

**DELEGATED**

**AGENDA NO  
PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**24<sup>th</sup> November 2021**

**REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF FINANCE,  
DEVELOPMENT AND BUSINESS SERVICES**

**20/2847/OUT**

**Far End Farm , Worsall Road, Kirklevington**

**Outline application for three dwellings in area to south of existing dwellings**

**Expiry Date**

**SUMMARY**

The application seeks outline permission, all matters reserved except for access, for the erection of three dwellings, to include the associated infrastructure.

A total of six letters of support have been received. The support letters have considered the wider context of the site to provide justification for the development. There are no objections to the proposed development from any of the external consultees although the Highways Manager is unable to offer support to the development which would be out with the limits to development.

The main planning considerations of this application are the compliance of the proposal with national and local planning policy, the impacts upon the character and appearance of the area, impacts on existing and future occupiers, highway safety, drainage, flood risk, ecology, archeology and any other material planning considerations.

The above impacts of the proposal have been considered however, due to the extent of the development which would be outside of the defined development limits would result in a form of development which would largely be contrary to Local Plan Policy SD3(4), without meeting any of the exceptional circumstances set within the policy or those within paragraph 80 of the NPPF.

Consideration has been given to any other material planning consideration to support the departure from policy namely the 2016 permission for a single dwelling on the site. However, it is not considered that the presence of a single dwelling out with the limits to developments does not give justification for the proposed additional dwellings and associated infrastructure proposed as part of this application.

It is not considered that the principle of development can therefore be established and consequently the recommendation is one of refusal.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Planning application 20/2847/OUT be Refused for the following reason

Development outside the define limits

1. In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policy SD3 (4) of the Stockton on Tees Local Plan which states that dwellings outside the limits to development will only be supported where they are compliant with the identified criteria as detailed in SD3(4) which aims to restrict new dwellings within the countryside without justification. To permit the development would undermine the defensible boundary of the development limits. There are no special circumstances relating to the proposal to override the policies of the Local Plan and Government policy within the National Planning Policy Framework (para 80).

## **BACKGROUND**

1. The application site has an extensive planning history relating to the development of the site for holiday cottages and various extensions and alterations to the site. The most relevant applications have been included below;
  - 14/3166/COU Change of use of 5 holiday lets into independent residential dwellings. Approved 4th February 2015
  - 15/0622/COU Change of use of 1 holiday let into independent residential dwelling. Approved 3rd June 2015
  - 16/2269/FUL Erection of dormer bungalow and associated access. Approved 8th November 2017
  - 18/1858/FUL Application for the erection of 3 no garage/storage blocks (Partial demolition of existing garage block/store) Approved 19th October 2018
  - 20/0720/FUL Demolition of existing double garage and erection of a two storey dwellinghouse Approved 21st August 2020

## **SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

2. The application site is a parcel of land associated with the existing development at Far End Farm which is located off Worsall Road in Yarm. The wider site comprises a cluster of several cottages with Far End Cottage, The Stores Cottage, Kelly's Cottage, Stable Cottage and Folly Cottage located to the south of the Site. The western boundary being shared with an area of land which will be a landscaped area as part of the new Tall Trees Housing development. Opposite the Site to the north is the housing development of Morley Carr and to the east is Far End Cottage.
3. For clarity, all of the existing development associated with Far End Farm is within the defined development limits. The proposed site is predominantly out with the limits to development.

## **PROPOSAL**

4. Outline planning permission, all matters reserved except for access is being sought for three dwellings and associated infrastructure out with the existing dwellings of Far End Farm, Yarm. Whilst approximately 0.18 acres of the site is within the defined development limits (approximately 0.8 acres falls outside of the limits).

## **CONSULTATIONS**

5. The following Consultations were notified and any comments received are set out below (in summary):-
6. Highways Transport & Design Manager- The Highways Transport and Design Manager does not support the proposals on landscape and visual grounds, however there are no highway objections.

Highways Comments - The application is supported by a Transport Statement which indicates that the site would be accessed from the B1264 Green Lane via the private road which currently serves Far End Farm and several other dwellings. Adequate visibility is available at the junction of the private road and the B1264 Green Lane therefore the site access arrangements are considered to be acceptable.

Landscape & Visual Comments – The Applicant has provided updated information regarding the dwellings and their location within the cleared area of the site. It is now clear that no tree/woodland clearance will be necessary to facilitate the development. There is no landscape and visual objection to the principle of some development of this site within the limits of development, however the current proposals cannot be supported.

7. Environmental Health Unit (Contamination) - no grounds for objection from a contaminated land perspective to this application.
8. Environmental Health Unit - No objection in principle to the development

9. Northumbrian Water Limited – At this stage we would have no comments to make, as no connections to the public sewerage network are proposed in the application documents. Should the drainage proposal change for this application, we would request re-consultation.
10. Northern Gas Networks-No objections
11. Tees Archaeology - An archaeological desk-based assessment has been submitted; this clearly sets out the archaeological interest in the site. The archaeological desk-based assessment recommends that a programme of trial trenching be undertaken to provide further information on the nature and extent of the archaeological resource. This could be secured as a condition of outline planning consent for the scheme. We agree with this recommendation; however, it should be noted that further work may be necessary depending on the results of the trial trenching. I set out the proposed wording of the archaeological condition.

## **PUBLICITY**

12. Neighbours were notified and six letters of support have been received, the comments are set out below :-

### Mr Bill Hewson - Folly Cottage, Far End Farm

We are happy to support this application. It will make a nice change from the cookie cutter developments that now surround the property.

The applicants have done a great job with the existing properties on the site and we're sure the new ones will be equally nice.

### Mrs Gillian Brooks - The Outlook, Far End Farm

I have currently been renting a property at Yarm Cottages for just over two years and would like to add my support for the application for two new dwellings to be built on the site there currently known as 'The Paddock' for the following reasons:-

1. A precedent has already been established in that planning permission has already been granted for one dwelling on the site.
2. The application site is currently now surrounded by mass and expanding housing developments so it is difficult to understand how the addition of one or two extra dwellings can be deemed as damaging.
3. The applicant has a long and proven track record of providing attractive and desirable residential properties. This will simply be an addition in similar style.
4. The proposed housing will cause no harm to the immediate vicinity.

### M And L Addison - Far End Cottage, Worsall Road

The full version can be viewed on the public access, a summary of the letter of support is based principally of the adjacent residential developments.

### Jonathan Odonde - Kellys Cottage, Worsall Road

I write in support of the application. The surrounding area is now full of new development of mass housing and the addition in this application will not alter the landscape. The applicant has provided and I believe will continue to provide attractive and desirable residential dwellings as evidenced by their history and current dwellings

### Mr And Mrs Brooks Far End Farm Worsall Road

The full letter can be viewed on the public access, a summary has been provided below;

- Development would be sympathetic
- Three additional plots is nothing compared to what's been permitted either side

### Mr Christopher Read - 22 Pit Wood Drive Yarm

I'm writing in support of the three additional holiday cottages at Far End Farm. Having stayed there in the past for three months whilst waiting for a new build to be completed, I can confirm that the site is well managed and extremely attractive, easily with space to cope with further cottages. All of the present properties have been built to blend in beautifully with the

style of a farm, while retaining a spacious outside element. Extra to and fro traffic would be minimal, and surrounded as it is by new developments, the cottages are undoubtedly a benefit and indeed an inducement to anyone wanting to holiday close to Yarm High Street while staying at an attractive and relaxing haven of peace and quiet.

### **PLANNING POLICY**

13. Where an adopted or approved development plan contains relevant policies, Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that an application for planning permissions shall be determined in accordance with the Development Plans for the area, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this case the relevant Development Plan is the Stockton on Tees Borough Council Local Plan 2019.
14. Section 143 of the Localism Act came into force on the 15 January 2012 and requires the Local Planning Authority to take local finance considerations into account, this section s70(2) Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended requires in dealing with such an application the authority shall have regard to;
- a) the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application,
  - b) any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application and
  - c) any other material considerations.

### **National Planning Policy Framework**

15. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. Achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways. These are economic social and environmental objectives.
16. So that sustainable development is pursued in a positive way, at the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development (paragraph 11) which for decision making means;
- approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or
  - where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless:
    - i. the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or
    - ii. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.

Para 12. The presumption in favour of sustainable development does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision-making. Where a planning application conflicts with an up-to-date development plan (including any neighbourhood plans that form part of the development plan), permission should not usually be granted. Local planning authorities may take decisions that depart from an up-to-date development plan, but only if material considerations in a particular case indicate that the plan should not be followed.

Para 80. Planning policies and decisions should avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside unless one or more of the following circumstances apply:

- (a) there is an essential need for a rural worker, including those taking majority control of a farm business, to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside;
- (b) the development would represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset or would be appropriate enabling development to secure the future of heritage assets;
- (c) the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and enhance its immediate setting;
- (d) the development would involve the subdivision of an existing residential building; or
- (e) the design is of exceptional quality, in that it:
  - is truly outstanding, reflecting the highest standards in architecture, and would help

- to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas; and
- would significantly enhance its immediate setting, and be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area.

Para 194 In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

Para 195 Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

### **Local Planning Policy**

17. The following planning policies are considered to be relevant to the consideration of this application.

#### Strategic Development Strategy Policy 1 (SD1) - Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development

1. In accordance with the Government's National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), when the Council considers development proposals it will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the NPPF. It will always work proactively with applicants jointly to find solutions which mean that proposals for sustainable development can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area.

2. Planning applications that accord with the policies in this Local Plan (and, where relevant, with policies in neighbourhood plans) will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

3. Where there are no policies relevant to the application or relevant policies are out of date at the time of making the decision then the Council will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise - taking into account whether:

- Any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole;
- or,
- Specific policies in that Framework indicate that development should be restricted.

#### Strategic Development Strategy Policy 3 (SD3) - Housing Strategy

1. The housing requirement of the Borough will be met through the provision of sufficient deliverable sites to ensure the maintenance of a rolling five year supply of deliverable housing land. Should it become apparent that a five year supply of deliverable housing land cannot be identified at any point within the plan period, or delivery is consistently falling below the housing requirement, the Council will work with landowners, the development industry and relevant stakeholders and take appropriate action in seeking to address any shortfall.

2. The following are priorities for the Council:

- a. Delivering a range and type of housing appropriate to needs and addressing shortfalls in provision; this includes the provision of housing to meet the needs of the ageing population and those with specific needs.
- b. Providing accommodation that is affordable.

- c. Providing opportunities for custom, self-build and small and medium sized house builders.
3. The approach to housing distribution has been developed to promote development in the most sustainable way. This will be achieved through:
- a. Supporting the aspiration of delivering housing in the Regenerated River Tees Corridor (as identified on the Policies Map) in close proximity to Stockton Town Centre. Key regeneration sites which provide major opportunities for redevelopment include:  
Queens Park North, Victoria Estate, Tees Marshalling Yard and Land off Grangefield Road
  - b. Supporting residential development on sites within the conurbation as defined by the limits to development which comprises the main settlements of Stockton, Billingham, Thornaby, Ingleby Barwick, Eaglescliffe and Yarm.
  - c. Creating a Sustainable Urban Extension to West Stockton.
  - d. Promoting major new residential development at Wynyard leading to the area becoming a sustainable settlement containing general market housing and areas of executive housing in a high-quality environment.
  - e. Supporting residential development in villages (as shown on the Policies Map) through the recognition of existing commitments and new build within the limits to development where the land is not allocated for another purpose.
4. New dwellings within the countryside will not be supported unless they:
- a. Are essential for farming, forestry or the operation of a rural based enterprise; or
  - b. Represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset; or
  - c. Would re-use redundant or disused buildings and lead to an enhancement of the immediate setting; or
  - d. Are of an exceptional quality or innovative nature of design. Such a design should:
    - i. be truly outstanding or innovative, helping to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas;
    - ii. reflect the highest standards in architecture;
    - iii. significantly enhance its immediate setting; and
    - iv. be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area.

#### Strategic Development Strategy Policy 8 (SD8) - Sustainable Design Principles

1. The Council will seek new development to be designed to the highest possible standard, taking into consideration the context of the surrounding area and the need to respond positively to the:
- a. Quality, character and sensitivity of the surrounding public realm, heritage assets, and nearby buildings, in particular at prominent junctions, main roads and town centre gateways;
  - b. Landscape character of the area, including the contribution made by existing trees and landscaping;
  - c. Need to protect and enhance ecological and green infrastructure networks and assets;
  - d. Need to ensure that new development is appropriately laid out to ensure adequate separation between buildings and an attractive environment;
  - e. Privacy and amenity of all existing and future occupants of land and buildings;
  - f. Existing transport network and the need to provide safe and satisfactory access and parking for all modes of transport;
  - g. Need to reinforce local distinctiveness and provide high quality and inclusive design solutions, and

#### Transport and Infrastructure Policy 1 (TI1) - Transport Infrastructure

11. To assist consideration of transport impacts, improve accessibility and safety for all modes of travel associated with development proposals, the Council will require, as appropriate, a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment and a Travel Plan.

#### Policy HE2 – Conserving and Enhancing Stockton’s Heritage Assets

1. In order to promote and enhance local distinctiveness, the Council will support proposals which positively respond to and enhance heritage assets.

9. Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest that are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments, should be considered subject to policies for designated

heritage assets.

10. Where archaeological remains survive, whether designated or not, there will be a presumption in favour of their preservation in-situ. The more significant the remains, the greater the presumption will be in favour of this. The necessity for preservation in-situ will result from desk-based assessment and, where necessary, field evaluation. Where in-situ preservation is not essential or feasible, a programme of archaeological works aimed at achieving preservation by record will be required.

11. Any reports prepared as part of a development scheme will be submitted for inclusion on the Historic Environment Record.

### **MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

18. The main planning considerations of this application are compliance with national and local planning policies and the impacts of the proposals on the character of the area, amenity of the neighbouring occupiers, highway safety, ecology and archaeology.

#### Procedural Matters

19. The application is being reported to Members as under the Councils Scheme of Delegation, the application has received six letters of support contrary to officer's recommendation.

20. During the course of the application process the applicant has sought to challenge the defined development limits and the strategic process which was undertaken in adopting the limits along with the Local Plan in January 2019. This principally related to when application ref 16/2269/FUL was approved.

21. During the examination period a number of Main Modifications were identified to the Local Plan. These were subject to consultation between 27th September 2018 and 8th November 2018 and are referenced in the Inspectors Report.

22. The Local Plan and Policies Map were allocated in 2019 after being found to be sound by the Planning Inspectorate. The proposed development is therefore required to be considered against these in accordance with the requirements of Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

23. Notwithstanding the permission for a single bungalow at the site, the purpose of having defined development limits is to provide, clear defensible boundaries, for which development is to be confined, unless there are exceptional circumstances, such as those outlined within Local Plan Policy SD3(4). To not strictly follow the defined development limits, unless material consideration indicate otherwise, would have the potential to lead to the erosion of the limits and a weakening of the development plan.

#### Principle of development

24. The National Planning Policy Framework (2021) is clear in the purpose of the planning system which (paragraph 11) is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. Achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways. These are economic social and environmental objectives.

25. The conurbation of the borough is defined by the limits to development which have been drawn to include all the main settlements; these being Stockton, Billingham, Thornaby, Ingleby Barwick, Eaglescliffe and Yarm. The Site is principally located out with the defined development limits of Yarm. The Plan is clear, new residential development will be delivered through existing commitments and other new build proposals which are supported within the limits to development.

26. Policy SD3 (4) only seeks to support new dwellings out with the limits to development whereby they; are essential for farming, forestry or other rural based enterprise, represent the optimal

viable use of a heritage asset, would reuse a redundant and discussed building or are exceptional quality or innovative design. The proposed development would not meet any of the exceptional criteria as required by policy SD3(4). The proposed development is therefore simply contrary to the requirements of the Development Plan.

27. The applicants supporting statement seeks to rely on the previous approval of a single dwelling on the site as a material consideration. The 2016 application was considered under the former Core Strategy and at the time of decision the Local Planning Authority was unable to demonstrate a five year supply. As the 5 year supply of housing was at the time based on the housing requirement of the emerging Local Plan and was not able to be attributed significant weight at this time. Weight was also given to the adjacent development in so far as the development would not be considered 'isolated'.
28. The 2016 permission was granted and in doing so a number of conditions were imposed, which included pre commencement conditions. The applicant has sought to demonstrate that they have carried out the required works to the access, which fall outside of the 2016 redline plan, but included within the applicant's ownership. Furthermore, no discharge of condition application was made for condition 07 (site levels), which was a pre commencement condition. Equally, no application has been made for a certificate of lawfulness to satisfy the LPA that the 2016 permission is extant. Notwithstanding this, the presence of a single dwelling out with the limits to developments does not give justification for the proposed additional dwellings and associated infrastructure proposed as part of this application.
29. Whilst it is accepted that the proposed development would not be considered 'isolated' for the purposes of paragraph 80 of the NPPF. This is not the sole test under Policy SD3. Rather as set out in the above section of this report, the Local Plan was adopted in 2019 with a clear defined defensible limit to development, the proposed development of three dwellings, with associated infrastructure, predominantly out with the defined limits would be contrary to the Plan. As included above, the adjacent housing developments have all followed the development limits.
30. Whilst an up-to-date housing land supply does not necessarily mean other windfall site should not be considered, in this case the site is outside the defined development limits of Yarm and does not meet the exceptions detailed within Policy SD3(4). Attention is drawn to a recent planning appeal Ref;APP/N1350/W/20/3252846, in which following an approval of a development of 9 dwellings out with the development limits, granted despite being contrary to policy, as Darlington Borough Council was at the time unable to demonstrate a 5 year supply. Following the expiration of the permission the applicant re-applied, and whilst there had been no intervening change to the council's policy, the council were subsequently able to demonstrate a 5 year supply and consequently the appeal was dismissed. Stockton Borough Council are able to demonstrate a 5 year supply and therefore no full is given to the limits of development.
31. The submitted planning statement also seeks to make reference to the contribution the proposed development would make to the Councils supply of 'self build' plots. The Council is required by the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 to keep a single register of people / groups who want to acquire a serviced plot of land in the Borough. Planning decision makers are required to have regard to the register, which may be a material consideration in decision making. Whilst the application is for custom and self-build housing, which the policies in the adopted local plan are generally supportive of, this does not override or negate any of the other local plan policies. Nonetheless there are sufficient approvals for self-build plots in the north and south of the borough (not including individual permissions) which can meet the demand.
32. In view of the above considerations, no exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated to justify the departure from the development plan. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Local Plan Policy SD3 as well as paragraph 80 of the NPPF.

### Character



33. SPD1 seeks to resist the principle of backland development, it does however accept that in certain circumstances they may be appropriate. The existing development at Far End Farm, within the development limits, results from a number of converted farm buildings, which due to their former use have close relationships with one another. The proposed tight form as indicated on the illustrative plan would reflect the settlement grain of the wider site. Should permission be granted the scale and appearance would be dealt with through the reserved matters. This would also include details of lighting, boundary treatment and landscaping.
34. The Highways Transport and Design Manger raises no objection to the principle of development within the limits of development but cannot offer support for the development which would fall out with the limits to development.

#### Residential Amenity

35. The illustrative layout demonstrates that a suitable level of amenity in respect of privacy could be achieved for the occupiers of the proposed dwellings and those of the surrounding residential dwellings, in accordance with the Council's adopted guidance.
36. The Environmental Health Unit have been consulted on the proposed development and, subject to a condition required in relation to construction hours, have raised no objection to the proposed development.
37. For the reasons set out above, the proposed development due to its scale and siting would not be considered detrimental to the adjacent properties in terms of overbearing, loss of light or privacy. On balance, it is considered that the development will offer an appropriate degree of amenity for the occupiers of the development and the adjacent residential dwellings in accordance with the requirements of SPD1 Local Plan Policy SD8 and paragraph 130 of the NPPF.

#### Highways

38. The Highways Transport and Design Manager considers that the principle of development in this location is considered to be acceptable, from a highway's perspective, as the impact on the local highways network would be negligible and suitable visibility splays are achievable at the existing access onto Worsall Road.
39. All of the proposed plots are in excess of 45m from the adopted highway and as such exceed the maximum distance stated by Cleveland Fire Brigade in relation to access. It will therefore be necessary, as a part of any reserved matters approval, to provide a suitable turning head within the development that meets the requirements of Cleveland Fire Brigade.
40. All of the proposed plots are in excess of the recommended 'pull distance' for a refuse bin. It will therefore be necessary to provide a bin store immediately adjacent to the adopted highway to allow for the collection of refuse from the development.

#### Archaeology

41. Tees Archaeology have confirmed that whilst the site is not located within a Conservation Area nor does it contain Listed Buildings or other locally listed buildings and not located close to a scheduled ancient monument or another heritage asset. However, the HER records a medieval field system present at Far End Farm.
42. Much of the land surrounding the study site has been subject to archaeological investigation: an Iron Age/Romano- British settlement was uncovered c. 500m to the east of the proposed development site, while an Iron Age enclosure was recorded c.780m to the north. An archaeological desk-based assessment submitted for the land immediately west of the proposed development site noted the potential for remains relating to the prehistoric and Romano-British periods. The applicant has submitted an archaeological desk based assessment, which recommends a program of trial trenching. Subject to the recommended condition Tees Archeology have raised no objection.

### Drainage

43. The application form states that the proposed development would connect to a package treatment plant and a SUDs system, which is shown on the illustrative plans to be out with the limits. It is proposed that the details of this are secured via conditions.

### Ecology

44. A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal was submitted in support of the application. The report concludes that the Site is of low ecological value, however a number of mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures have been recommended. In the event of any approval, it is recommended that a number of conditions are imposed in support of the recommendation of the ecological appraisal.

### **CONCLUSION**

45. The proposed development would represent a development out with the limits of development, contrary to the development plans and without a strong material consideration to support the departure. It is recommended that the application be refused for the reasons specified above.

**Director of Finance, Development and Business Services**  
**Contact Officer Helen Boston Telephone No 01642 526080**

### **WARD AND WARD COUNCILLORS**

<b>Ward</b>	<b>Yarm</b>
<b>Ward Councillor</b>	<b>Councillor Julia Whitehill</b>
<b>Ward Councillor</b>	<b>Councillor Andrew Sherris</b>
<b>Ward Councillor</b>	<b>Councillor Dan Fagan</b>

### **IMPLICATIONS**

#### **Financial Implications:**

N/A

#### **Environmental Implications:**

N/A

#### **Human Rights Implications:**

The provisions of the European Convention of Human Rights 1950 have been taken into account in the preparation of this report.

#### **Community Safety Implications:**

The provisions of Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 have been taken into account in the preparation of this report.

#### **Background Papers**

Local Plan (2019)

#### **Supplementary Planning Documents**

SPD1 – Sustainable Design Guide

SPD2 – Open Space, Recreation and Landscaping SPD3 – Parking Provision for Developments

SPD4 – Conservation and Historic Environment Folder