



The countryside charity
North Yorkshire

PO Box 189
York
YO7 9BL

www.cprenorthyorkshire.co.uk

Tel: 07983 088120
Email: info@cprenorthyorkshire.co.uk

Branch Chair
Mrs Jan Arger

Authority: Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council

Type of consultation: Planning application

Full details of application/consultation: R/2021/0019/OOM - Outline application for up to 275 residential units, or up to 275 residential units with assisted living housing, with associated access, landscaping and open space

At land at: West of Kirkleatham Lane, Redcar

Type of response: Objection

Date of Submission: 25th February 2021

All responses or queries relating to this submission should be directed to the Secretary for the Trustees at the contact details shown above on this frontispiece.

All CPRE North Yorkshire comments are prepared by the charity using professional planners whose research and recommendations form the basis of this response in line with national CPRE policies.

External planning consultant used in this response:



KVA Planning Consultancy
Katie Atkinson, BA (Hons), Dip TP, MA
MRTPI
www.kvaplaning.co.uk

Comment

CPRE North Yorkshire ('CPRENY') welcomes the opportunity to comment on above application submitted on behalf of Homes England to Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council ('The Council').

Having had the opportunity to consider the documents, it is understood that the principle of development of this site was established via policy H3.15 of the adopted Local Plan and that an outline permission was granted for up to 550 dwellings on the wider site (R/2016/0663/OOM). Furthermore, land to the south of the application site, comprising part of the outline permission site is currently under construction as 'phase-1' of the Kirkleatham Green development, following the grant of planning permission for 376 dwellings in 2019 (R/2019/0485/RMM). The site location subject to this application is, therefore, the remainder of the site and would consist of 'phase-2' if approved.

CPRENY, therefore, do not object to the principle of the development at this stage, however, do have concerns regarding the two scenarios put forward for the Council to determine which amount to an objection against the proposals in its current guise.

Comments are set out in the remainder of this response.

Planning Context

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that an application should be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material planning considerations indicate otherwise.

The National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF') was updated on 19 February 2019 and sets out the government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. The NPPF is, therefore, a material consideration which should be taken into account in determining this application.

The planning system should contribute to achieving sustainable development. The NPPF aims to deliver sustainable development through the implementation of its policies. Paragraph 11 states that for decision making this means:

- c) *'approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; [...]*

The Development Plan relevant to this application consists of the Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan 2015-2032. The Local Plan is considered up to date, having been found sound by an Independent Inspector and adopted by the Council in May 2018, therefore, full weight can be afforded to the relevant policies within the development plan when determining this application, in line with paragraph 11 of the NPPF as set out above.

The applicant has submitted an outline application for two options, both of which CPRENY will consider in this response. Option A: is for up to 275 residential units; or, Option B: for 275 dwellings with assisted living accommodation.

The application site forms the northern part of the overall site granted outline permission in 2017 for up to 550 dwellings across the 23Ha site. This is in conformity with Policy H3.15 of the Middlesbrough Local Plan. It was envisaged that the site would be developed in two phases, initially in phase-1 for 300 dwellings and 250 for phase-2. However, the developer who submitted the detailed reserved matters application for the phase-1 site (the southern section) received planning permission for 375 dwellings. In combination, should the Council be so minded as to approve the outline application for up to 275 dwellings across the phase-2 site subject to this application, this would lead to an overall increased yield of 650 dwellings. This would be 100 dwellings above the intended site yield as set out by policy H3.15 of the Local Plan.

As this is an outline planning application, CPRENY would be concerned that a future detailed Reserved Matters application could be submitted to the same effect, requesting an increased yield over and above the 275 as suggested by this application. As such this would be significantly over the intended number allocated in the Local Plan and assessed against the Council's sustainability appraisal at the time. Furthermore, and importantly, CPRENY would be concerned that the site had not been subject to a full environmental impact assessment which would accurately determine the potential impacts and appropriate mitigations required as a result of the development proposal.

The site is situated only 2.1 km from the established Teesmouth and Cleveland Special Protection Area and Ramsar Site, however, the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SSSI and proposed extension to the Ramsar are located only 1.3 km from the site and as such, CPRENY were surprised that the Council did not seek a full EIA. The Council has a statutory duty under the Habitats Regulations to ensure that no detrimental impact is incurred on protected sites and species as a result of development. CPRENY would hope the Council are fully satisfied that this large proposal would not impact the designations and would fully comply with section 15 of the NPPF.

The applicant has not submitted adequate information to fully consider Option B and as such CPRENY assume that the developer would prefer to deliver Option A. It is unclear as to whether the assisted living accommodation is over and above the 275 units proposed for the site, or whether each proposed dwelling is to offer some form of assisted living. The Council should seek to clarify this prior to determination should this be a viable option. CPRENY would have concerns however, that vulnerable (elderly and less mobile) people would be located at a distance from services and facilities which would require reliance on private vehicles and equally being located so close to the existing industrial facilities at Wilton and do not believe this would be considered policy compliant.

Whilst it is recognised that this is an outline application, no indication of how this proposal will seek to use low carbon technologies to ensure the site is delivered to a net-zero (or as low as possible) standard have been included in the application documents. The overall site will deliver a minimum of 650 dwellings, and as such the Council should seek to ensure that all dwellings are built and delivered to an appropriate standard ensuring lifetime homes for residents alongside appropriate mitigation for the climate impacts of such a large development.

Furthermore, National Planning Policy is very clear that proposals should demonstrate a measurable net gain in biodiversity (paragraph 175d) and the emerging Environment Bill is expected to set out a requirement for all proposals to achieve a minimum net gain of 10% in biodiversity, which is already being rolled out as good practise across the country. CPRE consider that a site of this size should be capable of achieving a greater than 10% net gain and would encourage the Council to be pro-active in this regard, especially considering the benefits to biodiversity and climate change but also for the health and well-being of future residents.

In conclusion, CPRENY understand that the site already benefits from outline planning permission and that the site is allocated in the recently adopted Local Plan.

However, CPRENY object to the application in its current guise for 275 dwellings across the phase-2 site in this outline application which, if approved, would deliver 100 dwellings over and above the original outline permission and that set out in Policy H3.15 of the Local Plan. Scenarios put forward in both Option A (whilst preferable) and Option B are both considered too large for the overall site in combination with that already approved. It is understood that the figure of '550' (dwellings) cited in the plan is an 'estimated yield', however, 100 dwellings over this estimated amount is considered significant. Should a future detailed application seek to increase the permitted amount further (as was previously the case with Phase-1), then this would be a further substantial increase and the whole development would not be policy compliant and

should, in our opinion have been subject to appropriate assessment and EIA.

Furthermore, CPRENY are disappointed with the lack of information submitted in support of the proposals relating to the impacts the development will have on climate change and how this will be mitigated against through design or appropriate technologies. Equally, lacking is information relating to the required provision of measurable net gain for biodiversity.

CPRENY reserve the right to comment further should additional information be submitted in support of the proposals.