

Planning Committee

A meeting of Planning Committee was held on Wednesday, 10th February, 2021.

Present: Cllr Norma Stephenson O.B.E.(Chairman), Cllr Mick Stoker(Vice-Chair), Cllr Jacky Bright, Cllr Carol Clark, 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, Cllr Maurice Perry (Sub Cllr Bill Woodhead MBE)

Officers: Julie Butcher, (HR, L&C), Stephen Donaghy (DA&H), Elaine Atkinson, Fiona Bage, Helen Boston, Garry Cummings, John Dixon, Simon Grundy, Lisa Lyons, Jane Matthews, Kieran Meighan, Simon Mills, Martin Parker, Rachel Powell, Chris Renahan, Joanne Roberts (DoF,D&BS), Peter Bell, Nigel Hart, Michael Henderson, Sarah Whaley (MD)

Also in attendance: Cllr Luke Frost, Applicants, Agenda, Members of the Public

Apologies: Cllr Tony Hampton, Cllr Bill Woodhead MBE

P 27/20 **Declarations of Interest**

Cllr Lynn Hall declared she had a personal none prejudicial interest relating to item; 20/0191/EIS 'Land to the East of Yarm Back Lane, Stockton on Tees', Cllr Hall advised that she had attended two consultation evenings held by the developer as Ward Councillor in relation to the item, however, was not predetermined. Cllr Hall would take part in the discussion and vote on the item.

Cllr Maurice Perry advised the Committee that in relation to item 20/0191/EIS Land To The East Of Yarm Back Lane, Stockton-on-Tees, Cllr Perry had submitted objections during the consultation period and was deemed predetermined. Cllr Perry would take part in the discussion however would not vote

P 28/20 **Minutes from the Planning Committee meeting which was held 16th December 2020**

Consideration was given to the minutes of the Planning Committee meetings which was held on the 16th December 2020 and 21st for Approval.

RESOLVED that the minutes be approved as a correct record.

P 29/20 **20/0191/EIS Land To The East Of Yarm Back Lane, Stockton-on-Tees, Hybrid planning application comprising of 1) full application for the erection of 969 dwellings with associated infrastructure, access, landscaping, open space, SUDS and 2) Outline application for proposed primary school with all other matters reserved.**

Consideration was given to planning application 20/0191/EIS Land To The East Of Yarm Back Lane, Stockton-on-Tees.

The application site at Yarm Back Lane formed part of the West Stockton

Sustainable Urban Extension (SUE) which wrapped around the western fringes of the Stockton urban area from Letch Lane in the north to the A66 in the south. The site comprised approximately 135 hectares of land for up to 2150 dwellings and was identified for residential development within the Adopted Local Plan under Policy H2.

The formulation of the West Stockton SUE involved many discussions with landowners and stakeholders which alongside the collaboration from Homes England's Advisory Team for Large Applications (ATLAS), produced the Yarm Back Lane and Harrowgate Lane Masterplan (2015). The Yarm Back Lane and Harrowgate Lane masterplan had been adopted by the Council to guide development and the delivery of infrastructure to support the new housing.

New infrastructure would include;

- Highway junction improvements including improvement to the Elton/A66 interchange
- Community hub - to provide community centre, shopping, service and community facilities
- New primary school

This application was a joint submission by Persimmon Homes and Taylor Wimpey. The application was a hybrid application which sought full planning permission for the erection of residential development comprising of 969 homes, associated infrastructure and landscaping and secured outline consent and safeguarded 2.76 hectares of land to the north of the site for the future delivery of a primary school.

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 Officers report concluded that the Yarm Back Lane and Harrowgate Lane masterplan had been adopted by the Council to guide development and the delivery of infrastructure to support the new housing. The allocated land at the West Stockton SUE totalled 2,150 new homes out of the total housing requirement of 10,150 homes across the Local Plan period. Along with housing delivery at Wynyard, the SUE was therefore one of the key strategic sites for housing delivery under the current local plan.

The principle of housing on the site had already been established within the adopted Local Plan and the proposal accorded with the requirements of the development plan. It would also help to maintain the Council's delivery of 5 year housing land supply and ensure that the policies within the Local Plan remained

up-to-date.

Other significant benefits also came with the proposed development including the potential for the local authority to access £10M of Government Funding through the Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) which alongside developer contributions would facilitate the delivery of the Elton /A66 interchange which was essential highway infrastructure to support the site itself and the wider SUE. Other additional benefits would also include the investment value in constructing the homes and associated revenue to the Local authority from Council Tax receipts upon occupation.

Overall, 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. In planning terms, the site was therefore considered to be acceptable.

The application was therefore recommended for approval subject to the Heads of Terms and Conditions set out within the main report.

Members were presented with an update which since the original report, detailed 2 further letters of objection. In addition, comments had been submitted from one of the neighbouring Ward Councillors, Cllr David Minchella full details of which were contained within the update report.

Whilst the new comments received were noted it was considered that no fundamental new issues had been raised and therefore the material planning considerations remained as outlined in the original committee report to Members.

In addition, further discussions had taken place with the applicants over the Heads of Terms and associated implications should the Council not secure the Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF). Therefore, some additional wording was included to clarify that the agreed overall contributions were predicated on the Council being successful in securing the HIF funding. Additional changes were included to the overall contribution due to a typing error and an area of clarity for the overall S106 offer.

A representative from Persimmon Homes attended the meeting and given the opportunity to make representation, their comments could be summarised as follows:

The Applicant had worked hard with Council Officers, Members, and members of the public The Applicant fully endorsed the Officers recommendation.

Objectors attended the meeting and given the opportunity to make representation their comments could be summarised as follows:

Concerns were raised in terms of traffic safety, specifically congestion backing up to the A66. Yarm Back Lane, Durham Back Lane, Harrowgate Lane, Elton Interchange and Birkdale Road were also issues of concern in terms of traffic

safety.

Proposed traffic lights would only add to the current problems on the surrounding road network.

Rush hour traffic on Darlington Back Lane was already considered to be dangerous, any vehicles approaching Hartburn via the blind bend, and the addition of the proposed roundabout would only exacerbate this.

It had been indicated that there would be an additional 2000 cars travelling along Yarm Back Lane. Residents felt that with the additional vehicle journeys coupled with vehicles turning right into the new estate could result in road traffic accidents.

Emergency vehicles would be caught up in congested traffic.

One objector had requested details from Taylor Wimpey of where plots would be placed on the site and was still awaiting a reply.

The development would cause damage to the environment, in terms of animal habitats effecting deer, newts, sparrow hawks etc. There didn't appear to be any mitigation detailing what would happen to wildlife already inhabiting the site.

It was felt that concerns raised by neighbouring residents to the proposed development had been ignored by the Applicant.

There were flooding concerns due to the land being clay based.

One Objector sought clarity in terms of the site plan which detailed a thick black line running behind her property. The Objector had been informed that the black line was to be a 1.8 metre fence directly behind her home and asked for confirmation as to whether this was correct, and if so, had other residents who may be affected by the fence been notified.

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

Officers offered reassurance, explaining a great deal of work had been undertaken when looking at traffic conditions which included the entire length of Darlington Back Lane and Yarm Back Lane and the surrounding road network.

Traffic on Yarm Back Lane, Darlington Back Lane, Elton Interchange, the surrounding road network, and congestion backing onto A66, had been looked at in terms of the impact the proposed development would have on the road network for the best part of 8 years. Highways England had not objected to the application and recommended conditions to mitigate against any disruption to the A66 which was key criteria.

Officers explained the current issues on Yarm Back Lane due to the poor junction at the Two Mile House Farm, and that this had been mitigated against with the new route from Elton to Darlington Back Lane which would also see

journey times reduce from 13 to 5 mins therefore giving an 8 minute gain due to highway improvements.

The application had been fully traffic modelled and the increase in traffic would be fully accommodated.

It was highlighted that in terms of the loss of wildlife and their habitat, surveys had been undertaken and had not identified any protected species. There was a condition 'Biodiversity Enhancement and Management Plan' (BEMP) which would minimise the adverse effect of the development on the biodiversity of the onsite habitat.

Concerns raised relating to flooding had been fully considered and addressed by the flood risk team.

All distances between dwellings met requirements and the proposed 1.8 metre high fencing was standard.

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

Members raised questions relating to paragraph 43 within the Officers report, which stated that the financial benefit of Council Tax be considered a material planning consideration and therefore weighed in favour of the application. It was felt that it was not appropriate for a development to make money for a Local Authority.

Questions were raised relating to the developers offer of affordable homes at 20%, versus the Councils preference to achieve a 70:30 (affordable rented; shared ownership) mix, and the Councils acceptance of only 12.4% affordable homes, and how was the balance of affordable homes and the S106 agreement arrived at?

Assurance was sought that there would be no more variations to the revised number of affordable homes and that the developer would also not build 1 bed affordable homes.

Members expressed their disappointment at the lack of much needed Bungalows and how the development would deliver accessible and adaptable homes particularly for wheelchair users if bungalows were not provided.

Why had the applicant not submitted required detailed information relating to flood risk management? How could consideration be given to a plan without a detailed drainage system.

A request was made that the Committee be provided with more detailed information from the Environmental Health Unit in terms of noise and screening.

It was noted that Sports England objected to the application as there was no proposed investment to the sports network. Members also noted that there was no detailed scheme from the developer for the proposed provision of the two

areas of play and therefore requested that these were not left to the last possible minute and be provided during the build.

The cost of the improvements to the Elton Interchange was requested.

Discussion took place around the congestion on Yarm Back Lane and why there were no proposals to widen the carriageway. It was also noted that during bad weather the grass verges on Yarm Back Lane were churned up with HGV tyre tracks, also indicating the road was not wide enough. There were also no pedestrian areas on the lane.

Clarity was sought as to the speed limit on Yarm Back Lane and Members felt this should be reduced to 30mph as per Harrowgate Lane, due to road safety issues. Members also highlighted several road traffic fatalities on Yarm Back Lane.

Further explanation was requested relating to the Junction at the Two Mile House Farm Junction on Yarm Back Lane and how this would be improved.

In terms of the impact the development would have on wildlife, it was felt enough was not being done to protect wildlife when it came to planning applications / developments, and that more should be done before certain species were lost forever.

Habitat surveys were out of date.

There was some disappointment that this was a hybrid development and that schooling and housing should have been looked at together, not separately.

Members also asked Officers to clarify which of the 5 schools within walking distance had surplus pupil places and whether there was enough capacity at existing secondary schools to accommodate the development.

There was to be only one access point through the estate to the school which was felt to be inadequate. Members asked that school access and parking be considered further when the school site came forward for consideration.

It was felt the proposed 4 entrances to the site were disproportionate.

Clarity was sought as to whether the proposed hammer head road which linked the development to the Penny Black site in Hartburn, would result in road links creating a rat run.

The development was proposing 969 dwelling way above the original plan of 850 dwellings which would have been more acceptable in terms of density.

The Whinfell design was a 3 storey dwelling however many of the surrounding roads had bungalows, therefore conditions were required in terms of siting and orientation to ensure privacy was maintained for existing residents whose homes backed on to those properties and including, no loss of light or being overbearing.

There was a lack of a regular bus service, although there was currently a small operator offering a limited service which was the number 88 otherwise known as the little white bus. The X66 went nowhere near the new development.

Cycle paths and footpaths particularly on Durham Back Lane which was narrow and dangerous were not offered on the proposed application.

Assurance was sought that Wi-Fi would be installed during the construction phase and not after.

Members asked how the development fit in to the five year supply of housing?

Members shared objectors' concerns relating to the lack of a Landscape buffer.

It was felt this should be considered as overdevelopment of prime rural land, especially along the west side of Stockton.

Brief discussion took place around providing charging points for electric cars, helping to lower the carbon footprint.

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

Officers explained that Local Authority gains in Council Tax were now able to be considered as a material planning consideration. It did weigh in favour of the scheme although not significantly.

In terms of the reduction in affordable homes Officers explained that key pieces of infrastructure were required and the provision of a school, therefore, offset affordable homes for a contribution to S106 agreement to deliver essential infrastructure.

Officers acknowledged the lack of provision of bungalows, however there was no current policy for a developer to provide bungalows. There was however a wide range of homes proposed on the site which was considered acceptable.

In terms of the policy to provide accessible and adaptable homes as well as wheelchair user dwellings, this policy came forward on the adoption of the Local Plan. The proposal in front of Members today came before the Local Plan. The developer would need to conform to Building Regulations re accessibility.

It was usual for Flood Management Drainage schemes to be finalised at a later date. The developer would not be able to do this until the design and layout was finalised. This would also influence Environmental Health concerns. There was a condition within the report that the Local Authority would need to be satisfied with the final detail ensuring no impact to residents. Officers were satisfied there was no flood risk and there would be no impact to future or existing residents.

There were a number of SUDS basins which were designed to flood. The southern end of the site would be where the Suds basins would go, however,

the finer detail would need to be seen by Officers before sign off.

Where questions had been raised relating to noise, it was expected that there would be a level of noise and disturbance in the short to medium term of the build however as the build progressed this would change.

Further dialogue would be had with Sports England; however, it was noted that there was a degree of protection for residents. The Local Authority would agree the final detail of the open space and play areas when the layout of the site was finalised. Officers would ensure the play areas would be delivered as agreed

Officers highlighted the vast sums of investment which would be available from government funding through the Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) and developer contributions which would facilitate the delivery of the Elton / A66 Interchange and surrounding road network including Darlington Back Lane and Yarm Back Lane.

Where Members had questioned the widening of Yarm Back Lane, Officers explained that Yarm Back Lane was 7.3 metres wide therefore in terms of width complied with current standards. Officer also explained that the tyre tracks churning up the grass verges during bad weather could be a result of farming activity, however they would take Members concerns back to the designers for further discussion.

There would however be localised widening at 4 access points to the development to maintain the width of the road for main traffic flow.

The current speed limit on Yarm Back Lane was currently 50mph however vast majority of vehicles would reduce speed due to proposed changes to Elton interchange and Two Mile House Farm and the introduction of the four site accesses along Yarm Back Lane. Final site junction would be 30mph limit.

Officers agreed to investigate reducing the speed on Yarm Back Lane and open discussions with all relevant partners. Officers explained that this would be subject to road safety audits and dialogue with the Police. There had been 7 accidents on Yarm Back Lane in the last 5 years, spread across the entire length of the road and for various reasons, not all were speed related. Key point was that the junctions had been looked and assessed as safe at 50mph and this had resulted in no issues being raised.

In terms of pedestrian facilities / infrastructure there was a north south link to Darlington Back Lane which was deliberately routed away from Darlington Back Lane to Yarm Back Lane.

The overall density of the development would be 21 dwellings per hectare which was below the government's guidelines of between 30 to 40 dwellings per hectare.

The school site was 2.8 hectares. Currently existing schools would manage to accommodate additional children and therefore the school site had not been put forward. Housing would come first, and the school would follow.

Although Officers did not have the exact surplus capacity figures of the 5 schools, dialogue had taken place with education colleagues who had confirmed that there was sufficient capacity to support this scheme initially. Officers were appreciative of wider pressures and recognised the need for a new school which they were committed to delivering at the right time.

In terms of access to the proposed school site, Officers explained it was the intention that the access would come through the housing estate, with parking laybys, and turning areas for pick up and drop off. Officers would look at this again taking into account Members comments when the school came forward for consideration.

The provision of open access ducting to allow for Broadband / Wi Fi had been conditioned within the proposal.

Habitat surveys were not out of date and were concluded during September 2020. Officers were satisfied there would be no impact on protected species and any impact would be at an acceptable level.

Regards issues raised relating to lack of regular bus service, Officers explained that an assessment of the site had been undertaken and the whole site was within walking distance of bus services, which included the number 88, 61 and X66, X67.

The Hammer Head road link to the Penny Black would not be a traffic road link.

Cycleway was not considered necessary to incorporate at Elton interchange. The provision on site would connect to existing network.

Members were informed that in terms of how the development fit within the 5 year supply, this information was not readily available, as an update report was usually provided annually. It was confirmed that the Council had a 5 year housing land supply. It was however acknowledged that building rates had slowed down and although this was an important site the 5 year supply would be reviewed annually and looked at again.

In terms of Landscape buffering, the developer had set aside additional countryside planting within open areas and achieved the required separation distances.

Officers explained that the developer may want to provide 10% of electric charging points for cars, but ultimately this was the occupier's choice.

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.

A vote took place and the motion was refused.

A vote then took place on the officers recommendation.

RESOLVED that That planning application 20/0191/EIS be approved subject to the conditions and informatives set out in appendix 2 of the Offices report and subject to the applicant entering into a Section 106 Agreement in accordance with the Heads of Terms detailed below.

HEADS OF TERMS

The developer is required to enter into a section 106 agreement in accordance with the terms highlighted within West Stockton Strategic Urban Extension (SUE) Masterplan and policy and subject to those terms identified below being dependant on the Council securing the Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF)

- To contribute the sum of £9.6M towards the proportionate share of required infrastructure in broad accordance with the West Stockton Masterplan.
- Provide land to the value of £1,700,000 to deliver the primary school and Elton Interchange works
- Affordable Housing provision at 12.4% (120 units)
- Local labour agreement

With the detailed breakdown of such terms and contributions to be delegated to the Director of Finance, Development and Business and Services for final agreement. In the event that HIF is not secured the Director has the authority to secure the S106 agreement accordingly to ensure appropriate contributions are made in broad accordance with the SUE masterplan and policy.

N.B The proportionate share may be used to prioritise and bring forward any key piece(s) of infrastructure in line with the requirements of the West Stockton Masterplan.

P **19/2084/REM**
30/20 **Hunters Rest Farm, Urlay Nook Road, Eaglescliffe**
Reserved Matters application for the Scale, Layout, Landscaping and
Appearance of 108 dwellings.

The Chairman of the Planning Committee agreed to hear the officers report, public representations and member debate in relation to items 19/2084/REM and 20/0588/FUL, as one, as both items related to the same development.

The Planning Officer outlined planning application 19/2084/REM, Hunters Rest Farm. Urlay Nook Road. Eaglescliffe.

An outline application (17/0775/OUT) was presented to the Planning Committee on the 17th January 2018 with a recommendation for approval. Members deferred the application requesting the applicant to provide more information. An appeal was submitted for non-determination which was allowed on 23rd October 2018. In addition, and prior to the outcome of the appeal, a subsequent outline planning permission with all matters reserved other than access, for a residential development of up to 130 houses was approved on the 14th August 2018 (Application 18/0301/REV).

The application to be implemented was the appeal application which was approved subject to a Section 106 which included the provision of 15% of dwellings on the site to be affordable housing; Precautionary education financial contributions; contributions towards improvement works to the A66 Elton Interchange; contribution towards car parking solutions in Yarm; the provision, funding and implementation of a scheme to continue the provision of a bus service for up to five years following the end of existing provision and the provision of public open space with contingency arrangements for a financial contribution to be made in lieu in certain circumstances.

This application was for the reserved matters of that outline approval and sought permission for 108 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 planning permission be granted with Conditions for the reasons as specified within the main report.

The Principal Planning Office informed the Committee that there was a typographical error within the report which stated that Nelly Burdon's Beck running around the west and southern perimeter of the site was within Flood Zones 2 and 3, however should have read Flood Zones 1 and 3.

The Planning Officer outlined planning application 20/0588/FUL, Hunters Rest Farm. Urray Nook Road. Eaglescliffe.

This application was for engineering works to regrade the land near to Nelly Burdon's Beck in association with the reserved matters for the erection of 108 dwellings on the adjacent site (application ref: 19/2084/REM). The application was presented to committee to allow both aspects of the scheme to be considered together. The application had been fully assessed and the works were considered to be acceptable and there were no sustainable planning reasons to refuse the application.

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 that the application be Approved with Conditions for the reasons as specified within the main report.

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

The Officer recommendations were fully supported by the Applicant.

The development formed part of the Councils Local Plan.

Affordable housing would be provided at 15%, contributing to the Local Authorities five year supply of affordable housing.

Concerns relating to the placement of trees from neighbouring residents being too close to their boundaries had been addressed and the trees had been brought further into the site.

The Applicant had addressed site level issues.

There was to be public open space and footpath links to neighbouring areas.

The Applicant had made wildlife habitat improvements.

There was to be a combination of homes from 2 to 5 bed dwellings including the provision of much needed bungalows.

Outward facing houses combined well with the proposed landscape, where all matters had been addressed.

The application went over and above the original scheme.

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

Questions were raised as to why the opportunity hadn't been taken to take the access to the site off the roundabout.

In terms of density, Members were pleased to see the number of dwellings had been reduced to 108 rather than the 130 homes that had received planning permission at a Planning Committee meeting in August 2018. Members were also pleased to see bungalows within the submitted plans.

Concerns were raised relating to the impact of additional traffic on the local road network.

Members sought clarity as to where the Elementis pipeline was situated on the site and whether it could be moved.

Reference was made to the European Protected Species Licence and whether since Brexit this was still required?

Members asked if the 15% requirement for affordable housing was based on previous policy?

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

The roundabout did not extend as far as the Taylor Wimpey development.

Officers confirmed that traffic modelling had been based on the original approved outline planning application of 130 dwellings which was acceptable, therefore the new proposal of 108 dwellings would not impact on the road network.

Where concerns had been raised relating to the Elementis pipeline it was confirmed that the Applicant had a legal agreement with Elementis to divert the pipeline. A diversion route was able to be accommodated within the layout which would mean that the operation and maintenance of the pipeline would be unaffected. Officers also confirmed that the pipeline in question was that which was routed down Aislaby bank.

It was confirmed that the European Protected Species Licence was still required, and as yet no amendment had been received to the contrary even though Great Britain had left the European Union.

The 15% affordable housing had been agreed at the outline planning stage. and would consist of 6 affordable bungalows, six 3 bed and four 2 bed houses.

A vote then took place and the application was approved.

RESOLVED that planning application 19/2084/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
(10)100 REV A	18 September 2019
(00)1000 REV 11	18 September 2019
(10)101 REV A	18 September 2019
(10)1100 REV A	18 September 2019
(10)1101 REV A	18 September 2019
(10)200 REV A	18 September 2019
(10)201 REV A	18 September 2019
(10)300 REV A	18 September 2019
(10)301 REV A	18 September 2019
(10)400 REV A	18 September 2019
(10)401 REV A	18 September 2019
(10)500 REV A	18 September 2019
(10)501 REV A	18 September 2019
(10)520 REV A	18 September 2019

(10)531 REV A 18 September 2019
(10)530 REV A 18 September 2019
(10)521 REV A 18 September 2019
(10)600 REV A 18 September 2019
(10)601 REV A 18 September 2019
(10)700 REV A 18 September 2019
(10)701 REV A 18 September 2019
(10)800 REV A 18 September 2019
(10)801 REV A 18 September 2019
(10)810 REV A 18 September 2019
(10)811 REV A 18 September 2019
(10)900 REV A 18 September 2019
(00)120 18 September 2019
(10)901 REV A 18 September 2019
(00)100 18 September 2019
(00)370 B 18 September 2019
JCC18-263-205-T2 23 December 2019
SR4052/008 REV B 30 March 2020
(00)300_AG 18 May 2020
JCC18-263-60-A 18 May 2020
N839-ONE-ZZ-XX-DR-L-0602-P01 18 May 2020
(00)350_E 18 June 2020
(00)360_G 18 June 2020
N839-ONE-ZZ-XX-DR-L-0201-P07 18 June 2020
N839-ONE-ZZ-XX-DR-L-0202-P07 18 June 2020
N839-ONE-ZZ-XX-DR-L-0203-P07 18 June 2020
(00)SK27_A 20 January 2021
(00)SK28_A 20 January 2021
(50)1100_A 20 January 2021
(00)SK26_A 20 January 2021
(50) 420 REV D 22 January 2021

02 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.

03 Hedgehogs Fencing; Notwithstanding the submitted information, holes shall be installed in boundary walls and fences at ground level to allow for the free movement of hedgehogs and be retained thereafter for the lifetime of the development.

04 Permitted Development Rights Notwithstanding the provisions of classes A, AA, 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

05 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 reenacting 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 without the written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

06 Removal of PD rights - no garage conversions; 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 garages shall be converted into part of the house or incidental uses 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 : Overhead Lines

Statutory clearances that shall be maintained are outlined in ENA43-8 Overhead Line Clearances. Guidance for construction activities near Overhead Lines is given in GS6 which is available on the HSE website for download, it is the responsibility of the developer that clearances are maintained both during construction & upon completion of the development.

P **20/0588/FUL**
31/20 **Hunters Rest Farm, Urlay Nook Road, Eaglescliffe**
 Engineering operations including the regrading of land.

For the discussion of this item please see above.

RESOLVED that planning application 20/0588/FUL be approved subject to the following conditions and informatives;

01. Time Limit

The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of Three years from the date of this permission.

02. Approved Plans

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

Plan Reference Number Date Received
SR4052/SLP01A 13 March 2020
SR4052-019 12 March 2020
SR4052-009 12 March 2020
SR4052-008 12 March 2020
SR4052-001A 12 March 2020

03. Ecology and Mitigation

Works shall be undertaken in accordance with the recommendations, mitigation strategy and Compensation Scheme the Watercourse Survey and Tree Risk Assessment dated August 2020.

04 Final Details of regrading works

Before commencement of tree removal works a scheme shall be submitted and approved to demonstrate the final works to be implemented on site. The proposed scheme shall be formed by an on-site agreement between the applicant and the local planning authority and the scheme to be submitted shall clearly demonstrate the trees to be removed on site, the extent of earthworks in proximity to Nelly Burdon's Beck and the replacement planting to be provided. Thereafter the works shall be undertaken in accordance with the submitted details.

05 Flood risk Assessment

All works shall be undertaken in accordance with the Flood Risk Assessment (Report Ref: JCC18-263-C-05 Revision: 00 January 2021).

06 Pollution Control

Prior to the commencement of any development, a scheme for the provision and implementation of pollution control of the water environment, shall be submitted and agreed in writing with the Local Authority. The works/scheme shall be constructed and completed in accordance with the approved plans.

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.

**P
32/20**

**1. Appeal - Miss Hannah Spicer - 34 Cennon Grove, Ingleby Barwick
19/1492/COU - ALLOWED WITH CONDITIONS**

**2. Appeal - Mr Amlan Banerjee - 18 Branksome Grove, Stockton-On-Tees
20/0666/FUL - DISMISSED**

The Appeals were noted.