

## Planning Committee

A meeting of Planning Committee was held on Wednesday, 11th March, 2020.

**Present:** Cllr Norma Stephenson O.B.E(Chairman), Cllr Mick Stoker(Vice-Chair), Cllr Stefan Houghton (Sub Cllr Jacky Bright), Cllr Carol Clark, Cllr Lynn Hall, Cllr Tony Hampton, Cllr Sally Ann-Watson (Sub Cllr Tony Riordan), Cllr Maurice Perry (Sub Cllr Andrew Sherris), Cllr Marilyn Surtees, Cllr Luke Frost (Sub Cllr Steve Walmsley), Cllr Mrs Sylvia Walmsley

**Officers:** Simon Grundy, Jane Palmer (D of EG&D), Julie Butcher (D of HR,L&C), Sarah Whaley (AD of A,D and ES)

**Also in attendance:**

**Apologies:** Cllr Jacky Bright, Cllr Chris Clough, Cllr Eileen Johnson, Cllr Paul Kirton, Cllr Tony Riordan, Cllr Andrew Sherris, Cllr Steve Walmsley

**P**        **Evacuation Procedure**  
**51/19**

The Evacuation Procedure was noted.

**P**        **Declarations of Interest**  
**52/19**

There were no declarations of interest.

**P**        **Minutes from the Planning Committee meeting which was held on 15th**  
**53/19**    **January 2020**

Consideration was given to the draft minutes of the Planning Committee meeting which was held on 15th January 2020 for approval and signature.

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

**P**        **Supplementary Planning Document Adoption – SPD No.1 - Housing**  
**54/19**    **Supplementary Planning Document and SPD No.2 - Householder**  
          **Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document**

Members were asked to consider and provide comments on Supplementary Planning Document Adoption – SPD No.1 - Housing Supplementary Planning Document and SPD No.2 - Householder Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document.

A Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) provided guidance on how Local Plan policies were applied and would be a material consideration when determining applications for planning permission within the Borough. Two SPDs, the Housing SPD and Householder Extensions and Alterations SPD had completed a period of public consultation. In order to address the representations received during the consultation period, a schedule of comments and the Council's responses had been drafted which also set out how the documents would be amended prior to consideration by Cabinet and then to Council for approval to adopt.

Following Planning Committee, the SPDs would be presented to Cabinet who were recommended to note the contents of the documents and recommend to

Council to approve the adoption of these documents as Council policy, subject to minor editing and changes that were to be delegated to the Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Housing and the Director of Economic Growth and Development. Any comments raised by Planning Committee would be circulated to Cabinet in advance of the meeting.

Following adoption, the guidance in the documents would be used in the determination of planning applications.

Members were given the opportunity to raise questions / make comments. These were summarised as detailed below:

- Why hadn't the Council implemented the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), as this could help provide infrastructure? Would developers be able to pay less using the new commuted sum calculation?

Officers explained that in 2015, the Council gathered evidence, prepared and consulted upon a (preliminary) draft CIL charging schedule. The CIL was a form of development tax, levied per square metre of certain developments. The evidence gathered at the time suggested that there was some, albeit limited, scope to make a charge for some residential and retail development in some areas of the Borough. However, given the scale and type of development likely to take place and those to be allocated in the local plan (at the time), the amount that could be raised, the types and costs of the identified infrastructure needs and the arrangements made for funding in place at the time, the charging schedule was not implemented. This opportunity to raise funds was still open to the Council to consider.

The commuted sum contribution was standard practice where a Council accepted that there was strong evidence that affordable homes could not or should not be provided on site, however the first preference was always to provide affordable housing on site. The revised calculation would go to the viability of the individual scheme, taking account of and agreeing (amongst others) the open market values on site (of the homes that would have been provided) rather than as currently, the borough average house price. This approach sought a fair contribution based on the ability of the scheme to pay – some may pay more or less. The proportion of affordable homes required and flexes were set out in Local Plan Policy H4.

- What would happen if an applicant submitted more homes on a site that was providing affordable homes? Would we recalculate?

Officers would recalculate the proportion of affordable homes based on the new scheme (for more homes) through the requisite application for planning permission.

- Would developers be allowed to submit less information?

The information submitted by developers should be proportionate to the need for information and data required to determine a planning application and as relevant was set out in the SPD and appendices. SPD1 set out the information needed to enable the Council to advise potential applicants and determine planning applications, but acknowledged that certain types of applications

required more or less information to be submitted than others – as in the difference between a submission for outline and full planning permission.

- How did the Council account for part of a dwelling that might result from the affordable home calculation?

Where the calculation resulted in part of a home (e.g. 3.4 homes), the number would be rounded up or down (i.e. 3.4 would be 3 houses and 3.7 would be 4 houses). This was an established practice and when used, in the round, tended to balance out as calculations rounded up in other instances.

RESOLVED that:

1. Members noted the content of the Supplementary Planning Document Adoption – SPD No.1 - Housing Supplementary Planning Document and SPD No.2 - Householder Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document and provided the above comments for consideration and approval by Full Council.

2. Members noted that existing SPD 2 Householder Extension Guide, SPG 4 High Density Development: Flats and Apartments and SPD 8 Affordable Housing and SPD will be superseded and replaced if the new SPD's are adopted. The existing SPDs will continue to apply to applications submitted before the adoption of the new SPDs. The new SPDs will then apply to all new applications submitted after their adoption.

**P  
55/19**

**1. Appeal - Ms Catherine Prosser - 21 Silton Grove, Stockton-On-Tees, TS18 5AT**

**19/0971/RET - DISMISSED**

**2. Appeal - Ms Sarah Kane - 2 Potto Close, Yarm, TS15 9RZ**

**19/1345/FUL - ALLOWED WITH CONDITIONS**

**3. Appeal - Mr B Small - 47 Sacriston Close, Billingham, TS23 2TE**

**19/1688/RET - ALLOWED WITH CONDITIONS**

**4. Appeal - Mr William Gate - 1 Station Road, Eaglescliffe, TS16 0BU**

**19/1434/FUL - DISMISSED**

The Appeals were noted.