



**YARM TOWN COUNCIL**

Town Hall

High Street

Yarm

TS15 9AH

TEL: 07399 576254

E MAIL: [townclerk@yarmtc.org](mailto:townclerk@yarmtc.org)

Website: [www.yarmtc.org](http://www.yarmtc.org)

19th April 2021

FAO:

Elaine Atkinson  
Stockton Borough Council  
Church Road  
Stockton-on-Tees  
TS18 1LD

**OBJECTION TO PLANNING PROPOSAL:**

**REF: Application No: 20/2277/OUT**

(submission under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990)

**Proposal:** Outline application with some matters reserved for residential development with associated means of access and demolition of 68 Mount Leven Road.

**Location:** Yarm Riding Centre, Glaisdale Road, Yarm.

**Applicant:** Mr D Anderson

**For the Attention of Stockton Borough Council Planning Committee.**

On 10th November 2020, Yarm Town Council unanimously voted to object to the original version of this application (ref: 20/2277/OUT) for the reasons detailed below.

It is our understanding that the original application has been re-submitted with a change, namely the reduction in the size of the development by 5 houses (i.e. from 55 to 50).

Yarm Town Council would like to make clear that the primary reasons for the objection, detailed below, have not been mitigated by this reduction of 5 houses. On 13th April 2021 Yarm Town Council unanimously voted, for the second time, to object to this application for the reasons stated below.

## **1. Validity of the Application**

The Applicant is named as a Mr. D Anderson . It is understood that there are 3 registered owners listed with the Land Registry within the application boundary, none of whom is Mr. D Anderson. On what ownership basis has the application been accepted?

In addition, it is understood there is a section of unregistered land and there is no reference to a current lease.

The current revision of this application has now taken over 2 months to be re-presented (the deadline for original comments being 21st January 2021) and a number of residents / groups wish to know why this is the case ?

## **2. Local Area Development Plan**

With reference to The Local Area Development Plan this proposed development was not part of it and therefore surrounding infrastructure, already stretched does not have capacity to accommodate the needs and services that would be required by the residents occupying such a development e.g. the local schools and road infrastructure. The revised application now describes the land as 'White Land' - this description does not change this point 2. or others made in this objection.

## **3. Housing Supply (related to 2. above)**

- a) The Councils SHLAA (Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment) does not identify this site as being included within land suitable for development.
- b) It is understood that SBC currently has a 5 year supply which conforms with Government requirements.

## **4. Scope of the Development**

- a) There is a lack of clarity about the size and scope of the development and the quantity of dwellings therein. Different documents pertaining to the application seem to identify different quantities of dwellings. For example:
  - i) the Master Plan, Site Plan and the Application now indicates 50 dwellings (originally 44 were Open Market and 11 'Affordable' - what is the new ratio for 50 dwellings?);
  - ii) the Transport Plan stated up to 60;
  - iii) the Noise Report stated up to 50;
  - iv) the Landscape Assessment stated 54;
  - v) the Arboricultural Survey stated 5.

We understand some of the above quantities have been amended but there are still significant inconsistencies and lack of clarity that supports the basis of this objection.

- b) The Location Plan is inaccurate: the red line boundary does not encompass the area of SUDS pond and discharge to River Leven.

## **5. Access**

- a) Access to the proposed development will have a severe impact on the residents of Number 70 Mount Leven Rd largely due to traffic movements and the resulting disturbance and noise.
- b) The Transport Assessment indicates 446 per day between the hours of 0700 and 1900. There are no figures given for other times.
- c) Evidence is required for the assertion that there have regularly only been 36 vehicle movements per day.
- d) Numbers 66 and 70 Mount Leven Road have bedroom windows overlooking the access road and will be subject to increased noise levels. (NB The Wardell Armstrong report indicates that this application is contrary to policy).
- e) The access proposed for the development does not appear to be feasible without taking land from Numbers 66 and 70 Mount Leven Rd.

## **6. Services**

There is no reference to how sewerage will be treated but section 10 of the Application, Foul Sewerage, simply states 'see submitted information'.

## **7. Arboriculture & Landscape**

- a) The Arboricultural report is dated 2015 so it is not clear how this can be considered valid.
- b) There will be a detrimental effect on the mature trees on the boundary of 101 Valley Drive given the indicative storm water drainage indicated.
- c) There seems to be no requirement for / inclusion of screen planting as in other applications e.g. Mount Leven Village.
- d) Given the above and the contours of the land within the application site, the proposed 2 storey properties would dominate over the Mount Leven Rd bungalows and would be detrimental to their amenity and privacy.

Members of Yarm Town Council noted that 2 similar applications at this site for fewer dwellings have previously been refused (5 dwellings ref.17/2904/REV and 5 dwellings ref

16/0830/FUL - most recent refusal being 25th January 2019).

In summary, given the detrimental impact on the local community and existing infrastructure, the number and diversity of inaccuracies and lack of information and evidence within the application and the context that the proposal is not part of The Local Plan, Yarm Town Council objects to this proposal.