

Planning Committee

A meeting of Planning Committee was held on Wednesday, 3rd June, 2020.

Present: Cllr Norma Stephenson O.B.E.(Chairman), Cllr Mick Stoker(Vice-Chair), Cllr Jacky Bright, Cllr Carol Clark, Cllr Chris Clough, Cllr Lynn Hall, Cllr Eileen Johnson, Cllr Paul Kirton, Cllr Tony Riordan, Cllr Andrew Sherris, Cllr Marilyn Surtees, Cllr Steve Walmsley, Cllr Mrs Sylvia Walmsley

Officers: Julie Butcher (HR, L&C), Greg Archer, Elaine Atkinson, Simon Grundy, Peter Shovlin (EG&DS), Peter Bell, Margaret Waggott, Sarah Whaley (MD)

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

Apologies: Cllr Tony Hampton,

P **Evacuation Procedure**
56/19

The Evacuation Procedure was noted.

P **Declarations of Interest**
57/19

There were non declarations of interest.

P **Draft minutes from the Planning Committee meeting which was held 11th**
58/19 **March 2020**

Consideration was given to the minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting which was held on the 11th March 2020.

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

P **19/2639/REM**
59/19 **Land to the south of Kirklevington, Thirsk Road, Kirklevington.**
Reserved matters application for access, appearance, landscaping, layout
and scale for the erection of 145 dwelling houses to include 22 affordable
homes, village shop, car park, multi-use games area, landscaping and
associated engineering works.

Consideration was given to planning application 19/2639/REM Land to the South of Kirklevington, Thirsk Road, Kirklevington.

Outline planning consent was granted in 2017 for up to 145 dwellings on land south of Kirklevington, Thirsk Road, Kirklevington (15/1643/OUT). A previous reserved matters application (17/1718/REM) was approved in 2018. The principle of the development had therefore been established.

This application had been submitted to enable the delivery of a new core range of house types on the site that Story Homes Ltd had introduced since the approval of the previous reserved matters application and comprised the same number of dwellings as previously approved.

The application substituted the house types with a broadly similar mix, size and style of dwellings and layout to that which had already been approved.

As part of the outline consent, the applicant entered into a Section 106 Agreement to provide a financial contribution for additional school places, financial contribution to fund a daytime bus service Monday to Sunday for a five year period and a financial contribution to highway improvements.

A number of conditions were also attached to the outline consent covering amongst others surface water management, ecology and contaminated land. These conditions would still be required to be fully met by the developer.

The proposal was considered to be in line with general planning policies as set out in the Development Plan and was recommended for approval with conditions.

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 revised reserved matters application had followed the principles of the indicative outline planning application proposals and previously approved reserved matters application. 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 above and therefore the recommendation was to approve the application subject to the conditions set out in the report.

Since the main report, Members of the Committee were presented with a verbal update which recommended a further condition be added. The recommendation to be imposed was to create 'highways' that enabled Hedgehogs to roam freely, supporting the Hedgehog population.

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

- The site had already obtained planning approval, the applicant was merely seeking approval for the newly proposed homes, which in the applicant's opinion would be better for families.
- There were to be financial contributions made towards additional school places, financial contribution to fund a daytime bus service Monday to Sunday for a five year period and a financial contribution to highway improvements.

- The newly proposed homes would not impact on local residents.

Members were given the opportunity to ask questions / make comments. These could be summarised as follows;

- It was felt by some Members that Storey Homes had done little to appease local residents and their concerns. There had been much opposition to the development in particular from residents of St Martins in Kirklevington and the siting of the proposed play area. Play areas were known to be magnets to older children at night causing disturbances to local residents and requests were made that the location of the play area be re-looked at.

- Discussion took place around issues relating to the Kirklevington Sewage Treatment Works. Residents were already having to put up with sewage tankers up and down the road numerous times per week. Questions were raised as to whether the sewage works could cope with the additional homes and would this increase the number of times that the tankers would need to visit the plant?

- In terms of the proposed affordable homes Members asked if these would be marketed directly to residents of Yarm and Kirklevington.

- Members highlighted the Governments future plans to phase out gas boilers and asked what provision the developer had made in relation to this.

- Clarity was sought as to what the bus timetable would look like.

- Members requested that an illustration of the proposed shop be provided.

- It was highlighted that information contained within the report detailed that surface water management information was still to be submitted and that later within the report it was stated that a temporary measure would be implemented to allow runoff of surface water during construction, and that there was no increased risk regards flooding as a result of the development. Members sought confirmation that this was in fact the case.

- Members sought clarity as to what the trigger points for school places would be and would these additional school places be to primary or secondary schools. The local secondary school, Conyers was already greatly oversubscribed.

- Questions were raised as to who would be operating the proposed bus service and what the highway changes were to be at the Crathorne interchange.

- Members expressed their disappointment that a cycle path could not be provided at the A64.

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

- In terms of issues raised relating to the play area and where it was to be sited, this was to be made up of small scale timber equipment for small

children/toddlers and therefore it wasn't expected there would be any problems in terms of noise as this would be mitigated against as children would be accompanied by parents and visits to the play area would be during the day with limited impact on local residents. Officers did agree however that a condition could be looked at in terms of relocating the play area if Members requested it.

- Issues raised in terms of sewerage capacity, Officers explained that Northumbrian Water had confirmed they would provide sufficient connection to its network and provide capacity for foul sewerage from the site.

- In terms of affordable housing, there was a process to go through and Registered Social Landlords would have input into who their tenants would be.

- Regarding the provision of heating for the homes, the developer was adopting a 'fabric first' approach which involved maximising the performance of the components and materials that made up the building fabric itself, before considering the use of mechanical or electrical building services systems and what was being provided was sustainable.

- In terms of the buses operational time frame, this had been agreed previously, and that agreement couldn't be changed.

- Where members had asked for an illustration of the proposed shop, a detailed description was given within the report. The shop was to be single storey with a pitched roof, with an entrance on the eastern frontage facing on to the large green space at the east of the site. The appearance of the shop was considered to be acceptable.

- Regarding the financial contribution towards school places, Officers confirmed that this would be a contribution based on the usual formula and it would be a decision the education authority would determine as to which school needed the spaces within the Borough based on the displacement of children due to development and therefore it wouldn't necessarily be the local school who would benefit. The contribution would go to both primary and secondary schools.

- In terms of flooding, Officers explained that there was various conditions on the original planning application. Also some of the concerns raised by residents had not been proven, any issues relating to flooding would be managed with a development management plan.

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

Members requested further information be presented at a future meeting which included; flooding and water management, possibility of relocating the proposed play area, and additional information in terms of Kirklevington Sewerage Treatment Works capacity and whether there would be a requirement for additional journeys for the sewage tankers due to the additional housing.

A vote took place and the motion was carried.

RESOLVED that the meeting be deferred to a future meeting of the Planning Committee for the reasons as detailed above.

P 18/1459/REM
60/19 Land Off Roundhill Avenue, Ingleby Barwick, Stockton-on-Tees
Reserved matters application for a residential development comprising of 65 houses and associated access and landscaping.

Consideration was given to planning application 18/1459/REM Land off Roundhill Avenue, Ingleby Barwick, Stockton on Tees.

Outline planning permission with some matters reserved for a residential development of up to 65 no houses was approved on the 2nd June 2017 Application 15/2531/OUT with the access agreed.

The application was approved subject to a Section 106 which included the transfer of Land for open space purposes to Stockton Borough Council which would form part of Tees Heritage Park and a contribution for its maintenance. A commuted Lump sum was also agreed off site for affordable housing.

This application was the reserved matters for the erection of 65 detached dwellings and included full details of the houses, including layout, scale, appearance and landscaping.

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 consent be granted with Conditions for the reasons as specified within the main report.

Members were presented with an update report which since the original report detailed further comments which had been received, and in addition, a suggested change to the ecology condition so that it tied in with the ecology condition on the outline permission. There was also an additional condition to allow hedgehog friendly fencing to be installed. All comments raised had been addressed in the main report or at outline stage and did not change the recommendation. Full details were contained within the update report.

The Applicant was in attendance at the meeting and given the opportunity to make representation his comments could be summarised as follows:

- Twelve acres of land was to be transferred to Stockton Borough Council and open for public use.
- Where concerns had been raised relating to the pumping station,

Northumbrian Water would undertake a condition survey to make sure all pipe work was in good condition. It was also highlighted that the pumping station would not be moved in anyway

- As detailed within the update report there had been a change to condition 4, 'Ecological checking survey' and all surveys had been reviewed.

- The Applicant stated that they had worked hard to address all concerns and that the proposed scheme was the best possible scheme for the proposed location.

Objectors were in attendance at the meeting and given the opportunity to make representation their comments could be summarised as follows:

- Concerns were raised relating to hedgerows and open green space close to a residents property and the access of the proposed site, which was on the southern boundary of the development. Confirmation was sought as to whether the hedgerows and trees would remain as well as the open space which was home to numerous wildlife and was also used by many local residents.

- Issues surrounding the infrastructure in Ingleby Barwick was highlighted as not being good enough. Children were still being bussed out to schools in neighbouring areas.

- Concerns were raised in relation to the loss of wildlife due to the over development of Ingleby Barwick.

Cllr Ross Patterson was in attendance and was given the opportunity to speak. His comments could be summarised as follows:

- Cllr Patterson echoed what local residents had said seeking clarity regards protecting the hedgerow.

- Clarity was sought in terms of the proposed parking bays on the access road, why were they there, was it to access the heritage park?

- There were still issues to address relating to the pumping station, which had a few trees around it, however was still an eyesore and needed to be landscaped with bunds so it could be screened and not be seen.

- Questions were also raised in terms of whether the land was contaminated?

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

- In terms of concerns raised relating to the access road issue and the open space to the south these would remain untouched and the hedgerow would remain, although would be trimmed back in to allow the public right of way to be created.

- In terms of Infrastructure this had been considered previously.

- Concerns raised relating to the proposed parking bays, these had been requested by Stockton Borough Council to prevent people parking indiscriminately and possibly across local residents drives to access the heritage park.
- The pumping station would be sufficiently screened as shown on the landscape plans.
- In terms of concerns raised relating to contaminated land this had been considered at outline planning. There would be a condition included, that if any contaminated land was discovered at the build stage it would be dealt with accordingly.

Members were given the opportunity to ask questions / make comments. These could be summarised as follows;

- Members felt strongly that developers needed to consider better the retaining of hedgerows on all future developments.
- Questions were raised relating to the commuted lump sum for affordable houses off site, and where they would be built. Also under Housing Policy 4 (H4) which housing need did this meet?
- Concerns were raised in terms of affordable housing being built on the proposed site. What measures in terms of safeguarding would be in place for those residents who had invested in large properties, who may then struggle to sell, if the developer's plans changed, introducing smaller houses.
- Members highlighted comments received from the Ramblers Association, regarding the lack of access to the Heritage Park from the northern end of the development and connections to Ingleby Barwick BW 3, however condition 7 stated that no development shall commence until a detailed scheme for pedestrian entrance to the Tees Heritage Park had been submitted and agreed in writing, Members asked whether this been agreed in writing?

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

- In terms of the commuted lump sum, as part of the outline approval it was considered to be more beneficial to provide a commuted lump sum, and where this would be spent would be up to the private housing team. Any changes to the scheme would have to come back to planning to review. Officers did however confirm that the affordable housing would be provided off the proposed site.
- Where questions were raised relating to PROW access from north of the site, Officers explained that the plans were indicative and did show all relevant connections, however a formal public right of way diversion application would need to be considered and the Ramblers Association comments would be fully assessed at that point.

- Officers confirmed they always tried to protect as many hedges as possible as part of proposed schemes.

A vote took place and the application was approved.

RESOLVED that planning application 18/1459/REM be approved subject to the following conditions and informatives;

01 Approved plans

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

Plan Reference Number	Date Received
2102_RHL_00_XX_DR_A_003 Rev L	6 May 2020
2102_RHL_00_XX_DR_A_004 REV E	6 May 2020
2102_RHL_00_XX_DR_A_005 REV A	6 May 2020
2102_RHL_00_XX_DR_A_090	4 March 2020
2102_RHL_00_XX_DR_A_500 REV D	4 March 2020
2102_RHL_00_XX_DR_A_700 REV C	4 March 2020
C-1597-01E(SHEET 1 OF 3)	15 May 2020
C-1597-02E (SHEET 2 OF 3)	15 May 2020
C-1597-03E (SHEET 3 OF 3)	15 May 2020
C-1597-04C	4 March 2020 B
18-CO-GR-06.02-A	28 November 2019
18-CL-GR-06.02-A	28 November 2019
18-CL-GR-06.03-A	28 November 2019
18-CL-GR-11	28 November 2019
18-CO-GR-06.03-A	28 November 2019
18-CO-GR-11	28 November 2019
18-EL-B-06.02-B	28 November 2019
18-EL-B-06.03-B	28 November 2019
18-EL-B-11	28 November 2019
18-EL-GR-06.02-B	28 November 2019
18-EL-GR-06.03-B	28 November 2019
18-EL-GR-11	28 November 2019
18-EV-G-06.02-D	28 November 2019
18-EV-G-11	28 November 2019
18-EV-GR-06.02-C	28 November 2019
18-EV-GR-06.03-C	28 November 2019
18-EV-GR-11	28 November 2019
18-HU-B-06.02-C	28 November 2019
18-HU-B-11	28 November 2019
18-HU-GR-06.02-B	28 November 2019
18-HU-GR-06.03-B	28 November 2019
18-HU-GR-11	28 November 2019
18-LA-B-06.02-B	28 November 2019
18-LA-B-11	28 November 2019
18-LA-G-06.02-C	28 November 2019
18-LA-G-06.03-C	28 November 2019
18-LA-G-11	28 November 2019

18-LA-GR-06.02-B 28 November 2019
18-LA-GR-1128 November 2019
18-MA-B-06.02-C 28 November 2019
18-MA-B-11 28 November 2019
18-MA-GR-06.02-C 28 November 2019
18-MA-GR-06.03-C 28 November 2019
18-MA-GR-11 28 November 2019
GTC-E-SS-0010_R1-9_1_OF_1 23 April 2020

02 Landscaping to the southern boundary

Notwithstanding the submitted plans, prior to works commencing on the existing hedge to the southern boundary, the developer shall contact Stockton Borough Council to arrange a site visit to determine the extent of trimming works to facilitate the footpath. Works shall be undertaken in accordance with the schedule as agreed on site.

03 Surface of the bridleway

Prior to works commencing on the public right of way, full details of the bridleway surfacing shall be submitted and agreed in writing to the local planning authority. Works shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.

04 Ecological Checking Survey

Prior to the commencement of any site works, a checking survey for the presence of protected species and suitable habitat shall be undertaken and appropriate mitigation measures, if different from the original survey, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Site works shall be carried out in complete accordance with the updated survey unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

05 Permitted Development Rights

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

06 Permitted Development Rights means of enclosure

Notwithstanding the provisions of Part 2, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order), unless shown on the approved plan (1202_RHL_00_XX_DR_A_004 Rev E) no gates, fences, walls or other means of enclosure shall be erected between the front or side wall of any dwelling which the curtilage of the dwelling fronts or abuts.

07 Hedgehogs Fencing;

Notwithstanding the submitted information, prior to the erection of any fencing details of the specification for holes in boundary walls and fences at ground level to allow for the movement of hedgehogs shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The agreed works shall be

implemented in accordance with the agreed details and be retained thereafter for the lifetime of the development.

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

A number of public sewers and sewerage rising mains cross the site and may be affected by the proposed development. Northumbrian Water do not permit a building over or close to our apparatus and therefore we will be contacting the developer direct to establish the exact location of our assets and ensure any necessary diversion, relocation or protection measures required prior to the commencement of the development. We will be contacting the developer/agent directly in this matter, however, for planning purposes you should note that the presence of our assets may impact upon the layout of the scheme as it stands.

Informatives: Gradients

Slopes should be designed to allow easy maintenance, and where these areas are to be title transferred, planted slopes may have a gradient of 1:4, however, all amenity grassed slopes (including SUDs basins) which require cutting must be 1:5.

Informative: Contaminated Land

All materials re-used or imported to site should follow the CL:AIRE 'Code of Practice' (CoP) and Aggregate quality protocols to include an approved Material Management Plan (MMP). No material other than those classified as 'inert' should be brought onto site and are subject to these protocols. Any materials re-used on site must also be subject to WAC testing. This is to ensure all materials imported follow the correct material management protocols, are suitable for re-use and do not cause contaminative risk to site users.

P 18/0195/OUT
61/19 Land Adjacent To Low Lane And Thornaby Road, Thornaby, Stockton On Tees
Residential Development comprising up to 200 homes and including provision of a Neighbourhood Centre, Multi-Cultural Centre, Primary School, Open Space and Means of Access

Consideration was given to planning application 18/0195/OUT, Land Adjacent to Low Lane and Thornaby Road, Thornaby, Stockton On Tees.

At the Planning Committee meeting on the 31st July 2019 Members resolved to grant planning consent for the above application subject to planning conditions and the development entering into a Section 106 agreement. The original report

was contained within the appendices of the main report.

Since that time discussions had been ongoing with the land owner and their agent over the Heads of Terms. Whilst there was agreement on most issues, there had been areas of disagreement leading to a revised masterplan being provided and the landowner asking for a conclusion to all matters so a decision could be issued.

The outstanding issue was in relation to the provision of the recreational route and footbridge leading the site to Ingleby Barwick and whilst the landowners had offered two options to resolve matters, neither was deemed acceptable. Consequently the landowner asked that the application be determined without a connection and associated bridge being provided or an appeal on non-determination would be submitted.

As these were considered to materially affect the decision, Members reached in 2019, the matter was referred back to Planning Committee to make a decision on the merits of the scheme and revised Heads of Terms.

All material planning considerations remained as outlined within the original committee report unless otherwise addressed within the main report.

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 detail above and whilst it was regrettable no solution could be reached to resolve the recreational route, it was considered that the development as now proposed would remain consistent with the new Local Plan.

It remained the case that despite the loss of the recreational route, sufficient facilities were provided within the development to serve future residents and meet an element of their day-to-day needs. The access to other community facilities (supermarkets, schools etc.) was also not considered to be substantially different from other areas of Ingleby Barwick.

On balance the scheme was considered to remain a sustainable location and in view of the other material considerations outlined in the original report, was acceptable in planning terms.

Members were presented with an update report which since the original report to planning committee, detailed a further three letters of objection, full details of which were contained within the update report. No new substantive issues had been raised and the material planning considerations remained as set out in either the committee report or the original report to members on the 31st July

2019, unless otherwise addressed within the update report;

In addition a Heads of Term missing from the Committee Report, was in relation to bus services and bus stops, which was reflective of discussions with the agent/applicant.

The Planning Officers recommendation was that planning application 18/0195/OUT be approved subject to conditions, informatives and Heads of Terms outlined in the main committee report and the additional Head of Terms below;

'Provision of bus services and bus stops to serve the development'.

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

- The Applicant had been in detailed discussions with bus companies.
- The layout of the scheme had been amended and a bus company was affirming their intentions as they were keen to take a bus onto the proposed estate.
- It was felt the scheme did not need a new bridge as previously agreed over Bassleton Beck. The Applicant had originally been happy to pay for and provide a bridge however not at three times the cost of the originally proposed bridge.
- Without the bridge the scheme was affordable and acceptable.
- The Applicant informed the Committee that all hedgerows on the site were to be rejuvenated and maintained.

Councillors Ted Strike and Ross Patterson were in attendance at the meeting and given the opportunity to make representation. Their comments could be summarised as follows;

- Objections were raised in terms of access to the site not the houses themselves.
- Main roads in Ingleby Barwick were at full capacity which highlighted the need for more cycle paths. In addition more people were cycling especially during the current COVID-19 pandemic, where the government were actively providing more funding for cycle paths.
- All villages in Ingleby Barwick were linked to one another as they should be, with cycle paths and walkways, which should be the same for this proposal. The proposal as it stood currently would mean that the new residents would be isolated.
- Members were asked to support residents, and approve the application only with satisfactory walkways linking this village to the others.

- If officers could not agree a price for the bridge it would be the residents that would lose out.

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

- Officers appreciated sentiments expressed regards the provision of a bridge, however it was needed to be considered whether the lack of the footbridge made the proposal so inherently unsustainable that it alone meant the application should be refused. Officers had looked at the proposed site in terms of sustainability and it had everything residents needed in terms of shops, bus, school etc. therefore the scheme was acceptable in planning terms without the bridge.

Members were given the opportunity to ask questions / make comments. These could be summarised as follows;

- Concerns were raised relating to the need for cycle paths and walkways which were considered an essential part of any new development. The actual description within the report mentioned the primary school, however the school was outwith the application site?

- Clarification was sought regarding the issue of the bridge as there had been a plan to put a metal bridge across, then an issue regarding the cost. What was wrong with the plan to put in the metal bridge?

- Clarity was sought in terms of recreational footpaths and formal footpaths and the difference between them.

- In terms of traffic congestion the A174 and the A19 had been widened however there was still potential for grid lock at the Mandale Interchange, more so due to new development of houses in Middlesbrough.

- Thornaby Town Council had suggested that a feasibility study be carried out to future proof and prevent grid locking.

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

- The land where the bridge was proposed was council land which needed to be designed as the land in question was quite marshy. Officers considered the cost of £50,000 reasonable for the bridge. In addition it was also considered that the bridge would become a financial burden in terms of maintenance for Stockton Borough Council eventually.

- The last proposed bridge was unlike the original one and was categorised as a recreational bridge only and therefore was not suitable for bicycles.

- In terms of the nature of recreational and formal footpaths. A formal footpath was usually a hard surface such as tarmac and was of a certain width.

Recreational paths were not made of as expensive material and could be narrower and not necessarily flat.

- In terms of comments raised relating to potential grid locking at the Mandale Interchange, Planning Officers agreed to pass those comments on to the Highways, Transport & Design Manager.

A vote took place and the application was approved.

RESOLVED that planning application 18/0195/OUT be approved subject to the following conditions and informative and subject to the applicant entering into a Section 106 Agreement in accordance with the Heads of Terms below;

Approved plans;

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

Plan Reference Number	Date on Plan
LTP-2691-TS-06-01-B	23 May 2019
5755_200	26 January 2018
5755_201_E	27 February 2020

Reserved matters;

02 Details of the appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale of each phase of the development (hereinafter called the reserved matters) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before development of the phase concerned begins, and the development shall be carried out as approved.

Time limit for submission of the reserved matters;

03 Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority not later than three years from the date of this permission.

Time limit for commencement;

04 The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.

Phasing programme;

05 No development shall take place until a Phasing Programme for the development hereby permitted has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This shall identify the phasing of infrastructure, landscaping, public open space (in accordance with the Open Space Strategy), accesses, associated community facilities and residential areas within the development permitted herein. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Phasing Programme.

Open Space Strategy;

06 No development shall take place until an open space strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall identify the extent, location, phasing and design of public open space within the development permitted herein. Development shall be carried out in accordance

with the approved open space strategy.

Dwelling numbers;

07 The total number of dwellings authorised by this permission shall not exceed 200

Energy efficiency;

08 No development shall take place until an Energy Statement identifying the predicted energy consumption and associated CO2 emissions of the development and detailing how the housing in that particular phase of the development will achieve a 10% reduction in CO2 emissions over and above current building regulations through the energy hierarchy has been submitted to and been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Where this is not achieved, it must be demonstrated that at least 10% of the total predicted energy requirements of the development must be provided from renewable energy sources either on site or in the locality of the development. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved details.

Construction Method Statement;

09 No development shall take place until a Construction Method Statement (CMS) has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority relevant to that element of the development hereby approved. The approved CMS shall be adhered to throughout the construction period relating to that element of the development and shall provide details of:

- i. Construction access;
- ii. Parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
- iii. Loading and unloading of plant and materials;
- iv. Storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
- v. The erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities to public viewing, where appropriate;
- vi. Wheel washing facilities; measures to control and monitor the omission of dust and dirt during construction;
- vii. A Site Waste Management Plan;
- viii. Details of the routing of associated HGVs;
- ix. Measures to protect existing footpaths and verges; and a means of communication with local residents.

10 Construction activity;

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

Ecological Survey;

11 No development in a particular phase shall take place until a timetable for the implementation of the ecological mitigation measures within that phase as set out within the submitted Ecological Impact Assessment (Naturally Wild, January 2018) has been submitted to and been approved in writing by the local planning authority. The ecological mitigation measures shall be implemented in accordance with the approved timetable.

Restrictions on retail provision

12 Notwithstanding the information submitted as part of the application the neighbourhood centre (including the community centre) and any associated landscaping and parking provision shall not exceed a total site area of 0.3 hectares. The maximum net retail floor space of any retail unit shall also not exceed 280sqm.

Noise protection – traffic and commercial noise

13 No development shall take place on any particular phase until a scheme for the protection of habitable rooms within the dwellings on that phase from the effects of traffic noise and neighbouring commercial uses has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and retained as such thereafter

Drainage

14 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. Such details shall be in accordance with the submitted "Flood Risk Assessment and Surface Water Management Strategy" and include;

- a) Detailed design of the foul water management system
- b) Detailed design of the surface water management system
- c) A build program and timetable for the provision of the critical surface water drainage infrastructure
- d) A management plan detailing how surface water runoff from the site will be managed during construction phase
- e) The arrangements for the future maintenance and management of the SuDS elements of the surface water system, including:
 - I. Identification of those areas to be adopted and
 - II. Arrangements to secure the future operation of the system throughout its lifetime

Thereafter the development shall take place in accordance with the approved details.

Unexpected land contamination

15 If during the course of development of any particular phase of the development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present, then no further development on that phase shall be carried out until the developer has submitted to, and obtained written approval from the local planning authority for, a remediation strategy detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with. The remediation strategy shall be carried out as approved.

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

- Provision of access to serve the development
- The provision of a dedicated and segregated left turn lane on the Ingleby Way approach to the A1044 Thornaby Road / Ingleby Way / Stockwell Avenue roundabout
- Provision of 20% affordable housing
- To dedicate a parcel of land (0.8 ha) on the western boundary for the purposes of a primary school
- A contribution towards secondary education provision in line with the Council formula
- Provision for a scheme for open space and its future management
- Provision of a footway access to Thornaby Road
- Provision of a footway access to Low Lane
- Provision of a scheme for open space and its future management, including the arrangements for transfer to a Management Company or the Council or another person or organisation
- Provision of a Travel Plan and associated incentives
- Provision of bus services and bus stops to serve the development.

- P
62/19**
- 1. Appeal - Miss Nicole Evans, 1 Worsley Close, Eaglescliffe, TS16 0BW
18/2445/COU - ALLOWED WITH CONDITIONS**
 - 2. Appeal - Mr Herring - Aislaby West Farm, Aislaby Road, Eaglescliffe
18/2000/FUL - ALLOWED WITH CONDITIONS**
 - 3. Appeal - A K Homes - 28 Mark Avenue, Norton, Stockton-on-Tees
19/1023/RET - DISMISSED**
 - 4. Appeal - Mr S Twaites - 22 Orde Wingate Way, Stockton-on-Tees, TS19
0GA
19/1372/COU - DISMISSED**
 - 5. Appeal - Mrs Emily Greenhalgh - Cross Farm, Wynyard Road, Wolviston
18/2161/FUL - DISMISSED**
 - 6. Appeal - Mrs Melanie Rees - 7 Marquis Grove, Norton, TS20 1QQ
19/2053/FUL - DISMISSED**
 - 7. Appeal - Mr & Mrs Williams - Follyfoot Banks, Calf Fallow Lane, Norton
19/1752/FUL - ALLOWED WITH CONDITIONS**
 - 8. Appeal - Mrs Frances Connolly - Ouston Moor Hall, Darlington Back
Lane, Stockton-On-Tees
19/1323/FUL - ALLOWED WITH CONDITIONS**

The Appeals were noted