



# Redcar & Cleveland Submission Local Plan April 2017

## SUMMARY OF DETAILED REPRESENTATIONS IN RELATION TO POLICIES H3 AND COUNCIL RESPONSE





## Introduction

This paper has been prepared in response to several representations which were submitted regarding **Policy H3 – Housing Allocations** and variously to site specific housing allocation policies (H3.1-H3.30) and contend, for reasons set out, that the plan is unsound.

The approach of preparing a separate report has been taken rather than using the bespoke comments database as it provides a more effective means of providing a substantive response to detailed representations, particularly those which also propose housing allocations on sites which were rejected in the emerging plan. Some of the representations form part of wider objections to the plan including, among others, Policy H1 Housing Requirements and Policy SD2 Locational Policy, which are the policies most strongly linked to Policy H3. Other representations to H3 policies have been handled conventionally in the database.

The paper provides the Borough Council's responses to the following 14 representations:

- Home Builders Federation (Comment Ref. PLP\_096)
- Story Homes (PLP\_126)
- Theakston Estates (PLP\_178)
- KCS Development Ltd (PLP\_060)
- G & M Collins (PLP\_165 & 166)
- Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd (PLP\_113-118 & 153-154)

With the exception of the submission from the Home Builders Federation, the above representations advocate the inclusion of further housing allocations, on sites which have been rejected in the emerging plan. These representations are founded on the argument that the housing requirement, as set out at Policy H1, is not sufficiently aspirational and should be set significantly higher (to about 350 dwellings per annum), to fully account for the impact of economic growth, thus necessitating further land allocations.

The Council's position on the housing requirement is fully explained in the separate response to Policy H1. However, it is worth stating here that the Council maintains that the assessed housing requirement is correct and Policy H1 is sound. As such, it is contended that sufficient land has been identified through Policy H3, including a significant buffer of at least 20 per cent in excess of the minimum requirement, and no further housing allocations are needed.

Individual submissions in connection with Policy H3 are summarised below, including the points of objection as shown in *italics*. This is followed by the Council's response.

### Home Builders Federation (PLP\_096)

- *While the wider representation from the Home Builders Federation (HBF) asserts that the housing requirement under Policy H1 is too low, reference is not made to any specific allocations or other sites. It is nonetheless pointed out that all sites in the housing delivery trajectory should meet criteria at Footnote 11 to Para 47 of the NPPF, (Para. 38).*

### Council Response

As noted above, the Council maintains that the assessed housing requirement under Policy H1 is correct.

NPPF Footnote 11 provides a definition of a deliverable site which is capable of development within five years. The housing trajectory in the plan takes into account the assessment of Five Year Housing Land Supply (September 2016) which has been subject to consultation with housing developers and site promoters and therefore provides an informed estimate of short-term housing delivery. Most of the sites assessed as deliverable are under development. All the remaining supply is on sites with planning permission and most of this is on sites being pursued by major housebuilders.

Where there is some uncertainty that permissions will be implemented within the first five years, but sites are nonetheless considered capable of development within the plan period, they have been included in later phases of the delivery trajectory, in line with NPPF Footnote 12. In some cases, sites with planning permission were excluded from the plan where there is significant doubt that development can be achieved within 15 years.

- *In Table 3 of the plan, which lists major ongoing developments, the contribution on smaller sites and conversions with permission has been subject to a 10% discount. It is suggested that this discount should be applied to other sites with an unimplemented planning permission (Para. 41).*

#### Council Response

The Council believes that a 10% discount against permission sites is not justified, for the following reasons:

- i. 14 sites with an unimplemented planning permission for a combined total of 1,521 housing units are included in the supply estimate and all of these sites have been identified as housing allocations. 42% of this supply (636 dwellings) is accounted for on three sites (Marske Road, Saltburn, Longbank Farm, Ormesby and Low Grange Farm, South Bank). All three sites are controlled by different volume housebuilders who have indicated, through the SHLAA and local plan processes, an ongoing commitment to delivering development, with the sites at Saltburn and Ormesby expected to achieve completions in the next five years. At Low Grange Farm, limited potential development has been assumed over the plan period to reflect the site location in a lower housing value area and in terms of the planning consent which allows up to 10 years for the submission of reserved matters.
- ii. A further 36% of the supply is taken up by the major allocation site West of Kirkleatham Lane, Redcar, for which outline consent was granted for 550 dwellings in April 2017. This is a large greenfield site which is in the ownership of and is being actively promoted by the Homes and Communities Agency, which, as the government's public body tasked with increasing housing supply is committed to ensuring delivery.
- iii. The remainder of the supply, just over 20%, is on ten sites. On six of these sites planning permission has been granted fairly recently, in the last eighteen months, while it is anticipated that permissions for grant-funded supported living schemes on two other sites will be activated in 2017/18. Where short-term delivery may be less assured (on sites with or without an existing planning permission), the trajectory allows for the later development of allocations within the plan period.
- iv. In the SHLAA, four sites with combined permission for 64 dwellings have already been discounted outright from the plan due to concerns about economic viability and in two cases there is a history of unimplemented permissions.

- *It is pointed out that there are differences between the housing supply figures set out under Policy H1 (4,727 housing units) and in the SHLAA, at Table 4 (4,898) and Table 5 (4,742) and it is requested that these variances should be explained or amended accordingly (Para .42).*

#### Council Response

The differences can be explained as follows:

- i. As noted at Para 6.35, it is recognised that the supply figures do not factor in assumptions about small windfalls and stock losses. This is because sufficient allocations have been identified in the plan to meet the housing requirement, including the 20% buffer, without relying on the application of trend-based windfall assumptions. The supply figure includes an estimate of existing commitments on smaller sites of fewer than 10 dwellings and conversion schemes with a 10% discount rate built in (185 units) and a base date of 31 March 2016. This comprises 160 dwellings on sites of 1-4 dwellings plus 45 units on sites of 5-9 units and conversion schemes which have also been included in the five-year deliverable housing land supply assessment in accordance with practice guidance. In addition to Policy H1, the Plan proposes 200 dwellings at the Skelton regeneration site included at Policy REG2, giving a total supply figure of is 4,927 and a surplus of 1,162 against a minimum requirement of 3,765 (resulting in a buffer of 31%).
- ii. SHLAA Table 4 is derived from the Five Year Housing Land Supply Assessment (September 2016), and includes permissions on sites of 5-9 dwellings (56) trend-based allowances in years 1 to 5 for small windfalls of site of fewer than 5 dwellings (235 units) and stock losses (85), together with an allowance for demolitions (90, including 40 on the Hummersea Hills redevelopment site, which have been accounted for in the plan at Table 3). The Five Year Supply Assessment shows that, as a 31 March 2016, there were an estimated 164 dwellings awaiting completion on sites of fewer than five dwellings. Allowing for a 10% discount for non-delivery (as appears to be standard practice in assessing five year supply), this would be equivalent to 3.14 years supply against the five-year trend. The windfall allowance was applied to the assessment to account for the likelihood that a further supply of small sites, in addition to current commitments, would continue to come forward and be built-out over the next five years. The supply figure in SHLAA Table 4 also includes 200 units at Skelton Regeneration Site.
- iii. In accordance with the site delivery trajectory, SHLAA Table 5 only includes major sites and allocations. It excludes sites of fewer than 10 units, allowances for small windfalls and stock losses or demolitions, apart from those which are confirmed at Hummersea Hills: hence the lower figure than *Table 4*. The purpose of *Table 5* is to show that sufficient sites have been included in the plan to ensure the minimum housing requirement can be met and that a deliverable five year supply can be maintained throughout the plan period. The difference of 15 with the figure at Policy H3 is due to the inclusion of Skelton Regeneration Site (200 units) and the exclusion of commitments on small sites (185).

For the sake of clarity and consistency in the 2017 annual update to the SHLAA (which will incorporate the Five Year Housing Land Supply Assessment), it is proposed to remove the windfall allowance and to only include commitments on small sites and conversions.

It is proposed to remove the reference to the trend-based windfall allowance at Appendix 4 as a minor modification to the plan.

- *It is suggested that net windfall developments are likely to diminish and that consideration should be given as to whether they would continue to offset demolitions (Para. 42).*

#### Council Response

Although it is recognised at Para. 6.35 that windfall contributions can fluctuate, there is currently no evidence to suggest they might diminish or cease to exceed stock losses. As noted above, there is an ongoing supply of commitments on small sites, and the plan allows for the development of windfall sites including, as per Policy SD3, on exception sites outside development limits. Notwithstanding this, as windfalls have not been factored into the supply calculations and there are no major demolition programmes underway or in the pipeline, any drop in contributions would not currently be expected to undermine the delivery of the housing requirement.

- *At Para. 43 it is recommended that Part d. of the policy regarding maintaining a continuous five-year housing supply should be strengthened through mechanisms such as a partial plan review or the release of additional sites.*

#### Council Response

The plan promotes a substantial increase in net housing supply which significantly exceeds the assessed minimum requirement plus a 20% buffer and should ensure a deliverable five-year supply can be maintained over the course of the plan period and remove the need for additional housing allocations. Furthermore, delivery is front-loaded with around 70% of supply on sites which are currently under development or have planning consent, including approximately 2,000 dwellings on sites under development. As such, it is anticipated that supply requirements are capable of being comfortably achieved over the early years of the plan period; this is reflected in the indicative delivery trajectory at Appendix 4 of the Plan and should negate the requirement for an early review. As confirmed in the Monitoring and Implementation Framework at Appendix 1, the review of Policy H3 will form part of the regular review of the Plan.

Nonetheless, at Policy H1 it is stated that in the event a deliverable five-year housing land supply cannot be evidenced, the Council will work with landowners and the development industry in seeking to address any shortfall. At supporting Para 6.14, it is confirmed that consideration will be given to bringing forward additional sites, provided the development would make a significant contribution to reducing the supply deficit and that delivery on other sites would not be compromised.

The Council will seek to address any shortfall through appropriate mechanisms which, depending on the scale and nature of potential under-delivery, could include:

- in the first instance, liaising with developers and landowners to consider delivery constraints and whether and how housing delivery can be accelerated on existing developments, permission sites and allocations;
- drawing on the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and any other appropriate evidence to identify additional allocations where justified;
- preparation of new development plan documents, development briefs and use of the Council's powers to support delivery, such as through Compulsory Purchase Orders; and / or

- undertaking a partial review of the Local Plan, if necessary.

It is proposed to expand on the text at Para 6.14 to further clarify the Council's approach to under-delivery, as above.

### **Storey Homes (PLP\_126)**

Detailed representations have been submitted on behalf of Story Homes in respect of the Plan and Policy H3. Several issues have been flagged up in relation to Policy H3 and are dealt with below, in turn.

- *It is contended that the distribution of supply falls short of the Locational Strategy to achieve a 60/40 development split between the urban/coastal areas and the rural area (Paras. 7.1 – 7.5).*

#### Council Response

The representation shows commitments and allocations for 4,105 dwellings with 1,348 (32.8%) in the rural area. However, the figures do not include contributions on existing developments, or commitments which are profiled for delivery beyond the first five years.

The total level development as set out in the Plan to the end of the plan period is 4,927 dwellings, and can be broken down as follows:

Current Major Developments (Local Plan Table 3):	1,732
Commitments on small sites and conversions (Local Plan Table 3):	185
Policy H3 Housing	2,810
Policy REG3 Skelton	<u>200</u>
	4,927

Excluding commitments on small sites and conversions, the level of development proposed in the rural area is 1,950 dwellings, which equates to 41% of the total. Given that Policy SD2 seeks to achieve a minimum 60% development in the urban and coastal sub-areas<sup>1</sup>. For clarification, in the context of Policy SD2 'development' is not restricted to C3 dwellings, though achieving the 60% target has informed the selection of housing sites in the plan and in that regard it is considered that the supply in the rural area is sufficient.

- *It is contended that the allocations in the rural area do not reflect the settlement hierarchy at Policy SD2 as Guisborough, the principal rural settlement, contains just 29% of the total which is less than the smaller settlement of Brotton.*

#### Council Response

The majority of additional housing supply in Guisborough over the plan period would be on sites which are under development and therefore not allocated, but as per the previous point the representation has not taken account of this. Reflecting its primary status in the rural settlement hierarchy, the plan allows for the provision of over 850 dwellings in Guisborough which accounts for 44% of the rural total and is 20% more than the next placed settlement, which is Skelton.

---

<sup>1</sup> In the event that the allocation at Policy H3.16 is deleted as proposed (see response to Rep PLP\_111), the corresponding proportion of development in the rural area would increase to 42%.

- *The level of development proposed at Boosbeck (70 dwellings) cannot be considered sustainable having regard to the Sustainability Appraisal which states that Boosbeck is ‘comparatively remote from the main East Cleveland Towns and the conurbation’ and there is no employment site in the village.*

#### Council Response

Policy SD2 seeks to direct development to the most sustainable locations and states ‘only limited development of an appropriate scale will be allowed within the service villages and villages’.

No allocations are proposed in the villages, and the proportion of proposed development in service villages, which is on two sites at Carlin How and Boosbeck, is equivalent to 2% of the total supply (6% in the rural area). From that broader perspective, the level of development proposed cannot be considered to be either excessive or to undermine the aims of Policy SD2.

With regard to Boosbeck, Policy H3.30 supports the development of approximately 70 dwellings on the abattoir site and adjacent land (outline consent for 69 dwellings and public open space was subsequently granted in February 2017 to the new landowner). The proposals would result in the appropriate re-use of a vacant brownfield site in the village and would, therefore, be in conformity with Policy SD2 as amended. The development would also achieve a more acceptable use of the abattoir site while helping to meet local housing needs over the plan period and supporting local services.

As noted at Policy H3.30, to support economic viability the development area has been extended onto adjacent land outside development limits to achieve a larger number of dwellings, bearing in mind the abnormal costs pertaining to site clearance and remediation.

It is acknowledged that the scale of development proposed on a single site may appear substantial relative to the size of the settlement, its range of services and its position in the settlement hierarchy. Nonetheless, the level of development proposed is still less than that which has taken place in Boosbeck within the last 15 years, which included two sites for 50 and 25 dwellings respectively.

- *In allocating housing sites, insufficient account has been taken of housing market and economic signals and housing needs in the rural area, as evidenced in the SHMA, and terms of average house prices which confirm variations between settlements with Guisborough having a notably strong housing market; and that this in turn raises questions about deliverability of allocations in lower value housing areas, particularly Loftus and Carlin How (paras. 7.10-7.20).*

#### Council Response

It is recognised that variations exist between sites and localities in terms of housing markets and local needs and this is reflected in the plan as follows:

- Through the generous over-allocation of land against the assessed minimum requirement which exceeds the 20% buffer.
- In the indicative delivery trajectory at *Appendix 4*, where it has been assumed that sites in lower value housing areas, regardless of size, complexity and planning status, may be less likely to be developed in the short-term.



- Some suitable site options in East Cleveland, including sites in Loftus, were excluded as allocations on deliverability grounds.
- The relatively high proportion of supply at Guisborough compared to other rural settlements.

Nonetheless, while it is recognised that house prices in parts of East Cleveland tend to be lower than in Guisborough, it should be noted that significant development has been delivered in East Cleveland over the previous fifteen years or so, particularly at Skelton where completions have exceeded those at Guisborough, demonstrating a resilient local housing market.

The distribution of housing sites and delivery profiling in the rural area is set out in *Table 1*, below. Taking account of ongoing developments, in line with Policy SD2 the supply focuses on the larger and more sustainable settlements, with comparatively limited development going to the smaller villages. Around 45% of the supply would be on sites at Guisborough, where the market is strongest and therefore most likely to withstand a higher level of development. The plan seeks to provide a range of sites to appeal to different sectors of the market and to meet, so far as possible, housing needs and realistic aspirations in the main rural settlements. This approach will also help to support the development of sustainable rural communities rather than concentrate activity in areas of higher market value. Therefore, it is contended that plan promotes a balanced and realistic distribution of housing supply.

*Table 1: Local Plan Rural Housing Distribution and Indicative Projected Delivery*

Settlement	Sites	Under Development	Planning Consent	Dwellings	Years 1-5	Years 6-10	Years 11-16	Years 17+
Guisborough	10	6	1	855	465	340	50	0
Skelton	4	1	1	466	197	104	165	200
Brotton	2	0	1	295	25	90	180	0
Loftus	3	0	1	257 *	-40	130	127	0
Boosbeck	1	0	0	70	0	45	25	0
Carlin How	1	0	1	46	0	10	36	0

\*217 net

- *The plan is not sufficiently flexible as through policies such as SD3 Development Limits, further delivery is stifled and, as such, additional allocations should be allocated in sustainable locations which offer the greatest prospect of delivery.*

#### Council Response

The above point is linked to the argument that the minimum housing requirement at Policy H1 is too low. As the Council believes that the assessed requirement of 234dpa is correct, the inclusion of a significant buffer provides a high degree of flexibility to ensure that the requirement can be comfortably met if some sites do not progress as indicated in the delivery trajectory. In fact, based on the indicative trajectory in Appendix 4 of the plan, the minimum requirement could be achieved within the first 10 years. Confidence in the supply position is further boosted by the following:

- The expectation that, due to the current level of housing commitments, a higher proportion of development can be achieved in the first part of the plan period potentially generating a surplus against the minimum requirement.

- The inclusion of a range of sites across the borough and the limited reliance on large strategic allocations to deliver the requirement.
- No allowance has been made for windfall contributions.
- There are two live housing appeal decisions which, if allowed, could add a further 1,200 dwellings to the supply.

As outlined above in the response to the representation from the Home Builders Federation (PLP\_096), in the event that a deliverable five-year housing land supply cannot be evidenced, the council will take appropriate action in seeking to address any shortfall.

The level of housing supply advanced through the plan is however considered to be sufficiently large and flexible to enable the delivery of an appropriately balanced distribution between settlements and market locations without undermining the achievement of numerical delivery requirements.

- *Para 7.23 refers to the identification of sites at risk of non-delivery as identified in the November 2016 SHLAA and that the majority of sites and units (413 out of 495) are in the rural area which has implications for achieving the 40% supply target. It is suggested that the sites are deleted or supplemented by further allocations.*

#### Council Response

In accordance with guidance in the PPG (Para. 43), the SHLAA includes a risk assessment in terms of delivery prospects. While a large proportion of supply would be on sites which are either under development or being actively pursued by major housebuilders and are therefore considered low risk, ten sites were identified where short-term delivery prospects were less assured, including five sites with planning permission which have been excluded from the Five Year Housing Land Supply Assessment (September, 2016). Nonetheless, unlike those sites which were discounted as allocations due to significant development constraints, it is contended that these sites, are capable of being developed over the course of the plan period.

The ten sites account for a small proportion of the supply (10%) and if none of the rural supply of 413 dwellings was delivered, this would reduce the proportionate supply from 41% to 36%, though this would not be in conflict with Policy SD2 which, as noted above, seeks only to achieve a minimum 60% development in the urban and coastal areas and does not set a target for the rural area. The supporting text, at Para. 2.9, confirms *'approximately 40% of new development will be located in the rural areas, focused around Guisborough and the East Cleveland towns of Brotton, Loftus and Skelton'*.

To reflect current uncertainties, in the delivery trajectory completions have been allocated to later years, thus allowing further time to address any constraints or other matters, or for market conditions to improve including through the implementation of the adopted plan. The comments in the SHLAA reflect differences between sites and delivery assumptions and are not based on any detailed technical analysis, such as that in the Whole Plan Viability Testing Study (December 2016) which concluded: *'Our analysis has shown that based on current policy requirements and site allocations for residential sites, RCBC has struck an appropriate balance between the policy requirements necessary to provide for sustainable development and the realities of economic viability'*<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>2</sup> Plan Viability Testing Update Aspinall Verdi (December 2016), Para 9.6.

The representations also include comments in regard to Policy SD2 and these have been dealt with separately. However to put the supply distribution into perspective, wards in the rural area contain around 33% of households<sup>3</sup>. The higher supply figure proposed at Policy SD2 reflects the relatively high proportion of ongoing developments in the rural area (54% as at 31/03/2017, excluding smaller sites), and the fact that existing developments account for 40% of the supply over the plan period. As sites in the rural area account for 41% of the supply in the plan, there is limited scope to add further allocations.

- *Following on from the comments at 7.23, at Para. 7.24 the deliverability of five sites in East Cleveland as flagged up in the SHLAA (November 2016) is questioned, with low sales values in these locations cited as a key issue. The sites are Hummersea Hills, Loftus, Former Rosecroft School. Loftus (Policy H3.27), Former Handale Primary School. Loftus (Policy H3.28), Boosbeck Abattoir site and adjacent land (Policy H3.30), and Low Cragg Hall, Carlin How (Policy H3.29) and they have a combined potential for 373 dwellings.*

#### Council Response

It is considered that the above sites are capable of being developed within the plan period for the reasons set out below.

- Hummersea Hills, Loftus (147 dwellings; 107 net)

This site comprises the remaining part of a Coast & County Housing mixed tenure housing redevelopment scheme and is the subject of an extant planning permission, having partly been built-out, mostly for affordable housing. Part of the site is the subject of a separate permission, granted in 2015, for an extra care scheme for 60 extra-care affordable apartments. This proposal has attracted HCA funding but, development has been put on hold following changes to government legislation<sup>4</sup>. As that the existing planning consent, which expires in June 2018, may not be activated it has been assumed that development would be achieved in years 6 to 10.

The other part of the scheme relates to the market housing element of the development which has stalled due to limited market interest with 87 units remaining outstanding. The final clearance phase of 40 dwellings was undertaken in 2016 which is likely to make the site more attractive to development. It has been provisionally assumed that completions would be achieved in years 11 to 15, though it is conceivable that new proposals may evolve and that delivery may be achieved sooner.

- *Former Rosecroft School. Loftus (Policy H3.27; 100 dwellings)*

As noted in the SHLAA, the extended site had not been previously been marketed, hence the uncertainty about when development might proceed. The site is an established private residential area in a semi-rural location which comprises larger properties and bungalows and attracts higher sales values than other parts of the town, but this distinction is not captured in average prices in the SHMA which records average values for the entire parish. The original allocation site had historically attracted volume housebuilder interest and has been extended to include part of the adjoining playing field in order to support development viability, with the indicative yield increased from 50 to 100, thereby increasing the potential development value and in turn economic viability. The

---

<sup>3</sup> As per SHMA, Table 1, p31.

<sup>4</sup> As confirmed in the Five Year Housing Land Supply Assessment 2016/17-2020/21 (September 2016).

extended site has been remarketed by the Council and has attracted interest from a major housebuilder. It is therefore considered that site can be built out within the plan period and, while it has been assumed in the trajectory that the development could be achieved within 6 to 10 years, in the subsequent light of renewed developer interest, completions may be achieved before then.

- *Former Handale Primary School. Loftus (Policy H3.28; 10 dwellings)*

As confirmed in the SHLAA, this is a new site and an additional allocation put forward via the consultation on the draft Local Plan. The site is in an older housing area close to social rented housing and smaller terraced properties and comprises an unused early-twentieth century school building and hardstandings. Subject to site clearance (if required) there are no identified physical or availability constraints and given its size and location, the site may be attractive to a smaller developer or social housing provider. The site has not been subject to marketing, hence the uncertainty about when development might proceed and the provisional assumption that completions would be achieved in years 6 to 10. However, notwithstanding the timing of delivery, this is a small site and its redevelopment for housing would have a very limited bearing on the supply position.

- *Boosbeck Abattoir site and adjacent land (H3.30; 70 dwellings)*

This is another new site and an additional allocation put forward via the consultation on the draft Local Plan. The site has not been subject to marketing, hence the provisional assumption that completions would be achieved in years 6 to 10.

As previously noted, the development area has been extended beyond the abattoir site boundary and onto the adjacent open space to achieve a larger number of dwellings to support viability and outline permission has since been granted for 69 dwellings.

Boosbeck has experienced relatively significant development in the last fifteen years, including the Greenside View development (50 dwellings) which is situated near the allocation site. Prior to the 2008-2011 recession, the abattoir site had attracted interest from a major housebuilder. It is therefore reasonable to expect, in light of the extended development area and historic completion levels in the village, that development would be realistically achievable within the next 15 years.

- *Low Cragg Hall, Carlin How (Policy H3.29; 46 dwellings).*

The above site, which is outside adopted development limits, is the subject of a further planning permission shortened to two years, the previous two-year consent having lapsed in 2015. In the original permission, the period for the submission of the reserved matters was reduced from three to two years because the application was approved as a departure from the development plan policy on the basis that the Council could not demonstrate a deliverable five year housing land supply, a reduced time period for the implementation of the permission was stipulated to ensure that delivery of the site takes place within a shorter period of time to help make up the supply shortfall and allow the Local Planning Authority to reconsider the development of the site as part of a review of the local plan should the permission not be implemented. The second application was approved with the same conditions attached.

The site comprises sloped grazing land and there are abnormal costs associated with surface water flood risk management. The representation has drawn attention to the lapsed permission, the localised nature of the housing market and the low sales values achieved at Carlin How. While this is

not a high value residential location, the sales values also however reflect the nature of the housing stock at Carlin How, which is dominated by small, older terraced dwellings without front gardens.

The permission site has the potential to broaden the housing offer in the village, though it is acknowledged that its development will be dependent on generally buoyant market conditions; this happened in the previous decade when an adjacent brownfield site, formerly a timber yard, was redeveloped for 24 semi-detached dwellings and the inclusion of the Cragg Hall Farm site as an allocation may also help to progress its development. The site is considered developable rather than deliverable, with completions assumed towards the end of the plan period, from year 11 onwards.

Over two-thirds of the above supply would be on three sites in Loftus. While it is accepted that average property values in Loftus may be lower than in Guisborough and some other settlements, a noticeable shortage of properties in the town has been identified in the SHMA, including larger detached dwellings, and a significant shortage of smaller affordable units.

The three sites included in the plan are in different neighbourhoods and provide development options which can respond to meeting different unmet needs and aspirations and support the regeneration of the town, with the Rosecroft site in a location which attracts higher sales values.

- *At Para 7.26 it is suggested that the allocations mentioned at Para 7.24 should be deleted or supplemented with reserve sites to address any ensuing under delivery in the rural area.*

#### Council Response

The Council does not agree that the allocations should be deleted as it is considered reasonable to assume that they are capable of development over the course of the plan period. Furthermore, the plan incorporates a significant buffer against the minimum requirement and the delivery trajectory indicates that a surplus against the assessed minimum requirement could accrue in the short-term, which would preclude the need for additional allocations. The trajectory indicates that in the first 10 years, over 75% of the total supply may be built out. As this is equivalent to over 15 years supply, excluding any windfall contributions, it is conceivable that the minimum net requirement could be delivered within the first ten years, without recourse to sites and supply profiled in later years.

The trajectory shows that 70% of the rural area supply would be delivered within the first ten years and would account for 39% of the supply over that period which would be in line with Policy SD2. 59% of this supply would be on Guisborough sites, the vast majority of which is on sites under development.

- *At Para 7.27 it is stated that further housing allocations should be made at Guisborough, and linked to this Paras 7.28 to 7.34. the case is made for the allocating the South of Stokesley Road site and is critical of the suitability assessment in the SHLAA which includes the comment that 'the site is remote from central Guisborough and facilities within walking distance are limited'.*

#### Council Response

Further housing allocations are not justified as the supply of housing land put forward through the plan achieves a 31% surplus against the assessed minimum requirement. Furthermore, the proportion of development in the rural area (41%) is generous when it is considered that the target in Policy SD2 is to achieve at least 60% development in the urban and coastal areas. At Guisborough, over 850 dwellings are proposed and the share of development as set out in the trajectory (44%), is

considerably more than all other rural settlements and is therefore in conformity with the settlement hierarchy. Guisborough sites account for 18% of the overall supply, which is significantly more than the proportion of households in the borough (13%)<sup>5</sup>.

Notwithstanding the numerical supply position, current developments and proposed allocations provide for a range of housing types in Guisborough, with the majority of this supply (around 500 dwellings) to be provided in the west of the town at the ongoing Galley Hill and Pine Walk developments, close to the Stokesley Road site.

The allocation sites in Guisborough (particularly those inside development limits at Cleveland Gate, Wilton Lane and Park Lane) are in more sustainable locations than the Stokesley Road site which is comparatively remote. Most facilities in Guisborough, including shops and businesses in the town centre, major retail and employment sites at Rectory Lane, secondary and further education establishments and healthcare, leisure and community facilities, are beyond reasonable walking distance of the Stokesley Road site.

Taking into account ongoing developments, the development of the site would result in a further westward extension to the built-up area and promote a spatial imbalance and a less sustainable pattern of development away from the town and its services, and a disproportionate supply of housing in Guisborough relative to the overall supply position. Realistically, the allocation of the Stokesley Road site is also likely to strengthen the case for the rejected Galley Hill site on the opposite side of Stokesley Road (see PLP\_126). If both sites were built-out, this would result in the further development of up to 400 dwellings, thereby exacerbating supply and spatial development imbalances.

Reasons for the rejection of the Stokesley Road site (SHLAA ID 454), which was submitted for consideration in response to the Draft Local Plan (June, 2016) are set out in the updated *Housing Land Supply and Allocations Background Evidence Paper (April, 2017)*.

- *Having regard to NPPF Para 48, it is queried why no allowance has been made for windfall contributions when they have been acknowledged as an important source of supply at Para 6.35.*

#### Council Response

The NPPF, at Para. 48, advises that local authorities may wish to include windfalls in the five year housing supply, subject to providing compelling supporting evidence, but it is not suggested that this should be applied over a longer period. Notwithstanding this, sufficient allocations have been identified in the plan to meet the housing requirement, including the buffer, without needing recourse to the application of trend-based windfall assumptions, thereby providing greater certainty that housing needs will be met. While it is recognised that windfall sites are an important source of supply (developments on smaller windfall sites alone averaged 36 dwellings net in the five years from 2011/12 to 2015/16), the estimated contributions from existing permissions on small sites and conversions applied in *Table 3* of the plan (185 dwellings) is similar to the trend-based average on sites of fewer than five units applied in the Five Year Housing Land Supply Assessment (September, 2016).

---

<sup>5</sup> As per SHMA, Table 1, p31.

## Theakston Estates (PLP\_178)

Theakston Estates makes the following representations:

- *Additional housing allocations are needed in order to meet a higher housing requirement than that proposed under Policy H1 which is considered too low.*
- *The site at Woodcock Wood should be allocated because it has been assessed as developable in the SHLAA and has similar characteristics to the adjacent allocation site at Longbank Farm, Ormesby which as outline permission for up to 320 dwellings, granted on appeal (Policy H3.6).*
- *The wording of the policy should be amended to confirm that in the event of a shortfall in five-year housing land supply, a plan review will be undertaken to enable the release of additional sustainable sites for housing.*

### Council Response

As noted above, it is considered that the housing requirement at Policy H1 is correct and, as such, no further allocations are required as sufficient developable supply has been identified to meet the minimum requirement, plus the 20% buffer.

The SHLAA has provided a platform for the further assessment of potential housing sites, including Woodcock Wood, through the plan-making process. Woodcock Wood was rejected as an allocation in favour of other sites in more sustainable and acceptable locations. The reasons for rejection are set out in the *Housing Land Supply and Allocations Background Evidence Paper*.

The site at Longbank Farm was preferred to Woodcock Wood in a previous iteration of the draft Local Plan (September 2013). It is considered that Longbank Farm provides a more sustainable and suitable location for housing than Woodcock Wood, for the following reasons:

- It is more strongly related to an existing residential area and as such is more urban in character. Although part of the site is on higher ground than Woodcock Wood, the principal of residential development on the hillside is long established and through careful design there is an opportunity to manage the impact on the landscape and soften the abrupt urban edge and in that respect the approved layout shows the majority of development on the lower, less visible part of the site.
- There is better access to public transport and the major road network from Longbank Farm. The A171 Ormesby Bank to the west of Longbank Farm is on the main bus route connecting Middlesbrough with Guisborough and East Cleveland with frequent services operating at peak hours. Longbank Farm is also closer to Nunthorpe Railway Station. Woodcock Wood is more distant from the nearest regular bus service, at Bankfields Estate to the north. Ormesby Bank is a main arterial route into Middlesbrough is connected to the A174 Parkway and, via the Nunthorpe Bypass to the south, links to the A172 and A174 westbound in Middlesbrough. Flatts Lane, to the east of Woodcock Wood, is an unclassified road which is not connected with the Parkway and is more distant from the A172 and A174 routes.
- It is in a less ecologically sensitive location. The Longbank Farm site is an intensively mown area of open area arable farmland bordering post-war suburban housing with property curtilages abutting the western and southern boundaries. By contrast, Woodcock Wood occupies a more

secluded setting being enclosed by heavily wooded areas, and separated from the Normanby residential area by the A174 Parkway. The Woodcock Wood site functions as an area of accessible urban fringe countryside blending into the adjacent Flatts Lane Country Park (a local nature reserve), has been recorded as having biodiversity interest and up until recently contained substantial areas of natural grassland.

- Overall, there is better access to educational facilities from Longbank Farm including primary, secondary and tertiary education on a single site at Nunthorpe Academy.

Therefore, while the two sites are adjacent and as such naturally merit comparison, in doing so there are important variations to be drawn between them in terms of accessibility, location, character and, in turn, the potential to achieve sustainable development. As confirmed in the representations, the Woodcock Wood application was refused on sustainability grounds.

With regard to amending the wording of Policy H3 to enable an interim plan review specifically pertaining to five year housing land supply, the Council's position under Policy H1 and detailed above in the response the Home Builders Federation representation (PLP\_096) is considered appropriate bearing in mind the high level of development underway and in the pipeline and having regard to potential delivery risks in the SHLAA.

### **KCS Development Ltd - Windy Hill Farm, Marske (PLP\_060)**

KCS Development proposes that land at Windy Hill Farm, Marske should be allocated for housing for the following reasons:

- *It is an appropriate, sustainable and deliverable site which could help to meet housing needs in the borough.*
- *There are currently no identified physical problems or limitations, other potential impacts or environmental conditions which would preclude the development of the site for housing in the short term, as confirmed in the Officer's report to the 2014 outline application (R/2014/0178/OOM), which set out that the application was considered acceptable, subject to conditions in relation to highways and transport matters, drainage and flood risk, ecology, contamination and works to the public right of way.*
- *Work is ongoing to produce a sensitively designed scheme for the partial development of the site which would not adversely impact on landscape character and would maintain the integrity of the strategic gap.*

### Council Response

As noted above, an appropriate range of sites have been identified to meet assessed housing supply requirements at Policy H1. The 2014 outline application, for 75 dwellings, was refused on the grounds that the proposals were contrary to policies DP1 (Development Limits), CS23 (in relation to Strategic Gaps) and CS22 (Sensitive Landscape Areas). In the emerging local plan, the site was rejected in favour of alternative options in more suitable and sustainable locations with better access to local services. Notwithstanding, while it is appreciated that further work is ongoing to address the concerns about the impact of the development on the sensitive landscape area and the strategic gap with Saltburn, the representations do not provide any substantive evidence to demonstrate that these issues could be satisfactorily overcome.



## **G & M Collins – Land North of High Farm, Teesville (PLP\_165)**

G & M Collins propose that land North of High Farm, Teesville should be included as an allocation for the following reasons:

- *Additional housing allocations are needed in order to meet a higher housing requirement than that proposed under Policy H1 which is considered too low.*
- *It is a developable site in a sustainable location and its inclusion as an allocation alongside the nearby site to the south of High Farm would be appropriate .*

The Land North of High Farm (SHLAA Site ID 418) was excluded as an allocation for the following reasons:

- visual prominence from the A1085 and the noticeable impact of development would have on the green wedge;
- it provides an attractive green space at the entrance to the High Farm development;
- subject to access considerations, partial development on the allocation site the south of High Farm (Policy H3.8), is deemed more appropriate in terms of the impact on the green wedge and in seeking to broaden the housing offer in Greater Eston; and
- the high level of development already proposed on other sites in more sustainable locations in the north of Greater Eston over the plan period.

The representation goes on to address the above reasons for rejection as follows:

- *Although the site is visually prominent from the A1085, the impact of development on the green wedge could be mitigated through appropriate design and landscaping and the footprint of the development would not extend further into the green wedge than the development to the south.*
- *With regard to the loss of the green area at the site entrance, there is a more pressing need to allocate additional housing land and it is contended that the remaining green wedge could provide an attractive setting for the development which in turn, through appropriate landscaping treatments, could improve the setting of the High Farm development.*
- *In terms of comparison with the proposed allocation on land further south, the development could be sensitively designed to limit the impact of development on the green wedge, a purposeful green wedge would be retained to the west and the development would further broaden the housing offer in Greater Eston;*
- *With regard to housing sites and allocations in the north of Greater Eston, attention is again drawn to the need for additional allocations to meet a higher requirement than at Policy H1 and the sustainability credentials of the sites compared to the High Farm development and proposed allocation at Normanby High Farm.*

### Council Response

As noted above, the Council's position in relation to the housing requirement is set out in the response to representations against Policy H1 and, as such, it is considered that no further allocations are required to meet supply requirements.

Although the development of the site would not reduce the depth of the green wedge more than that established by the High Farm development, it would nonetheless have a more noticeable impact on its integrity than the proposed allocation site which is in a less prominent location between the High Farm development and Smiths Dock Park and on that basis is a preferable site.

Any contribution to the wider environmental improvements in the green wedge would not deliver any further benefit to what is already proposed as a condition of the existing permission to create a community woodland and enhance the green wedge. At present, the site functions as well-managed amenity green space which provides an attractive setting for the High Farm development and an appropriately open area of land in the green wedge. These attributes would be diminished in the event of development with no indication that the community woodland would be any more likely to become established as a result.

It is not clear how in 'further broadening the housing offer in Greater Eston' the development of this site might differ from the general market housing currently being provided at High Farm, or the low cost market housing being built at Fabian Place and other potential development sites in the same area, including the major site at Low Grange Farm. The proposed allocation site to the south has, in contrast, been advanced by the same site promoter as an 'executive' housing location. Although this claim has not been substantiated, the site is close to mid-market private suburban housing at Normanby from where it would be accessed, and as such a higher value product which expands the local housing offer is likely to be more feasible than on the northern site.

It is acknowledged that in being particularly close to shops and other local services along the Trunk Road corridor at South Bank the site is in a sustainable location, albeit less so than the allocated sites further east at Eston Park and Low Grange Farm. Furthermore, notwithstanding the separate debate about housing requirements, it is considered that sufficient allocations have been identified in the Greater Eston North housing sub-area over the course of the plan period considering local market capacity.

Taking into account the current developments at High Farm and Fabian Place, 670 dwellings are proposed within the plan period including, it is assumed, 200 completions at the Low Grange Farm site which has an outline consent for 1,250. The proposed level of development in the market area is substantially more than that achieved over recent decades, during which time significant housing clearance has also taken place in parts of South Bank and Grangetown, leaving areas of vacant urban land. Where new development has been achieved, this has typically been for social or lower cost market housing. The sub-area is, overall, characterised by lower property values and a large social rented stock. That the High Farm development has been reconfigured from larger detached dwellings to general housing is testimony to local market limitations. In seeking to maintain a continuous five year land supply, it is important to avoid compromising housing delivery and the development of other sites by over-allocating land in the same market area.

### **G & M Collins – Normanby High Farm - Policy 3.8 (PLP\_166)**

Land at Normanby High Farm has been allocated for the partial development of up to 150 dwellings, to the south of the existing High Farm development. While supporting the allocation in principal, the representation contends that the policy is unsound for the following reasons:

- *Because the cap of 150 dwellings is not justified as the overall housing requirement is too low and in providing additional supply the site can accommodate up to 300 dwellings, as demonstrated in the submitted highway capacity study.*
- *Policy criterion d), requiring the prior completion of the ongoing High Farm development, is unreasonable and overly restrictive and would not be in conformity with the NPPF to boost significantly the supply of new housing.*

#### Council Response

The ceiling of 150 dwellings reflects recognised junction capacity limitations at Skippers Lane / Ormesby Road junction, which has limited scope for improvement. The representations have suggested that the site could accommodate up to 300 dwellings, but this would also be dependent on accessing the site from the north, which would not be considered acceptable as the existing access road is not designed to serve a larger development. The provision of a second access route from the north, to the west of the ongoing development would not be acceptable because it is considered inappropriate in design terms and would further diminish the green wedge. The submitted capacity assessment concludes that the site could accommodate up to 200 dwellings if served solely from the south.

Notwithstanding capacity estimates, however, the Normanby High Farm site has been allocated in order to ensure the residual requirement can be met once other sites have been taken into account. Bearing in mind the substantial buffer against the assessed minimum requirement, there is no need to increase this figure in order to comply with Policy H1.

While it is recognised that the delivery of the site would not be dependent on securing access through the existing development, as confirmed in the Plan (Para.6.91), criterion d. has been included in order to promote the achievement of a coherent extension to the development and continuity of housing supply. The prior completion of the existing development will support the progressive southerly development of the High Farm site and is informed by the level of ongoing commitments, which based on recent completion rates represents more than five years' supply, and includes the final phase of the scheme, for which detailed permission for 116 dwellings was secured by the landowner in May 2015.

The final phase is being marketed and it is pointed out in the representation that in the event it is not taken up by a volume housebuilder, the landowner may seek to undertake the development themselves. However, the implication of this, that commitment from a major housing provider has yet to be secured, would appear to lend justification to the Council's policy approach.

#### **Taylor Wimpey - Sparrow Park Farm, New Marske (PLP\_113)**

Taylor Wimpey proposes that land at Sparrow Park Farm, New Marske should be included as an allocation for 300-350 dwellings for the following reasons:

- *Additional housing allocations are needed in order to meet a higher housing requirement than that proposed under Policy H1, which is considered too low, and in order to significantly boost the supply of housing.*
- *The site is in a sustainable location and development will help to meet local housing needs over the plan period.*

Sparrow Park Farm (SHLAA Site ID 13) was excluded as an allocation for the following reasons:

- New Marske has relatively limited service provision, and reflecting this it is included towards the bottom of the settlement hierarchy at Policy SD2 as one of four rural service villages. As the policy advocates 'limited development of an appropriate scale in villages and service villages', with the majority of development directed to the urban and coastal sub areas and higher ranking rural settlements. It is contended therefore that the proposed scale of development would be disproportionately large and contrary to the overarching policy.
- There are alternative sites in locations within or adjacent to larger settlements nearby which have a greater array of services and facilities and would, from a sustainability perspective, be more suitable for large-scale development and capable of satisfying local housing demand.
- Development could set a precedent for a further substantive northwards extension on the remaining 16ha.

The representation goes on to address the above reasons for rejection as follows:

- *The key issue facing New Marske is ensuring the provision of new housing to meet local needs and sustain local services. New Marske is larger than the other three service villages and is, on the Council's admittance<sup>6</sup>, more sustainable than other service villages as it is closer to and has better links to the larger settlements at Marske, Redcar and the Teesside conurbation. The same representation, against Policy SD2, argues that New Marske should be included as part of the coastal sub-area.*
- *Development in larger settlements would not address the issues raised in the Council's own evidence base which states unmet needs within New Marske.*
- *As presented in the site promoter's submission document, allocation of land to the north is not being sought. Furthermore, the proposal should be considered on its own merits in accordance with well-established planning principles and, as such, whether the allocation as proposed would set a precedent for further development to the north is irrelevant.*

### Council Response

As noted above, the Council's position in relation to the housing requirement is set out in the response to representations against Policy H1. It is considered that no further allocations are required to meet supply requirements.

The representation does not expand on the point about significantly increasing the supply of housing. However, the plan achieves this objective as the level of development proposed through existing developments, commitments and allocations (over 300 dwellings per annum) is considerably more than historic delivery rates with, for example, annual net completions over the last 15 and 25 year periods averaging around 200 and 185 respectively. The increase in supply also needs to be considered within the context of steadily declining household growth projections over the plan period.

---

<sup>6</sup> As quoted in the Sustainable Appraisal.

Notwithstanding the response regarding Policy SD2, which is being dealt with separately, New Marske is a smaller and less sustainable settlement Redcar, Marske and Saltburn with fewer services, and the scale of development proposed is excessive relative to the size and function of the settlement and the geographical distribution of housing supply as proposed through the plan.

The Council's stated position, about meeting local housing needs and supporting local services, which is quoted in the Sustainability Appraisal, originates from an earlier document, the Preferred Housing Allocations Background Evidence Report (January 2009) which accompanied the LDF Communities Development Plan Document (Preferred Options). The quoted text was applied without exception to all services villages and smaller villages and reflects Policy CS2 of the adopted LDF Core Strategy, which advocates '*limited development in the East Cleveland service villages and villages*'. It does not, therefore, reflect any recent evidence of housing need and demand in New Marske. Furthermore, due to the high level of development proposed in the plan relative to the assessed requirement and the proximity of New Marske to larger settlements, it is conceivable that housing needs may be met elsewhere, in more sustainable locations, and without reducing the population or undermining service provision in the village.

While recognising that the proposal does need to be considered on its merits, the Council's concerns in relation to the further development of the site are informed by sustainability considerations and the following observations:

- The wider site, which extends to 35ha, is disproportionate to the size and function of New Marske as a dormitory settlement and would more than double the footprint of the built-up area.
- A significant extension on just over half the land area is proposed and the indicative layout continues to show the relationship between the proposed development and the remainder of the site. The development as proposed would undoubtedly set a precedent for development to the north of New Marske.
- The submission document refers to the site as '*a sustainable and logical non-strategic opportunity (or a strategic opportunity to deliver a significant number of dwellings should the entire site be brought forward)*', thus bringing the additional land into focus as a further development option, particularly as the physical development of the wider site would appear feasible within the plan period.

### **Taylor Wimpey - North of Marske Road, Saltburn (PLP\_114)**

Taylor Wimpey proposes that land North of Marske Road, Saltburn should be included as an allocation, for 55-60 dwellings, for the following reasons:

- *Additional housing allocations are needed in order to meet a higher housing requirement than that proposed under Policy H1, which is considered too low, and in order to significantly boost the supply of housing.*
- *The site is in a sustainable location and development will help to meet local housing needs over the plan period.*

### **Council Response**

This site was put forward following consultation on the Draft Local Plan (May 2016) and a site promotional document (January 2017) has been submitted with the representations.

As noted above, the Council's position in relation to the housing requirement is set out in the response to representations against Policy H1; it is considered that no further allocations are required to meet supply requirements. The representation does not expand on the point about significantly boosting housing supply, but as above the plan achieves this objective as the proposed level of development, as well as significantly exceeding the assessed minimum requirement, is considerably more than historic delivery rates. The increased supply also needs to be considered within the context of steadily declining household growth projections which provide the baseline for determining the housing requirement. The site is closer to Marske than the permission site on the opposite (south) side of Marske Road, and, as such, the impact on the strategic gap is potentially more significant

### **Taylor Wimpey – Land North and West of Galley Hill, Guisborough (PLP\_115)**

Taylor Wimpey proposes that land at North and West of Galley Hill, Guisborough should be included as an allocation, for 195 dwellings, for the following reasons:

- *Additional housing allocations are needed in order to meet a higher housing requirement than that proposed under Policy H3 which is considered too low, and in order to significantly boost the supply of housing.*
- *The site is in a sustainable location and development will help to meet local housing needs over the plan period.*

#### Council Response

As noted above, the Council's position in relation to the housing requirement is set out in the response to representations against Policy H1. It is considered that no further allocations are required to meet supply requirements.

The representation does not expand on the point about significantly boosting housing supply, but as above the Council would argue that the plan achieves this objective as the proposed level of development, as well as significantly exceeding the assessed minimum requirement, is considerably more than historic delivery rates. The increased supply also needs to be appreciated within the context of official household projections which provide the baseline for determining the housing requirement and forecast a steady decline in household growth rates over the plan period.

The reasons for rejecting this site as an allocation in the emerging plan were set out in the Housing Land Supply and Allocations Background Evidence Paper (June 2016):

- The site is relatively remote from local services and central Guisborough and development would result in a further substantial, westward extension to the built-up area, in addition to the existing major developments at Galley Hill and Pine Walk.
- There are alternative sites which are in more sustainable locations and together with existing housing sites they would be expected to provide a sufficient range of housing to meet needs and aspirations in Guisborough over the plan period.

Some issues which apply to the nearby site South of Stokesley Road (PLP\_126), as considered above, also apply here and include the following:

- The relatively high level of development already ongoing and proposed at Guisborough, most of which (over 500 dwellings) is on two adjacent sites.
- The allocation sites at Guisborough, particularly those within the adopted development limits, are in more sustainable locations within the town than the subject site which is remote from most services and facilities.
- Development would result in a further westward extension to the built-up area and, taking into account ongoing adjacent developments, would promote an imbalanced and less sustainable pattern of development on the west periphery of the town.
- Realistically, the allocation of the site would also strengthen the case in planning terms for development on the site on the opposite side of Stokesley Road, thereby exacerbating supply and spatial development imbalances.

### **Taylor Wimpey – Grundales, Marske & Mackinlay Park, Redcar (PLP\_116)**

Representations from Taylor Wimpey promote the development of two neighbouring sites in the green wedge between Redcar and Marske as follows:

- 430 dwellings in farmland as a greenfield extension at Grundales to the north-west of Marske (SHLAA site 403);
- 310 dwellings at Redcar Rugby Union Football Club, Mackinlay Park, Redcar (SHLAA site 158).

Taylor Wimpey proposes that the above site should be included as a housing allocation for the following reasons:

- *Additional housing allocations are needed in order to meet a higher housing requirement than that proposed under Policy H1, which is considered too low, and in order to significantly boost housing supply.*
- *The site is in a sustainable location and development will help to meet local housing needs over the plan period.*

It has been confirmed that while the two proposals have been submitted together the delivery of either is not dependent on the other. Responses for each proposal are therefore dealt with separately, below.

### **Grundales Site**

The Grundales site falls within the Green Wedge between Marske and Redcar and is in a sensitive landscape area. The proposals show two distinct housing areas separated by formal open space and the provision of a road link from the A1085 Coast Road to serve the proposed development. The site was rejected in the emerging plan for the following reasons:

- There are alternative site options which are in less environmentally-sensitive locations and preference should be given to those sites on that basis, including the including the preferred greenfield extension at Mickle Dales (Site 451) and the urban greenfield site at Kirkleatham Lane (Site 450).
- Development, including the provision of a dedicated access road from the A1085, could impact on the characteristically flat and open character of the coastal landscape area which is, although without formal designation, also recognised as a premier regional birding site, ('Redcar Coastal Fields') attracting a range of rare and endangered bird species and wading coastal birds.
- Although the green wedge is particularly broad at this point, and development as proposed would still leave a significant gap with Redcar, in the absence of a defensible boundary, development could serve to encourage further intrusive development towards Redcar or the coast.

The representation includes a rebuttal to the above.

#### Council Response

Although the representations state that a significant area of green wedge land would be retained, the proposed development would still visibly extend into the green wedge and the characteristically flat and open sensitive landscape area, with the impact prominent in distant views from the A1085 Coast Road.

#### **Mackinlay Park**

Mackinlay Park abuts housing at the south-eastern edge of Redcar and falls within the green wedge between Redcar and Marske. The site comprises the RRUFC clubhouse, playing pitches, car park and squash courts.

The proposals show the wholesale development of the site for up to 310 dwellings, with the sports facilities relocating onto adjacent farmland, which falls within the sensitive landscape area. The housing site and the new sports facilities would be served via the existing suburban road network at Green Lane / Oak Road.

The site was rejected in the emerging plan for the following reasons:

- There are alternative greenfield options which are in less environmentally- sensitive locations and are more imminently developable, including the proposed allocations at Mickle Dales and West of Kirkleatham Lane.
- The prospective re-use of existing farmland with managed grassed pitches and built facilities and possible requirement for a new access road could, subject to land assembly, have an adverse impact on the character of the sensitive landscape area which is, although without formal designation, also recognised as a premier regional birding site, ('Redcar Coastal Fields') attracting a range of rare and endangered bird species and wading coastal birds.

The representation includes a rebuttal to the above and an objection, which is being dealt with separately, to the protection of the site under Policy N3 as secondary open space.



### Council Response

As noted above, the Council's position in relation to the housing requirement is set out in the response to representations against Policy H1. It is considered that no further allocations are required to meet supply requirements.

The representation does not expand on the point about significantly boosting housing supply, but as above the plan achieves this objective as the proposed level of development, as well as significantly exceeding the assessed minimum requirement, is considerably more than historic delivery rates and needs to be considered within the context of steadily declining annual household growth projections.

Although the representations seek to address issues around the impact of the housing development and the relocation of the sports clubs on the green wedge and the sensitive landscape area (with ornithological matters to be considered further), the issue of potentially providing a separate access road has not been considered.

Therefore, notwithstanding housing requirement and land supply issues, the Council maintains concerns about the impact of development on public safety and residential amenity if, as proposed, the existing minor suburban road network at Green Lane was used to serve a more substantive development generating a significant increase in vehicle movements.

### **Taylor Wimpey – Flat Cat Lane, Marske (PLP\_117)**

Taylor Wimpey proposes that land at Flat Cat Lane, Marske should be included as an allocation for the following reasons:

- *Additional housing allocations are needed in order to meet a higher housing requirement than that proposed under Policy H1, which is considered too low, and in order to significantly boost the supply of housing.*
- *The site is in a sustainable location and development will help to meet local housing needs over the plan period.*

The site at Flat Cat Lane forms part of a larger area of agricultural land to the West of Longbeck Road (SHLAA Site 010) which was rejected as an allocation in the draft Local Plan for the following reasons:

- Development would noticeably impact on the strategic gap and could establish the principle of further development between the railway and the A174 on the larger Sites 54 and 55 to the east.
- Bearing in mind the proposed allocation at Mickie Dales (Site 451), development could noticeably reduce the gap between Redcar and Marske when viewed from the A174 and other prominent vantage points.
- Unlike alternative sites nearby, comprehensive development would appear to be dependent on securing agreement between different landowners.

In rebuttal of the first reason for refusal, it is pointed out that the development would not have any greater adverse impact on the strategic gap than the Marske Inn Farm site previously proposed by the Council as a housing allocation (in the Draft Local Plan, September 2013).

The representations do not comment on the other two reasons for refusal regarding establishing precedent for development south of the railway line and land assembly issues. With regard to the latter point, it should be noted that part of the site is in the same ownership as the Marske Inn Farm appeal site.

#### Council Response

As noted above, the Council's position in relation to the housing requirement is set out in the response to representations against Policy H1. It is considered that no further allocations are required to meet supply requirements.

The representation does not expand on the point about significantly boosting housing supply, but again the Council would argue that the plan achieves this objective as the proposed level of development, as well as significantly exceeding the assessed minimum requirement, is considerably more than historic delivery rates and needs to be considered within the context of steadily declining household growth projections which provide the baseline for determining the housing requirement.

Although the Marske Inn Farm site was previously included as an allocation this was rejected by the Council in a later iteration of the plan, and a subsequent planning application for a mixed use development was refused on the basis that development would have an adverse impact on the strategic gap. The proposals are the subject of an appeal inquiry with a decision anticipated before the end of May.

#### **Taylor Wimpey – Morton Carr Farm, Nunthorpe (PLP\_118)**

Taylor Wimpey propose that land at Morton Carr Farm, Nunthorpe (referred to as 'East Nunthorpe') should be included as a strategic allocation for approximately 1,500 dwellings together with open space and community facilities including convenience retail and land reserved for a primary school for the following reasons:

- *Additional housing allocations are needed in order to meet a higher housing requirement than that proposed under Policy H1, which is considered too low, and in order to significantly boost the supply of housing.*
- *The site is in a sustainable location and development will help to meet local housing needs over the plan period.*

Morton Carr Farm (SHLAA Site 402) was rejected in the draft Local Plan for the following reasons:

- Significant development is already proposed nearby, including nearly 500 dwellings on three sites identified as preferred allocations, which are more strongly related to the urban area and are in more sustainable locations. Preference should therefore be given to the development of these sites. Also, allocating this site would load excessive and unrealistic dwelling requirements onto the Nunthorpe area, potentially to the detriment of local infrastructure capacity including secondary school provision and the wider highway network in Redcar &

Cleveland and Middlesbrough, bearing in mind the substantial level of residential development taking place or proposed either side of the administrative boundary.

- The potential scale of development is not needed to meet overall housing requirements and aspirations, and focussing development at this location would not be in conformity with the aims of the plan to prioritise development within settlements and to achieve an appropriate balance between different areas of the borough.

It was subsequently noted in the SHLAA (November 2016, Para 3.14) that:

‘While the indicative proposals for Morton Carr Farm seek to incorporate some local facilities including the potential provision of a primary school and local shops, significant questions remain regarding the cumulative impact of large-scale development on the ability to meet infrastructure requirements, notably in relation to the impact on the local highway network, including the strategic road network (A174 and A19) and on local services including secondary education and healthcare’.

### Council Response

As previously noted, the Council’s position in relation to the housing requirement is set out in the response to representations against Policy H1 and it is considered that no further allocations are required to meet supply requirements.

The representation does not expand on the point about significantly boosting housing supply, but as above the Council would argue that the plan achieves this objective given that the proposed level of development, as well as significantly exceeding the assessed minimum requirement, is considerably more than historic delivery rates and need to be considered within the context of the official household projections which provide the baseline for determining the housing requirement and show progressively declining household growth over the plan period.

The representation does not dispute the existence of more sustainable sites nearby, nor does it respond to the point about achieving an appropriately balanced spatial distribution of development, or to the concerns about the impact on off-site infrastructure as stated in the SHLAA. Rather, alongside the wider arguments about the need for a higher requirement and additional housing allocations, it focuses on the sustainable location of the site and refers to the potential to provide on-site facilities including ancillary retail and potentially a primary school.

Therefore, and notwithstanding the housing requirement and land supply issues, the Council maintains that the proposals are considered inappropriate taking into account the wider development and infrastructure context and in terms of the locational policy and spatial strategies in the emerging plan.

### **Taylor Wimpey – Newstead Farm, Guisborough (PLP\_153)**

Taylor Wimpey proposes that land at Newstead Farm, Guisborough should be allocated for the development of ‘executive-style’ housing, for the following reasons:

- *Additional housing allocations are needed in order to meet a higher housing requirement than that proposed under Policy H1, which is considered too low.*
- *The site is in a sustainable location within Guisborough and there are no insurmountable constraints preventing its viable development.*

The site was rejected as an allocation in the emerging local plan for the following reasons:

- There are alternative sites in Guisborough which are in more sustainable and less environmentally-sensitive locations and are less physically and environmentally constrained.
- There are significant physical and environmental constraints and the associated abnormal costs may prohibit the provision of genuine executive housing developed at a particularly low density (perhaps of 10 dwellings per hectare or less, as defined in the emerging plan), which would be similar to the adjacent housing at Stokesley Road and would be most appropriate at this site.

In the SHLAA, the site has previously been identified as 'not currently developable' due to the multiple physical constraints affecting its developability (vehicular access, varied topography and irregular linear configuration, flood risk from Chapel and Hutton Becks, biodiversity value and pipelines crossing the sites and the potential, to achieve a genuine low density executive housing development which would be considered appropriate at this location).

#### Council Response

The representations have also drawn attention to the inclusion of the site in the Preferred Options Draft LDF Communities DPD (2009). The site was allocated for the development of up to 40 executive dwellings, to be developed at a density of no more than 10 dwellings per hectare, together with a major linear green space and subject to a number of conditions including achieving satisfactory vehicular access into the site and avoiding development in areas at risk of flooding. The widest, central part of the site, which would assume the main developable area, is bordered to the north by larger lower density properties with substantial gardens and this, together with the identification of Guisborough as a suitable location for 'executive' housing in the 2009 SHMA, informed the policy position.

The Council's view on developability is informed by the impact of physical constraints in undermining the ability to achieve a genuine, low-density executive housing scheme as previously advocated through the LDF. Evidently, without a substantial and inappropriate increase in density and housing numbers, assuming vehicular access constraints can be satisfactorily addressed, development may not be achievable. As the representations do not address this and other, on-site concerns, the Council would dispute the assertion that all delivery constraints can be satisfactorily overcome.

The representations do not include an indicative layout or a dwelling estimate, but propose 'executive-style' housing, which implies a higher density and may be line with previously submitted layouts from other parties which proposed a much higher yield of up to 75 dwellings.

The representations also state that the entire is inside Flood Zone 1. However it should be noted that the Environment Agency map shows that parts of the site, albeit mostly in peripheral areas, fall within the indicative flood plains of Hutton and Chapel Becks and some central parts of the site, where development is most feasible, are at risk of surface water flooding. Any development proposals would therefore need to be designed around these issues and incorporate a sustainable urban drainage scheme.

Notwithstanding the capacity to overcome constraints and to achieve an acceptable development appropriate to the site and its location, Guisborough is experiencing a substantial increase in housing supply with developments progressing on several major sites which, together with proposed

allocations, provide for significant additions to the housing stock and a range of house types, including detached dwellings, and would be expected to meet housing requirements in the town over the course of the plan period. Furthermore, the proportion of detached dwellings in the town is relatively high<sup>7</sup> and the updated SHMA has not identified any unmet demand for larger detached properties.

As noted above in the response to Story Homes (PLP\_126), the overall share of development in Guisborough is higher than the proportion households and is significantly more than any other rural settlement, which strongly reflects the rural settlement hierarchy.

It is considered therefore that no further allocations are needed in Guisborough and, assuming physical constraints could be overcome, the proposed development of executive-style housing is not required or appropriate at Newstead Farm.

### **Taylor Wimpey – Kilton Lane, Brotton (PLP\_154)**

- *The submitted representations supports in principle the allocation of Land at Kilton Lane, Brotton, as set out under Policy H3.25 in the Publication Local Plan, but the following amendments to the policy are requested:*
  - *that the allocation boundary is extended to incorporate land further east, as included as part of the application site previously submitted by Taylor Wimpey in 2011 (application ref. 2011/0301/OOM) for housing and a sustainable drainage scheme.*
  - removal of criteria requiring the resolution of sewage treatment capacity issues (criterion h.), and the resolution of archaeological matters (criterion i.), as all the relevant technical matters were resolved as part of the 2011 application to develop on part of the site to the east of Kilton Lane and the application was refused only in principle.

### **Council Response**

The 2011 application (ref. 2011/ 0301/OOM) sought outline permission for a mixed-use development, comprising a retail food store, C2 residential care home and 158 dwellings on part of the allocation site, covering a larger development footprint on land to the east of Kilton Lane and an area of steeply sloping land to the east which would be used for drainage purposes associated with the proposed development.

Regardless of the level of agreement previously reached on different technical matters, as the proposed allocation site also includes land to the west of Kilton Lane, it is appropriate that the criteria set out in the policy should still apply, with the exception of criterion h). in relation to sewage treatment (see explanation below).

The 2011 application was rejected on the basis that the site was outside development limits and the proposals did not meet any of the exceptions criteria under development plan Policy DP1 Development Limits, but this in itself did not infer that the scheme layout, including the residential footprint, was considered acceptable. The Council does not agree with extending the developable area and the development limit boundary beyond the established building line in order to extend the housing area further east.

---

<sup>7</sup> As per Redcar & Cleveland Local Housing Assessment (2006).

Reiterating the response in the Report of Consultation to the Draft Local Plan (October 2016), the southerly extension of the development limit from the rear of properties at Crispin Court southwards to meet the Brotton by-pass would achieve a logical and uniform extension to the built-up area than that proposed in the application and, including the land to the west of Kilton Lane, would promote a more contained and sustainable greenfield extension which would be more strongly related to the settlement and closer to services and facilities in the village. Furthermore, subject to the mitigation of archaeological issues, the removal of retail and C2 residential uses has the potential to compensate for the loss of dwelling capacity as previously proposed, notwithstanding the additional capacity on the western site.

With regard to sustainable drainage requirements, the Council would again refer to its response in the Report of Consultation and to Policy SD3 (criteria j) which allows for development outside development limits where it is required for technical or operational reasons. The application proposals sought to establish a sustainable drainage system via the provision of a pumping station and utilising the downward slope of the land to the north-east. As proposals of this nature would appear to be acceptable under policy SD3(j), the development limit would not need to be extended for the purpose of accommodating the SUDS scheme.

It is agreed that criteria h) regarding foul sewage treatment should be removed as Northumbrian Water have submitted a representation stating that they consider that it is not required (see PLP\_75). The removal of criterion h). from Policy H3.25 will therefore be included as a proposed modification to the plan.

It is not agreed that archaeological matters were resolved as part of the application process and does not therefore support the removal of criterion i). The archaeological evaluation associated with the application, published in August 2011, concluded that further work needed to be undertaken in order to establish the full extent of the archaeological remains and to agree appropriate mitigation measures (whether through preservation in-situ or excavation) and there is no further evidence that the additional work was completed or that specific mitigation arrangements were agreed. Furthermore, a revised layout has not been submitted to show how archaeological issues would be addressed.

