less than 9 metres away from the conservatory at Harrowgate Cottage which was not shown on the plans.

- It was felt that more consideration could have been given to residents that already lived near the proposed site.
- Letch Lane and the Horse and Jockey Public House had much better buffering than that of Beverley Lodge and Harrowgate Cottage.
- A local resident from Letch Lane explained to the Committee that he bought his house 25 years ago due to the open views to the front and back of his property. The proposal if approved would now have houses to both elevations.
- Concerns were raised in relation to traffic on Harrowgate Lane which was described as horrendous. Questions were raised as to how this was to be dealt with.
- Issues regarding flooding was also a concern as the fields to the front and rear of the residents property had seen enough rain water to form what looked like lakes in those fields along Harrowgate Lane.
- Concerns were also raised as to the disturbance of wildlife, and whether any consideration had been given to this.
- Pylons were highlighted as a concern and clarity was sought as to how close a house could be built to a pylon.
- One resident highlighted the impact on revenue lost to the High Street in Stockton Town Centre due to the delay in building residential homes which had been identified for housing development in 1972. The loss had been calculated at over £500 million to the High Street

The Applicants Agent was in attendance at the meeting and given the opportunity to make representation. His comments could be summarised as follows;

- Outline planning permission for the proposed site was granted in January 2015 with all matters reserved other than access, however there was a new signalised junction proposed for the site. Permission was granted subject to financial contributions for bus services, cycle paths, offsite highway improvements, travel plan initiatives, primary school education, and also 15% affordable housing. The reserved matters application did not change any of the financial contributions or affordable housing provision and the principal of development had already been agreed.
- The reserved matters of layout scale landscaping and appearance had been submitted in November 2017 and since then the applicant had worked very positively with all the relevant officers of Stockton Borough Council.
- The original number of houses proposed was 350 dwellings. This had now been reduced to 340. Whilst it may be perceived that some areas maybe dense, the site was less dense than originally envisaged, particularly responding to a number of engineering constraints across the site such as a water main, a

national grid substation etc.

- Where reference had been made by objectors in relation to the lack of pepper potting of affordable housing, the developer would like to pepper pot the affordable housing however Registered Social Landlords who would be responsible for managing the affordable homes, in order to make the management of the homes easier, tend to request that the affordable homes are put in one location..

- In relation to public right of way 47, Durham Road there was no direct footpath link on the adopted highway however there would be a direct route provided through the site as far as was possible

- Where surface water and foul water drainage had been raised, the design of such a system and the maintenance of such a system was subject to a planning condition. Those details had been submitted, however the finer detail of the drainage needed to be revisited due to the change of the site plan.

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

- The site did have outline planning permission and therefore concerns raised relating to loss of views, the impact of traffic had already been considered and established at the grant of outline permission. The proposed application was purely for what the site would look like in terms of its layout, appearance, scale and landscaping.

- In terms of affordable housing and pepper potting, unfortunately sometimes the affordable housing providers do wish for those homes to be grouped together for their management arrangements.

- Issues raised over the cycle route close to Beverley Lodge and the concerns relating to security such as lighting and CCTV. There was a pedestrian link adjacent to Beverley Lodge and there were fences in existence belonging to the adjacent property, existing properties were to maintain and look after their own boundaries. New properties would have boundary treatments agreed with the Council, those details had been submitted and were largely considered to be acceptable. Further detail was required around the acoustic fencing which was conditioned. The lighting scheme was yet to come before the Council which would form part of the adoption agreement, however as there was a footpath area there would be some kind of lighting sought to ensure the route was safe.

- There wasn't any issues regarding air pollution currently within the Borough.

- Regarding space and separation distances, they were all in accordance with the Councils guidance. Harrowgate Cottage which was specifically mentioned was 9 metres from the nearest new property and therefore acceptable in planning terms.

- Where objectors raised concerns in relation to wildlife, none of the species mentioned were protected.

- In terms of pylons there was an easement on the site which connected to the

National Grid site. The Developer had planned all the dwellings away from the easement and the pylon corridor which was considered to be acceptable in planning terms.

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

- In the Local Planning Policy, reference was made that the transport assessment would need to demonstrate that the strategic road network would be no worse as a result of the development. As the outline planning was granted 5 years ago the level of traffic would have increased since then and with the addition of this proposal would impact even further. A member of the public had already highlighted the current level of traffic on Harrowgate Lane.

- Beverley Lodge and Harrowgate Cottage were the only 2 properties directly affected by the new development, therefore a better buffer should have been provided between those existing dwellings and the proposed properties, just as had been done for the Horse and Jockey Public House.

- Where discussions had been had regarding the pepper potting of the affordable housing, Stockton Borough Council had a policy to pepper pot affordable housing for very good reason, because it was known to work. When Registered Social Landlords ask for them to be all together to manage them better, should the management of affordable homes be preferable to what was best for residents?

- Clarity was sought as to why some of the bushes on the site had sheeting over them.

- In relation to footpath 47, it had been stated by the applicants' agent that they wanted to take the footpath through the estate. Before this could be altered the path had to be walked by Ward Members as part of Stockton's Byelaws and accepted as a diversion of a right of way. It was felt that footpath 47 should be included as a condition as part of the application.

- The Committees attention was drawn to a paragraph within the officers' report which stated that traffic could not be revisited as part of the current proposal. The outline planning consent was made quite some time ago. The main concern being Junction Road where much of the traffic from the proposal would go. Since the outline planning approval there had been approval of the crematorium, Lidl and the new houses associated there, there was to be another 100 houses at the old education centre site expected in the future which would also impact on traffic. If all applications were to be looked at on an individual basis what were the plans for the future impact on traffic if other applications could not be taken into account. Traffic on Junction Road was already a problem regards capacity and emissions. With regards to emissions, there had been a recent article which stated that Stockton was in the top 44 towns in the country for emissions which did not meet the World Health Organisations standards, therefore it couldn't be said that this wasn't a problem.

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

- Due to a lack of clarity, Officers confirmed that outline planning permission was in fact granted in 2014. The application was originally submitted in 2013 but was refused and then resubmitted.

- In terms of traffic issues, the outline granted permission for 350 houses, which was the limit the developer could build, and traffic had been accepted for that. There was a much bigger picture in that the proposed site originally formed part of a housing allocation which was part of a much more comprehensive development for 2500 houses across the west of Stockton which would require improvements to the traffic and transport network. The proposed development would provide improvements to the Horse and Jockey roundabout, other schemes within the area would provide other improvements right the way along the west of Stockton. This would include the A66 at Elton interchange, Yarm Back Lane and Darlington Back Lane Junction, with a minor junction up and around that area. There was to be a new school, contributions to various other infrastructure requirements, all of which had been set out within the strategic vision for the Borough which led into the Local Plan.

- Regarding the buffer zone at Beverley Lodge and Harrowgate Cottage, Officers had considered the impact on the conservatory at Beverley Lodge and the impact on the neighbour and from a planning point of view the proposal was an acceptable situation. Although the properties looked close, due to the orientation of the properties there was no real overlooking issues.

- Where concerns were raised relating to pepper potting of the affordable homes. Officers explained that in an ideal world they would also like to see those homes pepper potted, but ultimately it was about getting the affordable housing on site and in this case it was considered to be acceptable.

- Regards the netting on the bushes, it was confirmed that it was to stop birds nesting on the site.

- Footpath 47 was not to be removed, it was a public right of way and ran from east to west to the north of the site and was outside of the site boundary. What was proposed was a connection to it which would be to the extent of AVANT's landownership. It was Stockton Council's intention to enter in to discussion with that landowner and facilitate a connection to the public right of way. Initially footpath 47 was looked at to see if access could be got to it from alongside the A177 however this was not possible as it was not the Council's land and there was no access to adopt a constructible footpath. It would also be considered unsafe to get access alongside the A177 at that point. Multiple ownerships also made it difficult to agree a route through. There was one access point where the National Grid owned the land and negotiations would be entered into with them although there would be no guarantees, if successful this would provide an additional access point to the public right of way.

- The Environmental Protection Officer addressed the Committee and explained that regarding the air quality there were no particular problems with the proposed development. Every year Stockton Borough Council along with all other Councils have to submit an air quality assessment for its borough, this is checked and vetted by Defra, and every year to date it had been accepted.

A vote then took place and the application was approved.

RESOLVED that planning application 17/2735/REM be approved subject to 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

PB:SF:01 REV A

5 February 2018

963-AVA-SD-00.01

3 November 2017

963-AVA-SD-00.02

3 November 2017

963-AVA-SD-10.05 rev E

13 March 2018

963-AVA-SD-10.06 rev E

13 March 2018

963-AVA-SD-10.07 rev E

13 March 2018

963-AVA-SD-10.11 rev E

13 March 2018

963-AVA-SD-10.12 rev E

13 March 2018

963-AVA-SD-10.13 rev E

13 March 2018

TPMA1010-001 B

3 November 2017

SD-10.02 N

13 March 2018

SUMM/NEW/001

9 November 2017

SUMM/NEN/001

9 November 2017

SUMM/ROY/001 A

9 November 2017

SUMM/PEY/001

9 November 2017

SUMM/PEM/001

9 November 2017

SUMM/NOY/001

9 November 2017

SUMM/MAN/001

9 November 2017

SUMM/KNI/001

9 November 2017

SUMM/STO/001

9 November 2017

SUMM/HRY/001

9 November 2017

SUMM/GLY/001 E

9 November 2017

SUMM/DAY/001

9 November 2017  
SUMM/CRD/001  
14 November 2017  
-/SUN/001  
9 November 2017  
SUMM/CAM/001  
9 November 2017  
SUMM/BAM/001  
9 November 2017  
SUMM/ASB/001  
14 November 2017  
BD\_001  
12 February 2018  
BD\_003  
12 February 2018  
BD\_020  
12 February 2018  
BD\_020A  
12 February 2018  
1059\_01 REV B  
6 March 2018

Materials;

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

Planting details;

03 A detailed planting scheme in accordance with those landscaping principles submitted and agreed as part of this application (drawing 1059\_01 Rev B), shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the first dwelling. Such a scheme shall specify final tree/shrub types and species, stock size, numbers and densities and the associated long term maintenance arrangements. The works shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the occupation of the buildings or the completion of the development whichever is the sooner and any trees or plants which within a period of five years from the date of planting die, are removed, become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Street Lighting;

04 Full details of all street lighting for the development along with the siting, colour and luminance levels shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority before such lighting is erected. The lighting shall be installed in accordance with the agreed details and be in place prior to the first occupation of the corresponding phase of the development.

Noise attenuation measures;

05 The hereby approved development shall be carried out in full accordance

with those findings and recommendations contained with the submitted Noise Levels and Noise

Amelioration Measures report (LA Environmental Consultants; AH/SF/001/R2; 1st February 2018). All works shall be completed before any of the hereby approved dwellings within the identified phase 4 of the development are occupied.

Acoustic fencing;

06 Notwithstanding the submitted boundary treatment details, full details of the external appearance and materials of all acoustic fencing shall be submitted to and be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority prior to occupation of any dwelling. Such means of enclosure as agreed shall be erected before the occupation of the relevant dwellings which have been identified for acoustic fencing. All acoustic fencing shall be maintained or replaced on a like for like basis for the lifetime of the development.

Hard Landscaping;

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

Feature Squares;

08 Notwithstanding any description contained within this application, prior to the first occupation of the hereby approved development full details of all hard landscape and planting works for the feature squares shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include layouts; hard surfacing materials; planting details (tree/shrub types and species, stock size, numbers and densities); construction methods including tree pits; minor structures (e.g. street furniture); and, a phasing plan for implementation. The feature squares shall be implemented in full accordance with the approved details and agreed phasing plan. Any landscaping works 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 or an alternative long term maintenance arrangement.

Removal of PD Rights - All Householder;

09 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.

Removal of PD rights – no integral garage conversions;  
10 Notwithstanding the provisions 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), no integral garages shall be converted into part of the house without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

#### INFORMATIVE OF REASON FOR PLANNING APPROVAL

##### Informative: Working Practices

The Local Planning Authority has worked in a positive and proactive manner and sought solutions to problems arising in dealing with the planning application by seeking a revised scheme to overcome issues and by the identification and imposition of appropriate planning conditions.

##### Informative: Northumbrian Water trunk mains

The applicant is informed that trunk mains cross the site and may be affected by the proposed development. Northumbrian Water do not permit a building over or close to their apparatus and advise that you will need to liaise with Northumbrian Water to establish the exact location of their assets and ensure any necessary diversion, relocation or protection measures required are in place prior to the commencement of the development.

- P  
105/17**
- 1. Appeal - Mr Alan Moffitt - 10 Low Church Wynd, Yarm, TS15 9BA  
17/1638/RET - DISMISSED**
  - 2. Appeal - Mrs Tracy Godden - Land To The Rear Of 108 Junction Road, Norton, TS20 1QB  
17/1487/FUL - ALLOWED WITH CONDITIONS**
  - 3. Appeal - Henry Taylor - Millstone Cottage West End Farm , Mill Lane, Long Newton, TS21 1DQ  
17/1300/RET - DISMISSED**
  - 4. Appeal - Mr C Boulton - 14 Glaisdale Road, Yarm, TS15 9RN  
17/1279/RET - DISMISSED**
  - 5. Appeal - Simon Studholme & Sarah Hirst - Land North Of Thorpe Thewles, Durham Road, Thorpe Thewles  
17/0943/OUT - ALLOWED WITH CONDITIONS AND COSTS ALLOWED**
  - 6. Appeal - Mr Gary Hutchinson - Rear Of 42 Junction Road, Norton, TS20 1PW  
17/0872/FUL - ALLOWED WITH CONDITIONS AND COSTS REFUSED**

RESOLVED that the appeals be noted.

- P  
106/17**
- 1. Appeal - Anthony Connolly - Roberta, Letch Lane, Carlton, Stockton-On-Tees, TS21 1ED  
17/1904/REV - ALLOWED WITH CONDITIONS**
  - 2. Appeal - Al Forno - Units 11 And 12 , Sandgate Park Shopping Centre, The Rings, Ingleby Barwick, Myton Way, TS17 5AA  
17/1811/VARY - DISMISSED**
  - 3. Appeal - Mr A Bryan - 554 Thornaby Road, Thornaby, Stockton-On-Tees, TS17 0AD  
17/1485/OUT - DISMISSED**

RESOLVED that the appeals be noted.

