

PLANNING COMMITTEE

A meeting of Planning Committee was held on Wednesday 6 December 2023.

Present: Cllr Mick Stoker (Chair), Cllr Michelle Bendelow (Vice-Chair), Cllr Carol Clark, Cllr Dan Fagan, Cllr Lynn Hall, Cllr Eileen Johnson, Cllr Tony Riordan, Cllr Andrew Sherris, Cllr Norma Stephenson OBE, Cllr Jim Taylor, Cllr Sylvia Walmsley, Cllr Sally Ann Watson and Cllr Barry Woodhouse.

Officers: Elaine Atkinson (DoF,D&R), Simon Grundy (DoF,D&R), Stephanie Landles (DoA,H and W), Martin Parker (DoCS,E&C), Julie Butcher (DoCS) and Sarah Whaley (DoCS).

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

Apologies: Cllr Stefan Barnes and Cllr Elsi Hampton.

P/34/23 Evacuation Procedure

The Evacuation Procedure was noted.

P/35/23 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

P/36/23 Minutes of the meetings which were held on 18th October and 8th November 2023

Consideration was given to the draft minutes from the Planning Committee meetings which were held on 18 October and 8 November 2023 for approval and signature

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

P/37/23 Planning Protocol

The Planning Protocol was noted.

P/38/23 23/1899/FUL 1 Whitehouse Drive, Stockton-on-Tees, TS19 0QE Application for change of use from a dwelling house (C3) to a children's home (C2) to include the application of render and garage conversion.

Consideration was given to planning application 23/1899/FUL 1 Whitehouse Drive, Stockton-on-Tees TS19 0QE

The application site was a detached 4-bedroom two storey dwellinghouse within the defined settlement limits of Stockton-on-Tees.

The application was seeking planning permission for the change of use of 1 Whitehouse Drive from a four-bedroom dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) to a children's

home (Use Class C2). The site benefited from off street parking, and a rear private amenity space.

The proposed children's home would provide accommodation for a maximum of 4 children between the ages of 7 and 17 years with 24-hour adult support, provided on a shift basis. Up to three members of staff would be present at the premises each day between 07:30am- 9:30pm. Two awake staff members would be present overnight.

As part of the change of use the existing garage would be converted to an office window replacing the garage door. A side window would be blocked up, internal alterations to rooms, and an extended driveway.

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 application be recommended for approval with conditions for the reasons as specified within the Officers report.

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

- . A local resident who lived in close proximity to the proposed development expressed that should the children residing at the home be young offenders then this would put themselves and their family at risk.

- . Concerns around Anti-Social Behaviour was highlighted.

- . It was felt that the drive at the proposed property could not accommodate 5 vehicles. In addition, 5 spaces would not be enough for staff and visitors therefore more spaces were needed otherwise cars would spill out onto Whitehouse Drive exacerbating current highways issues.

- . Whitehouse Drive was a very narrow road.

- . The home was in close proximity to a school, college and football club which already suffered with highways issues in terms of egress and exit at Whitehouse Drive.

- . There were parking issues in the area due to regular activity at Stockton Football Club.

- . People were parking on grass verges and there had also been damage to pavements in the surrounding area.

- . Traffic congestion was particularly bad during school drop off and pick up and it was difficult for residents in the local area to get on and off their driveways .

. Questions were raised as to why residents had only received notification of the Planning Committee 2 days prior to the meeting.

. It was felt that the children in the home occupying the proposed downstairs bedroom would cause disturbance possibly late into the night to the neighbouring property where a vulnerable person lived.

. The report did not present a full picture of the current issues in the area, and there were inaccuracies such as reference to a 4-bed property which was only a 3-bed property. It was also highlighted that the objections within the report were not representative of what had been submitted. A request was made that Members defer the application so an accurate report with all the facts be presented as well as Members undertaking a site visit.

. Clarity was sought relating to a request which had been made during May from a local resident to Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council whether the proposed development was to be changed to a children's home. A quick response was received in June explaining that it would be looked into. A reply was received in September stating that an investigation had taken place, and that nothing was planned, however plans were then submitted early October. Why had this taken so long to be looked into and why, 1 week after receiving the letter that nothing was planned, plans were submitted?

. A resident highlighted possible dangers to the children living at the home due to it being so close to Stockton Football Club as it was a licensed premise. The football club held many parties and there had been issues with teenagers having their parties there.

. One resident who explained they were a vulnerable person expressed their fear should the development be approved. Part of the resident's property had an external passage less than 2 metres away from the garage at the proposed site. The resident also explained that they also had a low fence along that part of the property which they did not want to make higher as this would cause the passageway to be dark.

. There were already existing issues with people parking outside of the resident's house making it difficult to negotiate the pathways with their wheelchair.

. There would be increased issues for emergency vehicles accessing Whitehouse Drive if the development was approved.

The Applicant attended the meeting and was given the opportunity to make representation. Their comments could be summarised as follows:

. The planning application accorded with council policy.

. The accommodation would provide specialist services to vulnerable children and extra care would be made regards the accommodation and would support social care and wellbeing.

. The house would be refurbished to a high standard and would not be out of character as there were many diverse house types in the area.

. It was unfortunate that young looked after children continued to be stigmatised.

- . The house was not for young offenders it was for 4 vulnerable children.
- . No planning or building regulations had been breached.
- . If the application was not approved the applicant would decide whether to rent or sell the property.
- . The Applicant acknowledged there was parking issues in the area however these were already there and not as a result of the Applicant arriving.
- .The structural layout at the property had been amended to meet parking needs.
- . In terms of resident's queries regarding the timeline relating to the request for an investigation by the Council as to whether the property was to become a children's home, the Applicant confirmed they had only purchased the property in September 2023 and therefore this was nothing to do with Stockton Council.
- . The applicant had corresponded with 20 residents and provided his personal details to enable them to contact him with any concerns.

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

- . The home was for 4 vulnerable children who required specialist providers.
- . There was space for 5 cars on the driveway and if necessary, this could be widened.
- . Letters were despatched 10 days prior to the committee meeting which was standard practice.
- . Summarising objections within the report was standard practice.
- . The home was currently a 3-bed property however would be a 4-bed once works were complete.
- . The request received on the 30 May in terms of whether the house was to be a children's home was looked into and although there may have been speculation it had nothing to do with the Council.
- . In terms of concerns raised relating to Stockton Football Club being licensed and a risk to the children residing in the home and linking the children to Anti-Social Behaviour, this would apply to any family with children.
- . Regarding claims that access to the road was narrow, the road was 4.8 metres wide, and the minimum required for a road with 2 way traffic was 4.2 metres, therefore the road was in excess of the minimum requirement.
- . The driveway to the proposed development could actually accommodate 6 parked vehicles however this was not what was required.

. Where it was claimed there had been pathways damaged due to parking issues the Principal Engineer from Highways, Transport and Environment stated this would be passed onto the Highways Maintenance Manager for future inspection.

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

. This application was a concern as it appeared to be retrospective, and providers appeared to be secretly acquiring these homes which was not inspiring.

. The report stated that the proposed home was surrounded by 3 other homes when it was in fact surrounded by 4 other properties, 1 being a bungalow which had amenity space opposite. The application was also too close to these properties.

. Bishopton Road West was a very busy road with traffic backing up making it dangerous.

. The infrastructure could not cope with more building in the area.

. There were parking issues in the area and by widening the drive at the proposed property it would take away curtilage parking.

. Members sought clarity following the Polices recommendation for good lighting and security and the impact this may have on the 4 neighbouring properties as it was felt this would be out of place and not in keeping with the character of the surrounding area.

. The illustration of the car park at the property showed stacked car parking which would present difficult manoeuvres when entering and leaving the drive.

. It was important that the management structure was right for the children.

. The children in these types of homes were vulnerable and were there through no fault of their own and needed to be cared for by the Local Authority. These types of homes were needed due to a lack of kinship and foster care.

. There were myths about all children in these types of homes being young offenders, they needed to be well looked after like any other child.

. One Member referred to a children's home in close proximity to a family member, which was also within a blue light zone and there had been no issues.

. These children needed to be kept in the Stockton area so they could continue to go to the same schools and keep the same friends.

. If the house was up for sale a family with 3 children could buy it and each family member could have a car.

. The home was in a good location as it was near to many local amenities and schools.

. Members did request the Applicant get in touch directly with the resident who had explained their vulnerabilities and fears to enable them to discuss their concerns directly and gain reassurance. The Applicant agreed.

. Although it would be too in-depth to have all objections in the report it was felt there was important information missing from the report which had appeared on the Planning Portal such as a response to a resident from the Applicant relating to the height of the resident's fence.

. It was also highlighted that a Ward Councillors comments had been omitted from the report.

. Clarity was sought as to when the Applicant had first discussed the application with the Council.

. Clarity was sought as to how many employees the Applicant had as the report stated there were 14 employees, therefore this suggested the car park may need to be increased to accommodate those staff.

. It was highlighted that the Applicant had a children's care home in Thornaby, where the same concerns had been raised with a lot of objections, however since opening there had not been any trouble and local residents had engaged with the children. Some residents who had originally objected had expressed that they were happy the home was there.

. The application could only be considered on planning grounds and there were no grounds to refuse the application.

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

. In terms of car parking spaces, the Applicant had provided requisite parking of 5 spaces even though 6 could be achieved at the site, in addition if the drive was widened a maximum of 10 spaces could be provided.

. If additional lighting was a statutory nuisance, then this would be picked up by Environmental Health.

. The parking layout on the drive was a standard layout in most developments and properties. Officers did accept vehicles would have to be reversed off the drive, and there was also a dropped kerb so people wouldn't be able to park on the kerb.

. In terms of highway safety, accidents in the last 3 years had been minimal and there had not been any on Whitehouse Drive, therefore highways could not raise any concerns, and the application was considered acceptable.

. There was an objection from a Ward Councillor however this was from a private e mail address.

. Any pre application advice was confidential and could not be disclosed, the Council could only consult when the application was submitted.

. The 14 staff referred to in the report was for the wider company. There would be 3 care givers at the home during the day and 2 during the night.

A vote took place, and the application was approved.

RESOLVED that planning application 23/1899/FUL be approved subject to the following conditions and informatives below;

Time Limit

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

Approved Plans

02 The development hereby approved shall be in accordance with the following approved plans;

Plan Reference Number	Date Received
SBC0002A	31 October 2023
SBC0001	9 October 2023
WHD100	9 October 2023
WHD101	11 October 2023
WHD102	9 October 2023
WHD103	11 October 2023

03 Approved Use

The premises shall be used for a three person children's home and for no other purpose including any other purpose in Class C2 of the Schedule of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 2020 (or any order revoking or re-enacting that order with or without modification), without planning permission being obtained from the Local Planning Authority.

04 Incurtilage Carparking

The development hereby approved shall retain a minimum of 5 incurtilage car parking spaces via the existing driveway in accordance with SPD3: Parking Provision for Developments 2011. The parking provision shall be retained thereafter for the lifetime of the development.

INFORMATIVE OF REASON FOR PLANNING APPROVAL

Informative: Working Practices

The Local Planning Authority found the submitted details satisfactory subject to the imposition of appropriate planning conditions and has worked in a positive and proactive manner in dealing with the planning application.

Informative: Cleveland Police

On commissioning, the Manager should contact Cleveland Police to discuss appropriate support at MFHcoord@cleveland.police.uk. Cleveland Police can also provide support regarding security of the property. The contact details can be found at <https://www.securedbydesign.com/contact-us/national-network-of-designing-out-crime-officers?view=article&id=308#cleveland-police>

P/39/23

23/1820/FUL Bay Tree House, Seamer Road, Hilton Erection of a 1.5 storey detached dwelling and demolition of existing dwelling/garage.

Consideration was given to planning application 23/1820/FUL Bay Tree House, Seamer Road, Hilton.

The application sought planning permission for the demolition of existing dwelling/garage and the creation of a replacement, a 1.5 storey detached dwelling.

The application site was a detached bungalow on Seamer Road in Hilton village. The surrounding properties on Seamer Road were a mix of 1940s/50s and 1960s/70s, single and two-storey properties of a range of different types and styles.

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 planning application be recommended for approval with Conditions for the reasons as specified within the Officers report.

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

- . The property was too large and too far forward in comparison to those close by as most of those were bungalows.
- . The proposed development would look out of place and spoil the thoroughfare.
- . The plot could easily take a family bungalow.
- . If approved, it would set a precedent for the main street through Hilton Village.
- . The property would encroach on the existing frontage and there was enough land to be moved back and keep within the existing building line.
- . Chair of the Hilton Village Parish Council indicated he was speaking on behalf of himself and the Parish Council representing 27 other residents that could not attend.
- . This was an ancient Village, and there would be no issue if the house was less intrusive and part of the Village.
- . There had been a previous application submitted which had been refused, however this new application was bigger and more intrusive.
- . The fact there were 2 storey homes on Falcon Walk was irrelevant to this application.

The Applicant attended the meeting and was given the opportunity to make representation. Their comments could be summarised as follows:

- . The property was purchased and had remained unchanged from 1970 and needed significant development.
- . The plot was a generous size however had structural issues. Shale needed to be removed therefore the building needed to be demolished and rebuilt.
- . Officers had provided guidance following the original application had been refused. The resubmitted application included building into the roof space and extending the building as advised by Officers.
- . There would be no significant impact in terms of overshadowing to neighbouring properties.
- . The application accorded with the Council's planning policies and was in keeping with the surrounding area.
- . No other regulatory authorities had submitted objections.
- . The house will be our family home, much improved and be energy efficient.

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

- . In terms of the character and building lines, Officers had looked at the surrounding area where there was a range of property types, in particular, Moorberries, which was off the main road and had a set of modern house types.
- . The development was not in a conservation area.
- . Officers felt the character, design and street scene was good.

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

- . Concerns were raised relating to the building line and whether it caused any overshadowing.
- . Clarity was sought as to whether residents in the adjacent property to the proposed development had objected.

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

- . In terms of the build line, this could not be compared to a terraced street with uniformed buildings which had a definitive clear building line, therefore in Officers views it did not exist with this property as there were a variety of properties within the area.
- . The development still retained a degree of frontage, and it was considered that the development retained the villages openness, greenery, and attractiveness.
- . Officers confirmed that there would be no impact on privacy, overbearing or loss of light.

. It was confirmed that the residents in the adjacent property had made an objection.

A vote then took place, and the application was approved.

RESOLVED that planning application 23/1820/FUL be approved subject to the following conditions and informatives below;

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
2305/PL/01 'O'	25 September 2023
2305/PL/02 'O'	25 September 2023
2305/PL/03 'A'	25 September 2023
2305/PL/04 'O'	25 September 2023
2305/PL/05 'O'	25 September 2023
2305/PL/06 'D'	9 October 2023
2305/PL/07 'B'	25 September 2023
2305/PL/08 'C'	25 September 2023
2305/PL/09 'O'	25 September 2023

03 Materials

Notwithstanding the submitted information the hereby approved development shall be constructed of the following materials

Walls – Red brick and cream render Roof – Slate effect concrete roof tiles Windows – Grey UPVC

04 Construction Noise

All construction operations including delivery of materials on site shall be restricted to 8.00 a.m. - 6.00 p.m. on weekdays, 9.00 a.m. - 1.00 p.m. on a Saturday and no Sunday or Bank Holiday working.

05 Additional Hardstanding

Notwithstanding the details hereby approved, the vehicular hardstanding to the front of the proposed dwelling to provide three in-curtilage car parking spaces (5 metres in width by a depth of 12.1 metres). The parking provision shall be retained thereafter for the lifetime of the development. The hardstanding shall be constructed from porous/permeable materials or provision made to direct run-off water from the hard surface to a permeable or porous area or surface within the curtilage of the dwelling house.

06 Enclosure

Prior to the occupation of the development, details of the enclosure/front boundary hedgerow shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This will be a detailed planting plan and specification of works indicating soil

depths, plant species, number, inter relationship of plants, stock size and planting methods. All works shall be in accordance with the approved plans.

Such means of enclosure shall be planted in the first planting season following completion of the development.

07 Permitted Development Rights – Extensions and Alterations

Notwithstanding the provisions of classes A, AA, B, C, D, E & F of Part 1 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (No. 2) (England) Order 2008 (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 otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority.

INFORMATIVE OF REASON FOR PLANNING APPROVAL

Informative: Working Practices

The Local Planning Authority found the submitted details satisfactory subject to the imposition of appropriate planning conditions and has worked in a positive and proactive manner in dealing with the planning application.

Informative: Care for Your Area

The applicant should contact Care for Your Area 01642 391959 regarding widening the dropped vehicle crossing.

Informative: In a Smoke Control Zone

As the property is within a smoke control area the occupant is to comply with the following:

- Burn authorised fuels- a list of these can be found on the following link <http://smokecontrol.defra.gov.uk/fuels.php?country=e>
- Install a DEFRA approved appliance; a list of these can be found on the following link <http://smokecontrol.defra.gov.uk/appliances.php?country=e>
- The appliance is to be installed by an approved contractor and certificates of the work to be submitted to the Local Authority

P/40/23

23/1709/ADV Land Off St Martins Way, Kirklevington, Retrospective advertisement consent for 4no non illuminated flag/flagpoles, 1no non illuminated fascia signs, 4no non illuminated leader board signs, 11no non illuminated wall signs, 1no internally illuminated monolith sign and 1no non illuminated double sided hoarding sign.

Consideration was given to 23/1709/ADV Land Off St Martins Way, Kirklevington.

Retrospective advertisement consent was sought for signage at a Taylor Wimpey residential building site in Kirklevington.

Advertisement consent had already been approved for signage at the site, but the signage had not been erected in accordance with the approved plans and this application was to rectify that matter.

A number of objections had been received to the signage and the comments had been fully considered and addressed in the report.

Advertisement applications could only be considered with highway safety or public amenity in mind, and it was not considered that there were sufficient reasons to warrant refusal of the application and therefore the application was recommended for approval subject to conditions as detailed within the main report.

Members were presented with an update report which since the original report detailed additional comments which had been received from the Environmental Health Team as well as comments from a neighbour who was unable to attend the committee meeting and had asked for their comments to be provided to Members for consideration. Full details of the comments were detailed within the update report.

The comments from the Environmental Health Team and the Neighbour were noted, however the issues of noise had already been considered in full at paragraph 22 of the main report and did not change the Officers original recommendation.

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 application be recommended for approval with Conditions for the reasons as specified within the main report.

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

- . Residents sheer exacerbation was completely understood. Taylor Wimpey had broken conditions, and this was the final straw, which had come on top of a long list of problems.

- . This was possibly the worst housing development site in the Kirklevington and Yarm area. The flags / flagpoles and signage were complete overkill, they should have just placed them where they were given permission for.

- . This issue should have been tackled with enforcement, and the developer should have been made to move the signage / flagpoles to where they had permission for.

- . If the main offending flagpole was moved this would elevate the issue for residents in terms of noise.

- . The flagpoles had temporary consent and would be removed on or before 11 August 2026.

. The noise created from the flags was upsetting to residents, the developer should compromise and move the offending flagpole?

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

. Officers informed the Committee that developers could erect 2 flagpoles anywhere without planning consent.

. In terms of enforcement being used, in the first instance the developer would be given the opportunity to rectify the issue regards what they did not have consent for, however if the application was refused at Planning Committee only the removal of 2 of the 4 flagpoles could be enforced.

. The actual material used for the flags was a thin tenting material and noise was not significant.

. The initial assessment of the application was for the flag to be held with metal, however following a site visit it was not held with metal on metal and therefore it could not be considered a statutory nuisance, therefore Environmental Health would not be able to enforce anything in terms of statutory nuisance.

. Members were reminded that to enforce against the current situation there had to be some harm compared to the original approval and there would need to be expedient reasons to enforce. If there was no harm in terms of planning merits the application could not be refused

A motion was proposed and seconded that the application be deferred to allow the developer to be approached to seek removal of 1 no flagpole.

A vote took place, and the motion was carried.

RESOLVED that retrospective planning 23/1709/ADV Land Off St Martins Way, Kirklevington, be deferred for the reasons as detailed above.

P/41/23 22/0334/EIS Land At Summerville Farm, Harrowgate Lane, Stockton-on-Tees Hybrid planning application comprising of 1) full application for the erection of 385 dwellings with associated infrastructure, access and landscaping and 2) Outline application with some matters reserved (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) for the erection of up to 285 dwellings.

Consideration was given to planning application 22/0334/EIS Land At Summerville Farm, Harrowgate Lane, Stockton-on-Tees.

The application site was located on the western fringe of Stockton and formed part of the West Stockton Strategic Urban Extension (WSSUE) which totalled 2,150 new homes across the Local Plan period. The application site formed one of the larger parcels of land within the northern parcel of the Strategic Urban Extension which was situated to south of Letch Lane and north of Outwood Academy.

A hybrid planning permission was sought, with part of the proposals seeking a full planning approval for 385 dwellings with associated infrastructure and the second

element seeking outline planning approval for 285 dwellings. The planning application was supported by an Environmental Statement (ES) and was considered under the Environmental Impact Assessment regulations.

The detailed part of the proposed development would provide a mix of two, three and four bedroomed properties over a mix of small terraces, semi-detached and detached dwellings with a mix of tenure types. The outline part of the application sought consent forming the south western proportion of the site, with only the means of access being considered at this stage. Access into the site would be via two new access points from Harrowgate Lane which would serve each development parcel.

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 application site formed part of the West Stockton Strategic Urban Extension which alongside housing delivery at Wynyard, the WSSUE formed a key housing site within the adopted Local Plan. The principle of housing on the site had already been accepted and established within the adopted Local Plan and therefore the proposed development was in accordance with those aims and requirements of the development plan. Delivery of housing on the site would also contribute to and help to maintain the Council's delivery of 5 year housing land supply.

With regards to the detailed part of this planning application, the proposed appearance, scale and layout of the development was considered to be acceptable and would allow for the creation of a development which included an attractive environment and acceptable level of the amenity for future occupiers. Equally the development could be accommodated without any undue impact on the amenity of any adjacent neighbours and as detailed in the Officers report, there were no technical reasons why the proposals would be unacceptable.

As detailed within the main report, in view of the fact that the proposal was acceptable in planning terms (subject to the identified condition and the outcomes of any viability appraisal) the application was put before members to consider the agreement to the principle of the development with the outcomes of the viability of the appraisal being delegated to the Director of Finance, Transformation & Performance, in conjunction with the Planning Services Manager as detailed below.

The Applicant attended the meeting and was given the opportunity to make representation. Their comments could be summarised as follows:

- . The application had been submitted by part of the Mistry Group Ltd which was the largest contractor for affordable housing which delivered quality homes.

- . 93% of it's residents would recommend Mistry Group Ltd.'s product.

- . Summerville Farm would be developed alongside other partners delivering new homes on a single site, consisting of private homes, build to rent homes and affordable homes.
- . The Applicant informed Members that they built homes far quicker than the competition resulting in faster return in revenue for the Council in terms of council tax.
- . The Homes would be the Linden Home brand.
- . The Applicant went far in excess of policy when delivering the number of affordable houses.
- . Since the original application submission in 2022 the Applicant had worked closely with council officers in terms of redesign and meeting the Councils wider technical policy.
- . All houses would meet national standards in terms of accessibility and adaptability.
- . All homes would have gas free heat pumps and solar panels, aligning with the Councils emission targets, delivering energy efficient homes.
- . The Applicant was ready to proceed regards nutrient neutrality which was approved by Natural England.
- . Should the application be approved, the development would commence in 2024.
- . The Applicant would work constructively with Officers to reach a suitable S106 solution.

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

- . Clarity was sought regards whether there would be access from the housing development onto Castle Eden Walkway.
- . This would be a great site for the residents of Stockton and some Members were happy to leave some of the detailed decisions to qualified Officers.
- . The developer appreciated what affordable, accessible, and adaptable housing were.
- . The application was a full planning application for 385 dwellings as well as an outline planning application for a further 285 dwellings, however the viability assessment for the outline planning application was still undecided, and the application lacked detail.
- . Were all the properties shown on the perimeter of the site consulted?
- . Clarity was sought as to where the access locations on the site were.
- . Concerns around whether junctions at the development site were adequate for the additional traffic, and also what the timeline would be for junction upgrades.
- . Questions were raised relating to the identification of the trees on the site and whether they would remain?

- . Ancient Hedgerows must be kept to mitigate against noise.
- . There were current issues regarding traffic backing up on Harrowgate Lane from the Harrowgate Lane development. Would the Harrowgate Lane development be completed prior to the proposed Summerville Farm development?
- . The current plans showed concrete fronts to the proposed dwellings for carparking, this would have a massive effect on drainage.
- . There should have already been a detailed single drainage plan for this development. There had already been 3 development sites developed by Persimmon Homes and Taylor Wimpey where residents had occupied properties prior to drainage plans being agreed.
- . Which one of the 17 Service Treatment Plans be used, and when would it be completed, this needed completing asap due to close proximity to local becks.
- . There was no certainty that 20% affordable housing would be delivered, neither the house type, tenure, or provider. There were also concerns around the viability assessment.
- . The size of the development would impact on access to GP surgeries.
- . 18 of the house types did not have active side elevations which the police had recommended to increase informal surveillance of the planned environment.
- . The Council's own Housing Manager had raised concerns in terms of what was actually being offered and it appeared that Officers were asking the Committee to vote against policy.
- . The Applicant had stated that they would build the development quicker, if so, then why could the Committee not have sight of the developments detailed information?
- . The Council receiving council tax revenue quicker due to a faster build was not a material planning consideration.

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

- . Officers confirmed that there would be access to Castle Eden Walkway via the top and bottom of the development.
- . All residents affected by the development were written to.
- . As many Trees and Hedgerows as possible would be retained which was conditioned.
- . There were conditions regarding consultation around discharge and this included the Service Water Team and Landscape Team and Officers would ensure that The Ramblers Association would be consulted regarding access to walkways

. The Applicant was proposing to provide 20% affordable housing on phase 1 of the development, however, it would depend on whether the Council would be prepared to accept a possible reduction in the outcome of the viability assessment from £8.5 million to £5 million. If that was to happen, then the Planning Committee would be advised, and a decision would need to be made whether there would be a reduction in affordable housing or financial contribution.

. The NHS were keen to secure a financial contribution, however it was difficult for Officers to assess the actual need of the NHS's requirement.

. Officers felt that the development would include swales and tree planting to address nutrient neutrality.

. All site Junctions had been assessed as part of the Yarm Back Lane business model and both Junctions had adequate capacity for the level of housing proposed.

. An uncontrolled crossing would be provided at the northern end of the site and a signal-controlled crossing would be provided at the southern end.

. There was another application coming forward at Tithebarn and it had been suggested that there would be access to the footway adjacent to Tithebarn as well as existing links at the Mitre, therefore there would be pedestrian links to the western side of Harrowgate Lane. A cycle lane had been conditioned going around the perimeter of the site which was in accordance with the latest guidance.

. In terms of parking and drainage this would be the responsibility of the developer and Northumbrian Water as the Council would not allow water to spill onto the highway.

. This was a single application in 2 parts, and the second part required further information and details. The outline planning application would establish the principle of development and would establish the provision of 285 houses including open space in the northern area. There were also numerous controls in place to make sure the Planning Authority had assurances in terms of infrastructure.

. Officers acknowledged and appreciated the concerns the Affordable Housing Manager had expressed, however once the viability assessment / appraisal outcome was known assurances would be looked at.

. Paragraph 7 of the planning report detailed that there would be a broad housing type / tenure mix.

. The application accorded with Planning Policy within the Local 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 detailed information.

A vote took place, and the motion was not carried.

A vote took place to approve the application as recommended in the Officers report and the application was approved.

RESOLVED that Members be minded to approve planning application 22/0334/EIS, with the decision being delegated to the Director of Finance, Transformation & Performance, in conjunction with the Planning Services Manager and the Chair of the Planning Committee, subject to conditions and informatives, the removal of the holding direction by National Highways and agreement being reached on the Heads of Terms.

The list of planning conditions and associated informatives are contained at Appendix 1 of the main report.

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;

- To contribute towards the proportionate share of required infrastructure in broad accordance with the West Stockton Masterplan.
- To secure the identified off-site nutrient neutrality mitigation
- To enter into a section 278 agree for delivery of highway infrastructure
- Local labour agreement

With the detailed breakdown of such terms and contributions to be delegated to the Director of Finance, Transformation & Performance, in conjunction with the Planning Services Manager and the Chair of Planning Committee for final agreement. 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/42/23 Appeals

In terms of the appeal decision, APP/H0738/W/23/3321634 relating to the Stoneacre Motor Group, RMB Motors Autoparc, Low Lane, High Leven, Stockton on Tees, Members sought clarity as to whether there would be any enforcement applied to remove the fence. The fence was an eyesore and was still in situ even though the appeal was dismissed. In addition, on exiting from Maltby to Low Lane in a vehicle there was also an advertising board obscuring vision. It was also asked whether the fence could remain in its current state should a future application be brought back to committee until that application was heard?

Officers informed Members that an enforcement notice was in discussion and currently being worked through, it was intended that action would be taken.

Regards questions raised relating to whether the current fence would remain should a future planning application be submitted, Officers explained that the fence may be set back which was being looked at.

The Appeals were noted.