

written statement for

Matter 4 subjects

Wednesday 16 June am

Methodology for selecting housing allocations (3)

Coniscliffe Park South and Coniscliffe Park North housing allocations (refs 41 and 249)

The Council has proposed main modifications to appendix B with the aim of ensuring that the Plan is sound with regard to flood risk on the two Coniscliffe Park housing allocations.

Q4.10. Are the proposed Coniscliffe Park South and Coniscliffe Park North housing allocations, with total capacity for around 1,520 dwellings and respective indicative yields of 420 and 630 dwellings during the plan period, justified? In particular:

The land being proposed goes directly against the LC&M NP and was until 5 years ago deemed “difficult to develop due to a number of strategic infrastructure issues” with no work being carried out to change this making the site not viable or sustainable. The land was offered up by the farmer following a request for land from the council, which the farmer is unlikely to turn down!

a) Would the development be suitably located in the context of policy SH1?

This seems to almost go directly against the outdated SH1 policy out of the 25 actions with only 1 being appropriate which is to liaise with housebuilders and landowners. The proportion of housing within the Rural Parish is also against the development of green belted areas within the borough.

b) Subject to the Council’s proposed modifications, would the requirements of appendix B, along with relevant policies in the Plan, be effective in achieving sustainable development on the site?

As previously mentioned until 5 years ago deemed this rural site was identified as “difficult to develop due to a number of strategic infrastructure issues” with no work being carried out to change this of late. Therefore the proposed development has a number of infrastructure issues to address including:-

- i. Flood alleviation and retention, including periodic flooding of Staindrop Road closing the strategic road every couple of years and reducing developable land**
- ii. The towns WTW with Choline restrictions and potential escape**
- iii. Many overhead Electricity lines across the site**
- iv. Large Diameter Strategic Water Main across the site serving Industrial Teesside**
- v. Highway implications requiring relief roads and bypasses, not two replacement roundabouts in Cockerton.**
- vi. Mains drainage only through pumping stations**
- vii. Education, Health and other key amenities**

To include all of these financial constraints and reduce the developable land are likely to not make the site viable or sustainable, particularly when existing previously used land within the urban area already has much of the infrastructure in place.

- c) Are the assumptions in the housing trajectory (appendix A) about the sites justified, including that a total of 1,050 dwellings will be completed on the two sites by 2036? Has the Council provided clear evidence that development will begin in 2022 and that 170 dwellings will be completed on the two sites by 2025?

Apart from the obvious statement that the houses are not in line with the SH1 DBC policy document are they required in the town. On the understanding that this can be proved and that other sites with outline planning are developed first followed by Brownfield sites. It is my understanding that any infrastructure required to make the site viable for example the relief road should be in place before any development is started therefore the suggested timescale is not realistic if at all.