

## Appendix 2: Report of Consultation for Hemlington Grange South

Name	Hemlington Grange South – Consultation Comments	Council Response
Stewart Jones	Development of non public open space is supported to bring Middlesbroughs housing stock up to sustainable standard	Support noted.
Amy Dawson	The South site proposal has no major showstoppers, as long as there is no huge tweaks made. The proposal to retain bordering edges is key here, this must be implemented at build stage to allow current residents the privacy that they expected when buying their properties on the original Hemlington Grange site. There is a wooded edge bordering the fields from the south edge of the current Taylor Wimpey site and residents expect this to be retained.	Comments noted.
Marcus Griffiths	Objections due to the following reasons: The amount of traffic passing close to the fronts of existing properties will increase and be dangerous particularly to children Flood risk as existing properties behind tree line on rambler's way already have drainage problems Noise level will increase due to increased traffic when noise is already at optimum levels due to close proximity of main road Reducing more green belt and damaging local area Have seen many types of birds, deer, foxes and other wildlife around border of proposed site which will become homeless Tree line between existing properties needs to be maintained at current height and depth due to rise of land in proposed area will cause overlooking and privacy issues Security/break ins are already high in the new builds local to this area, more needs to be done to protect those already here before adding more people Already permission to build in other direction towards police hub so why ruin more countryside which we are already lacking	Transport impacts of the development will be considered as part of the transport statement required to support any planning application. Council Highway Officer consider access from the existing Hemlington Grange site to be the most appropriate.
Jessica Ross	There should be a second entrance. I am unhappy that they propose all the estates use our entrance. This will cause a	Council Highway Engineers consider that access from the current entrance to the Hemlington Grange site is the most appropriate for the development.

	lot of traffic which I would be unhappy with. I am concerned that traffic will negatively effect the estate.	
Tom Regan	The proposal on this one is better as long as they are adhered to, keeping the edging between the elderwood site and the new proposed site is a MUST! As this keep the rural feel for this area, as long as no social housing is on the site it should keep the happy family vibe that elderwood has got already. If by removing these trees and bushes it makes it more of a council feel with houses being piled on top of one another for the profit of the businessmen who own these houses.	Comments noted
Michael	So much housing estate already in development. Mis sold property on premise of enough affordable housing in the area. Too busy already.	The principle of housing on this site has already been established through the Local Plan processThe Housing Local Plan policy H7 Hemlington Grange allocated Hemlington grange for the creation of a sustainable community of 1230 dwellings. Policy H23 allocates the site for a range of dwelling types and states that an element of affordable housing (5%) should be delivered on site.
William Botham	Please keep the green areas facing the Elderwood Park estate, enough green land must be kept.	The draft development brief makes provision for retention of green edge including the linear belt of trees along the northern, eastern and western boundaries provide the site with a rural feel and sense of enclosure that separates the site from the wider Hemlington Grange site. Other than to enable access links through, the green edges shall be maintained through retention of the linear tree belts. Dwellings adjacent to the green edges shall front onto these green edges.
Jayne Dawson	Should not go ahead. Enough properties in the Elderwood Park estate/Persimmon estate at Hemlington. Plenty of properties been built in other areas and there is plenty of land near BelleVue to accommodate. Land in the centre of Middlesbrough that could be used cross roads on Boro Road all over the border still not developed. Lots of redundant land that needs tidying up and developing without taking away	The principle of housing on this site has already been established through the Local Plan process. The Housing Local Plan policy H7 Hemlington Grange allocated Hemlington Grange for the creation of a sustainable community of 1230 dwellings. Policy H23 allocates the site for a range of dwelling types and states that an element of affordable housing (5%) should be delivered on site.

	<p>valuable unspoilt countryside for wildlife, family walks. nature and green belt. No other land should be taken up until all available building land is utilised fully in the inner town area. Roads in the Cleveland area are struggling to cope the amount traffic these new estates have already created. I am a very strong wild life protector and taking away all these green areas is losing all the wildlife. I live on the edge of this field in question and get lots of wildlife in my garden and around. This would be a tragedy to destroy more habitat for these animals to live in. When will the Council stop!!!!</p>	
John Moses	<p>I note again that the extra traffic from Hemlington will undoubtedly cause more traffic congestion at peak times between Trimdon Avenue and Mandale Road and also between Mandale Road and Green Lane in Acklam. This would imply that the existing traffic management must be changed and upgraded. I wonder how the electricity pylons will be dealt with: are they going to be moved around the housing or will they go straight through the housing, I don't know if 11 KV is considered high voltage but might this not be a danger to health; and might they therefore need moving? Again properties at three stories high or over may give a crowded in and overlooked feeling aren't they likely to be too high? ( For example, I don't think the new houses on Low Lane near Stainton Village are at all attractive or suit that area.) Again I wonder about how affordable 3 bedroom houses might be and that perhaps some two bedroom are needed?</p>	<p>The principle of housing on this site has already been established through the Local Plan process. Traffic implications and any appropriate mitigation will be considered as part of transport statement accompanying any planning application.</p>
Clare Wren	<p>As above with sympathetic care taken over development of the area surrounding the Larchfield Centre. Infrastructure does not allow for increased traffic onto Stokesley Road.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p>
Carolyn Simpson, Natural England	<p>Thank you for consulting Natural England on the Draft Development Brief detailing the design and development expectations for housing at Land at Hemlington Grange South. We note the brief for Hemlington Grange South is dated January 2019. Natural England is a non-departmental</p>	<p>The Hemlington Grange South development brief has taken account of relevant Housing Local Plan policies referred in the response e.g. it makes provision for new pedestrian and cycleway links.</p>

public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development. Our comments on the drafts take account of the indicative site yield of 130 to 150 dwellings at Hemlington Grange South; the Middlesbrough Housing Local Plan (adopted 2014) policies for Hemlington Grange H7, and H23. We also note that National planning policy and guidance should also be taken into consideration in the preparation of development proposals. Paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states: 170. Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan); d) minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures; On the basis of the above, Natural England advises that the following details of policy H23 should be taken in to account in the development expectations and design principles, as may be applicable at the Hemlington Grange South site: Design principles: â€¢ Section 10: Ensure permeability for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders: H23 n) pedestrian crossing points should be provided on the B1365 and Stainton Way. Links with the Lingfield countryside centre should also be included if possible; H23 o) bridleways, cycleways and footpaths should be incorporated into the site layout with links to the Unicorn Centre, Hemlington, Stainton and Thornton and Coulby Newham. â€¢ Section 33: Flood prevention/Sustainable Drainage: H23 j) water bodies should be incorporated into the development to help prevent flooding downstream, create a recreational and ecological resource, and form part

	<p>of a sustainable urban drainage system; H23 k) there is the potential to de-culvert across the site. This should be carried out where possible and a buffer zone created along the watercourse. Green Infrastructure (GI) and Biodiversity Net Gain are not mentioned within the development brief. With regard to green infrastructure, section 2.90 of the Housing Local Plan (pg 37) states: Development will be required to contribute to the delivery and implementation of this network by, where appropriate, providing green infrastructure that: c) maintains and enhances bio-diversity to ensure that development and implementation results in a net gain of Biodiversity Action Plan habitats. Natural England would welcome recognition of the above and opportunities to deliver GI and net gains within the design principles / the development brief. ∅ The following sections of H23 also be considered as part of the design principles: H23 g) green corridors should be incorporated within the layout to facilitate the movement of wildlife and pedestrians, and which contribute to the creation and management of habitats identified in the Tees Valley Biodiversity Action Plan. These corridors should be coincidental with existing desire lines and should link the Gables public house and the existing public right of way network to the south, and should continue through to the Hemlington regeneration area creating linkages with the wider green space network and local facilities; H23 h) creation of a community park to give the development a focal point and to provide additional biodiversity / landscape value.</p>	
Graham Hadfield	<p>The assumption that the land at Hemlington Grange South is appropriate for approximately 130 to 150 dwellings is flawed. Experience of development in south Middlesbrough and Redcar &amp; Cleveland since the 2014 Local Plan was drawn up has demonstrated the difficulty which developers have in selling the properties being built there. Allowing this development to go ahead would merely compound that</p>	<p>The principle of housing on this site has already been established through the Local Plan process. The site is not designated as green wedge in the Local Plan. The Housing Local Plan policy H7 Hemlington Grange allocated Hemlington Grange for the creation of a sustainable community of 1230 dwellings. Policy H23 allocates the site</p>

	<p>problem. A significant portion of the site is currently covered by mature trees, something which the town as a whole is short of. Destruction of those trees (even if only to the extent of access provision) would be detrimental to the ecology of the town as a whole. A pedestrian and cycle path link to/from a crossing of the B1365 to the Mallards would provide the thin end of the wedge for development of vehicular access which future occupants may demand rather than having to drive through the wider Hemlington Grange site to the north. Middlesbrough is crying out for affordable housing but such housing is required at accessible sites, not stuck out on the southern boundary of the Borough where bus services would be infrequent or even non-existent. Lack of public transport would tend to increase the demand for multiple cars per household. That would lead to parking on pavements as seen in other areas of the town, notwithstanding the parking provision conditions in the brief. Any development would be bound to cause an increase in traffic on the already busy B1365/Acklam Road and on Stainton Way, the A174 and A19. That would provide ammunition to those who care nothing for the green corridors which the town already has too few of and would lead for further calls for the destruction of Bluebell Beck Valley purely to service an increase in vehicular traffic from housing development of the type which is not needed in Middlesbrough.</p>	<p>for a range of dwelling types and states that an element of affordable housing (5%) should be delivered on site.</p>
<p>Katherine Bennett</p>	<p>I oppose the building of Hemlington South for the following reasons: The residents of Elderwood park pay maintenance charges for the communal areas of the estate: this is on top of council taxes that are paid in full, despite the council not being responsible for maintaining the area. The Hemlington South estate plans state it will be adopted by Middlesbrough Council yet will be accessed via the Elderwood park estate, whose residents pay additional maintenance fees. Will the council pay for the upkeep of the facilities and communal areas of Elderwood and Ashwood park as the surrounding</p>	<p>The principle of housing on this site has already been established through the Local Plan process. The Housing Local Plan policy H7 Hemlington Grange allocated Hemlington Grange for the creation of a sustainable community of 1230 dwellings. Policy H23 allocates the site for a range of dwelling types and states that an element of affordable housing (5%) should be delivered on site. The issues raised about maintenance charges are not a material planning consideration. However, the brief does not specify that the Council will adopt the areas of open space with the</p>

<p>estates are being adopted by the council and the areas in Elderwood park will end up being used by all? Living on the Elderwood park estate for the passed 6 months I have suffered from construction dust impacting my health, having eye problems. I have also had issues such as dust ruining the outdoor areas of the property, my car tires needing replacing due to the state of the roads while the area is being constructed. I live on building site and the noise and construction dust is unpleasant, I anticipated that this would be the case for the next year when I bought the property but as the South estate is to be accessed via Elderwood park, the construction dust, noise and state of the roads will continue for longer than expected when I purchased the property. this will lead to increasing the cost of living for me and other residents as we try to maintain our property and cars. The access to the Hemlington South Estate should be reassessed to prevent these issues. There will be increase traffic through Elderwood park, this will increase the noise and air quality of the area. The new estate will build on the already growing population in the area: there will be more traffic causing the roads in the area to suffer from the same issue as on Marton Road, commonly known as the Marton road crawl, that the council have struggled to resolve. The area also lacks the infrastructure to cope with the number of planned houses: there are a limited number of schools in the area. Middlesbrough Council need to look at building the right infrastructure into the estate, such as primary and secondary schools, doctors'™ surgeries before they build more housing. There are many areas closer to the centre of Middlesbrough that could be used to build new housing instead, where old houses have been demolished but the area seems to have been abandoned. (Grove Hill, Gresham and the area around the Riverside Football Stadium, which have been abandoned for decades.) The area proposed will damage the natural woodlands in the area, many people</p>	<p>Hemlington Grange South. The issues raised about dust and construction are not material planning considerations.</p>
---	---

	<p>travel to the area to walk around the woodlands and use the local businesses in the area that are currently classed as semi-rural, such as the Gables pub, Larchfield Farm and community centre, Coulby Farm and Cherry Hill nurseries. building this estate will lose the semi-rural feel of the area and make it less appealing for people to visit. The trees in the area will be taken down to build the houses in the new estate, this will damage the wildlife in the area and the semi-rural feel of Elderwood Park. The plans state the only 3 trees should be preserved, this is shameful and Middlesbrough Council should reassess this and consider preserving more than 3 trees.</p>	
Martin Chohan	<p>No issues providing the policies (H23 etc) are applied as per the existing Taylor Wimpy development and the roads, housing design and landscaping flow from the existing adjoining development to Hemlington Grange South.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
Alan Liddle, Stainton and Thornton Parish Council	<p>The site in question is a natural extension to the already approved site that is Hemlington Grange proper. However, building an extra 130-150 houses to the already approved 1275 houses will put increased pressure on the inferior road structure/network. When the approval was granted for the Hemlington Grange site, an initial appraisal of the transport impacts was undertaken and that has shown that the roads in the area do not have the capacity to accommodate the development without improvement. To date the only improvement has been a new junction onto the B1365 to serve the residential element of the development only. To suggest building more houses without developing the road infrastructure is both foolhardy and wrong. If the plans are approved, then that will mean there are over 1500 houses on the full site once completed. There are NO facilities such as a shop OR a meeting/community hall for the area. The residents will need these facilities to create their own community and every effort should be made to provide these. With all these new family houses then provision for</p>	<p>The principle of housing on this site has already been established through the Local Plan process. The Housing Local Plan policy H7 Hemlington Grange allocated Hemlington Grange for the creation of a sustainable community of 1230 dwellings. Policy H23 allocates the site for a range of dwelling types and states that an element of affordable housing (5%) should be delivered on site. The draft development brief makes provision for the green edges of the development to be retained.</p>



	<p>health(G P's) and school/education provision is also a must. The fact that a children's play area is to be included in any development is welcome, but there must also be the provision for cycle ways, decent footpaths linking in with the surrounding network and the opportunity should be taken to deliver a sustainable transport system linking the site with the wider Middlesbrough area and Policy H25 Hemlington Grange - Transport Infrastructure of the adopted 2014 Housing Local Plan should be implemented in full before granting permission for further development.</p>	
<p>JOHN ROEBUCK</p>	<p>As indicated above, the Council should consider integrating the affordable housing development within this area of land which promotes greater space per dwelling, rather than trying to cram houses on to a small site. Based on the GBI consultation, the Council should re-think the design brief and look to develop sustainable, energy efficient homes for families, incorporating a mix of dwellings that does not discriminate against disadvantaged families, but provides social housing in an attractive and innovative manner as part of a wider development</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p>Alex Hewson</p>	<p>I am emailing in relation to the proposal of council housing estates being built to the north and south of my estate, Elderwood Park, Hemlington.</p> <p>I wish to voice my frustration and anger to these proposals. I have worked extremely hard in my life to be able to afford my home, which I moved into in 2018 and these estates will lower my properties value in the future for certain. They will also bring a lot more traffic into Elderwood Park, there are a lot of young families on this estate and children will be more at risk to accidents with all the further traffic.</p> <p>I also pay a lot of council tax on my property. How can Middlesbrough Council justify such high Council tax on a property surrounded by council estates?</p>	<p>The principle of housing on this site has already been established through the Local Plan process. The Housing Local Plan policy H7 Hemlington Grange allocated Hemlington Grange for the creation of a sustainable community of 1230 dwellings. Policy H23 allocates the site for a range of dwelling types and states that an element of affordable housing (5%) should be delivered on site.</p>

	<p>I am sure you will have many angry residents from both Elderwood Park and Ashwood Park, because this is completely unfair and NOT REQUIRED! There are plenty of new houses being built in this area. Elderwood Park will be at least 5 phases, to the best of my knowledge. How can this be right when most of the area around the town centre is empty/boarded up houses?</p> <p>Please respond to this email and everyone else who is worried and stressed about these proposals. I think the residents of Elderwood Park and Ashwood Park deserve answers. My contact information is below.</p>	
Chris Nixon	I have reviewed both developments and have no issue with the grange south development as it is in keeping with similar developments locally.	Support noted.
Diane Wilson, Hambleton District Council	<p>Thank you for inviting Hambleton District Council to comment on the Hemlington North and Hemington Grange South Draft Development Briefs.</p> <p>The cross boundary relationship between Hambleton and Middlesbrough is recognised.</p> <p>Council officers therefore welcome the recognition of the cross boundary relationships and Duty to Cooperate engagement.</p> <p>Hambleton District Council have no comments to make on these draft Development Briefs.</p>	Comment noted.
Mr Ball	<p>We are a family of 3 adults and 1 child aged 15 and we request that you consider our response as set out in this letter. We are all very unhappy about one element of this proposal which affects us as a family and several other families who live on The Birches, Coulby Newham.</p> <p>As part of the above plans, we understand that you are considering an issue which could allow the installation of a footpath which will run from traffic lights on B1365 Road</p>	The Hemlington Grange South Development brief does not refer to a specific footpath in this location, the brief references that the site does not currently benefit from pedestrian/cycle paths links to local facilities. The brief states that a pedestrian and cyclepath link from the crossing of the B1365 through to Coulby Farm Way. The route shall run alongside the Mallards, south of Coulby Farm pub, and along the line of the existing pedestrian route to Coulby Farm Way.

across the grassed area between our property and the TA Centre.

We first became aware of this issue a couple of years ago. On that occasion, we do not recall any letter from the Council giving notice of the intention to build this footpath. After being alerted by a neighbour, we did find on your website, on the last page of a 789 page document, a plan with a note as follows: "New footpath to link with existing footpath from Woodlea..." and entered our objections on 22nd June 2018 online. We also spoke with Shelly Pearman to express our concerns verbally. Many of concerns set out in that letter still stand. We did receive a letter acknowledging our objections.

At that time we and other local residents were very puzzled as to why, if planning permission had not been passed at that time, was the pedestrian crossing installed and some shrubs been cleared in preparation to create the route and who had given this permission for this work? Since then, we have been subjected to a greater number of people walking across the road at the crossing site and exercising their dogs on the green belt area. Some of them are inconsiderate and either do not remove their dog mess or bizarrely leave poo bags on the green belt.

After a site visit in 2018 by planning officers and a subsequent conversation with Shelly Pearman we were assured at the time that the footpath was 'Not a done deal' and that any consultation would involve local residents. This did not explain why, if there are no plans for the footpath, had a pedestrian crossing been installed.

The proposed route for the footpath or as the proposal often refers to this, a multi user route, cuts through an established green belt, 10 to 12 feet above the level of adjacent houses.

This link will enable future occupants to access services and facilities in Coulby Newham, including Rosewood Primary School and bus services on Coulby Farm Way.

North south pedestrian routes shall be provided within the site to integrate into existing/proposed routes on the wider Hemlington Grange site to the north and to enable access to the Lingfield Community farm shop and café to the south.

These provision form part of the original permission for the wider Hemlington Grange development and are therefore outside of the scope of this consultation

Our objections are as below:

- Main concern is detrimental Impact upon privacy of local residents – This route would allow the overlooking of properties from Numbers 52 to 69. It would be a few metres away and many people will walk past the rear of our homes on a piece of land which is at the same height as the bathroom and bedroom windows. These windows need to be open particularly when the shower is in use. As a family of four, this is a daily issue, on multiple occasions, morning and evening. From the proposed route location, users will see into our bedrooms and bathroom which is a risk which will be multiplied should a pathway be built where planned – we would be happy to prove this for you should you wish to do a site visit, although to be frank we are very surprised that such an obvious privacy risk has not led to an alternative route being planned already
- Additional Anti-social behaviour – This multi user route would lead to further anti-social activities as shortcut for motor cyclists and a quick escape route for people committing anti-social behaviour or acts of theft from properties after gaining easier access to rear gardens along The Birches.
- We believe that the area around Nos 52 – 55 is at high risk as a surface water flooding area. As you will be aware, the rear of our property is an area in which water accumulates in gardens after significant rainfall to the extent that the Council installed a land drain along the edge of the rear of properties. There have been many significant rainfalls since this was done and it is evident that the issue is not resolved. Flooding is still a major concern arising from either the housing estate development or the installation of the footpath.

• There will be an increase in pollution - A greater number of persons using this route will create an increase in litter and dog bags being left on the site. The litter would be likely to blow down to our fence line and perhaps into residents' gardens

• Noise Pollution – This footpath would be a gateway from Crossfields, Swallowfields, Beechfield and other estates to Army Reservist Centre, Royal Mail and of course, The Gables Pub.

• Light Pollution – additional light pollution should any form of street lighting be placed adjacent to the footpath as bedrooms are at the rear of our homes.

• Detrimental impact on local wildlife – The area is a natural wild animal friendly environment – we regularly see bats, foxes, hedgehogs, birds of prey

There is already a new footpath leading North on the West Side of the B1365 heading from the development to the Gables Pub and there is already a footpath along The Ridgeway, past the Army Reservist Centre, Royal Mail and up to the rear of Woodlea. It is not clear why another footpath is required only 100 metres away?

We believe there is an expectation that the proposed multi user route will improve the safety of children and adults going from Hemlington Grange Phase 2 to Kings Academy and Parkway Centre as children will walk along the proposed footpath, all the way along the rear of Woodlea to the bridge at the Tesco Garage and then walk all the way back along to Kings Academy. This is unrealistic. We believe, however, that they will walk along the footpath, past the rear of Woodlea, then cut across the grass and cross

Stainton Way near Halfords (as they do now).

Alternative Proposal - Ultimately, we believe that the needs of resident of The Birches and the new estate could all be well supported by an alternative Council proposal as follows:

- a footpath from The Ridgeway, towards The Gables roundabout following round on the South side of Stainton Way and crossing closer to the Academy. This would be quicker for users than the unrealistic expectations under the current proposal

We politely request that you:

- seriously consider our suggestion above
- if an alternative proposal is agreed, that the Council, the developer or whoever removed the shrubs in apparent preparation for the pathway in 2018 despite no such permission being given, be instructed to replace these shrubs etc in order to discourage people from entering the green belt area
- inform us of any meetings, virtual or otherwise at which these proposals will be considered as we would wish to attend if possible
- confirm as soon as possible our rights to challenge this further at Appeal should the proposal be approved at the next stage.

Hopefully the Council will agree to consider the alternative route and satisfy the needs of all residents of both the new estate and The Birches. We feel so strongly about this issue that we need to plan for the next stage and we will seek professional advice to support our case should this prove necessary.

	Thank you.	
Sara Peacock, Cleveland Fire Brigade	<p>Cleveland fire Brigade offers no representations regarding the development as proposed, however Access and Water Supplies should meet the requirements as set out in: Approved Document B, Volume 1:2019, Section B5 for Dwellings.</p> <p>It should be noted that Cleveland Fire Brigade now utilise a Magirus Multistar Combined Aerial Rescue Pump (CARP) which has a vehicle weight of 17.5 tonnes. This is greater than the specified weight in AD B Vol 1 Section B5 Table 13.1.</p> <p>It should be confirmed that 'shared driveways' and 'emergency turning head' areas meet the minimum carrying capacity requirements as per ADB Vol 1, Section B5: Table 13.1, and in line with the advice provided regarding the CARP, above.</p> <p>Further comments may be made through the building regulation consultation process as required.</p>	Noted.
Sunny Ali, Highways England	<p>The comments that we would like to make are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relationship with the Local Plan</li> </ul> <p>As the Development Briefs identify, the Local Plan recognises the Hemlington Grange location as an area of development within the Plan period.</p> <p>The allocation in the Local Plan (and wider policies) identify a number of requirements for the site, including the need to comply with the Hemlington Grange specific policies (H7, H23 and H25 of the Housing Local Plan (adopted November 2014)); the "connectivity" related policies (CS17 and CS18 of the Core</p> <p>Registered office: Bridge House, 1 Walnut Tree Close, Guildford GU1 4LZ Highways England Company Limited, registered in England and Wales number 09346363</p>	Comments noted

Strategy (adopted February 2008)) and any other policies that may be relevant to bringing the sites forward (e.g. CS6 Developer contributions). Reference is also made to a Greater Hemlington Supplementary Planning Document and a Greater Hemlington masterplan.

With a view to the above, further work should ensure the linkages to policy are clearly made through cross-reference to the Plan, the Supplementary Planning Document and masterplan. It should also cover elements such as:

- o How the contributions of the developments to transport infrastructure improvements are being identified and how the “balanced package of highway improvements” (as noted in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan) are being identified.
- o How the sustainable urban extension envisaged (i.e. provision of both housing and employment development) is being ensured as the overall allocation is developed.
- o How a direct consideration in relation to any impacts at the SRN (as identified in policies) will be built in to future Transport Assessment.

- Relationship with (and cumulative consideration of) other planning permissions

The Hemlington Grange South Development Brief identifies that, for the Hemlington Grange allocation, 655 dwellings have been granted planning permission to date, of which over 200 are built. The assessment of the proposals subject to the Development Briefs, should build-in (from both policy and impact perspectives) consideration of elements that already have planning permission, in particular those on the allocation site (including application reference M/FP/0082/16/P).

- Specific comments on the Development Briefs

Based on the detail offered at this stage within the Development Briefs, the table below sets out a schedule of specific comments.



	The scale of development at Hemlington Grange South could have potential impacts at the SRN that would require specific consideration within a Transport Assessment. It will need to be ensured that a scenario whereby both developments come forward	Comment noted development brief will be updated to include reference to the requirement for a transport statement as part of any planning application.
	Consideration will be required within the Transport Assessments with regard the relationship with the Plan and other planning permissions (as identified above).	Comment noted.
	The sustainable connectivity proposals should be welcomed.	Comment noted
	This is a matter for the Council to satisfy itself with, but the provision of a suitable scale of parking is welcomed	Comment noted
	It is not clear as to why the smaller scale development (Hemlington North) is specifically identified as requiring a Transport Assessment, but the larger site (Hemlington Grange South) is not. As a starting point, the need for a Transport Assessment should be treated as “in scope” for both development areas.	Comment noted development brief will be updated to include reference to the requirement for a transport statement as part of any planning application.
	A consistent approach, in line with the Plan requirements should be developed to ensure any developer contributions are appropriately identified.	Comment noted.
Mark Rushworth, North Yorkshire County Council	<p>Highways &amp; Transport It is recommended that the impact of the proposal on the North Yorkshire distributor network is understood, in particular the A19 and A172 and the approach to Stokesley. Any resulting capacity issues or associated impact on the highway should be explored and mitigation tested accordingly.</p> <p>Children &amp; Young Peoples Service We have no shared catchment areas, or cross border catchments, near Hemlington. Schools to the north of North Yorkshire currently have surplus places, even primary and secondary schools in the urban centres such as Stokesley. As such, there are no Section 106 implications.</p> <p>Heritage – Landscape Both sites are close to the North Yorkshire County boundary,</p>	The principle of housing on this site has already been established through the Local Plan process. Transport implications were assessed as part of the planning application process. Any planning application will need to be supported by a transport statement.

	<p>and either in semi-rural locations or at the edge of open countryside.</p> <p>Both development briefs recognise this and incorporate the requirement to retain 'green edges' to maintain semi-rural character to the south, which is welcome. This will help to protect the wider landscape setting and overlap with North Yorkshire's rural landscape character areas.</p>	
<p>Cailin Newby, The Environment Agency</p>	<p>Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to provide comment to this draft development brief. We are a statutory consultee in the planning process providing advice to Local Authorities and developers on pre-applications enquiries, planning applications and strategic plans.</p> <p>We aim to reduce flood risk, while protecting and enhancing the water environment. Based on the environmental constraints within the proposed development area, we have no detailed comments to make on this development brief.</p> <p>There are pockets of surface water flood risk on site, which we would not be the statutory consultee. However, we have previously advised that the Middleborough Local Plan should be underpinned by an up to date Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and this plan should have applied up to date sequential and exception tests, where necessary. All strategic policies should be informed by an SFRA and should manage flood risk from all sources.</p> <p>We are supportive of several of design brief elements including SUDs and the requirement to retain green edges. We appreciate this element is largely to provide an attractive frontage and lessen the severity of the development in the countryside. It should be recognised this has the opportunity to provide green infrastructure and an opportunity for a biodiversity net gain on-site. This could also be said for the SUD's requirement, which should be supportive of a multi-functional design improving flood risk on site but also habitat creation. This brief should look to steer the development to enhance biodiversity and geodiversity at the design stage in</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

	<p>accordance with the visions of the emerging Local Plan and with the principles of national policy.</p>	
<p>Lyn, Newby Parish Council</p>	<p>ACCESS POINT 12, 15 &amp; 16  The Parish Council notes that the developer will be responsible for providing a crossing of the B1365 that links to a multi – user route. The developer is advised to budget for a signalled crossing.  We raise the following concerns at the proposed sighting of the crossing opposite Coulby Farm Way, the B1365 is an extremely busy road bringing traffic from the wider Middlesbrough area through to local garden centres, the surrounding areas along this road and on through to Stokesley and beyond. Commuters travelling into and from Middlesbrough also use this road.  The position of the signalled crossing for pedestrians causes concern owing to its sighting on the B1365, it is not far from the bend that passes Cherry Hill Nursery, traffic travelling towards Middlesbrough will then encounter a pedestrian crossing which potentially, will be in most use at peak traffic times, and this is the time that families are taking their children to school.  The planned pedestrian crossing appears to be in quite close proximity to the already signalled access at Hemlington Grange, this could cause problems with the halting and flow of traffic on the B1365 which we feel could create a major safety issue for both pedestrians &amp; motorists on this road. We are pleased to see that all vehicular traffic will be solely from the Hemlington Grange site to the North only and no access from the B1365. Which is the possible reasoning behind the pedestrian crossing planned on the B1365 but our concerns regards safety stand.  The Hemlington Grange Development has signalled lights already in place to aid the flow of traffic from the new housing development onto the B1365, could this not be used more safely for the South Hemlington development for</p>	<p>Middlesbrough Council Highway Engineers considered this the most suitable location for a crossing to link this development and the wider area for pedestrians.</p>

pedestrian usage linking into footpaths across the B1365?  
We agree that the existing hedgerows should be left in place & those removed replanted along the edge of the site this would direct pedestrian flow through the present access point.

#### LANDSCAPE DESIGN POINT 30 & 32

It is stated that - The rural character of the site provides a cue for a landscape strategy with the existing boundary hedgerows and trees to be retained around the outside of the site other than where access routes are required, Additional green corridors should be created throughout the site.

Also stated is - Where possible the two internal hedgerows that run in a north south direction should be incorporated within the landscape design. There are three prominent trees towards the south of the site that form part of the hedgerow that should be retained subject to being in good health.

The Parish Council supports in essence these two statements that the existing hedgerows are retained, but would like to see that the wording is strengthened to help ensure that they are retained, the wording leaves it open for a potential developer to remove the hedgerows, this being potentially easier and could be more cost effective. If the hedgerows are maintained along the edge of the site, pedestrians would need to use the present access point. Hedgerows have previously been removed for the Hemlington Grange Development and they have not been replanted. Will the same happen to the hedgerows mentioned in point 30?

The Parish Council supports that these well-established hedgerows and mature trees should be retained as the loss of habitat will be irreplaceable, they help to form an important wild life corridor, encourage biodiversity and it is important to conserve, enhance & create natural sites as well as maintaining & strengthening natural corridors.

	<p>As the Larchfield community have already experienced problems with people straying from the existing public footpaths since the first phase of the development. The Parish Council feels that improvement is needed for signage for the footpaths near &amp; around the Larchfield Community area to encourage correct usage of footpaths around the existing dwellings for vulnerable people.</p>	
<p>Mr &amp; Mrs Taylor</p>	<p>For the record, we strongly oppose the planned development for affordable housing as detailed on your website. This was conveniently left out of the documents sent to us by post.</p> <p>In response to the letter dated 26/06/2020, I would like to bring your attention to the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- We were never informed that there were to be any future plans to build affordable housing. Neither Persimmon Homes or our Conveyancing Solicitor were aware. It was explicitly stated by our solicitor that there were to be no affordable houses to be built in this estate.</li> <li>- We purchased our property here with the understanding that Taylor Wimpey and Persimmon were the only developers to be building houses. We looked at the plans to see the extent and boundary lines of future houses and then went on to purchase our property with those plans in mind.</li> <li>- The open spaces around us are what we moved here for. We wanted to be away from the traffic and daily hustle and bustle. The open green belt land surrounding our home was particularly attractive to us for dog walking, exercising and taking the grandchildren to play on the fields in a safe environment.</li> <li>- We have been reliably informed that affordable housing</li> </ul>	<p>The principle of housing on this site has already been established through the Local Plan process. The Housing Local Plan policy H7 Hemlington Grange allocated Hemlington Grange for the creation of a sustainable community of 1230 dwellings. Policy H23 allocates the site for a range of dwelling types and states that an element of affordable housing (5%) should be delivered on site..</p>

can, and does attract the wrong type of tenant. There is an estate just over the road from your proposed plans that has an affordable housing scheme that does have an element of the wrong type of tenant. There has been an increase in crime, particularly burglary and theft, on our estate. These crimes have been proved by the police to have been committed by tenants from the affordable housing estate close to our home.

- Adding more houses to an already growing estate will increase the volume of traffic encountered on a daily basis; this will also increase congestion on the roundabout at Stainton Way which is already a very busy roundabout at present. This will lead to further backlogs and increase journey times significantly especially when Kings Academy School is open.

- The proposed development will endanger the traditional values of the country style pub the Gables. After having conversations with the owner/landlady of the establishment she has expressly stated that building affordable housing will attract the wrong type of crowd to an otherwise mature and quaint family pub.

- Our hard earned life savings were used to buy our property. Building affordable housing in such close proximity to our home will devalue the house should we need to sell it in the future.

Furthermore the proposed development is causing anger, anxiety and unnecessary stress that we do not want or need at this point of in our lives. We feel that that there are much more suitable brownfield sites in Middlesbrough, highlighted on the local development plan, that should be used instead. If this development was mentioned to us before we

	<p>purchased the house outright, we would not have moved here. We feel cheated and disappointed by the way this has been brought to our attention.</p> <p>We hope our concerns do not fall on deaf ears. We would appreciate acknowledgement of receipt of this email by return.</p> <p>The proposed development will endanger the traditional values of the country style pub the Gables. After having conversations with the owner/landlady of the establishment she has expressly stated that building affordable housing will attract the wrong type of crowd to an otherwise mature and quaint family pub.</p> <p>- Our hard earned life savings were used to buy our property. Building affordable housing in such close proximity to our home will devalue the house should we need to sell it in the future.</p> <p>Furthermore the proposed development is causing anger, anxiety and unnecessary stress that we do not want or need at this point of in our lives. We feel that that there are much more suitable brownfield sites in Middlesbrough, highlighted on the local development plan, that should be used instead. If this development was mentioned to us before we purchased the house outright, we would not have moved here. We feel cheated and disappointed by the way this has been brought to our attention.</p> <p>We hope our concerns do not fall on deaf ears. We would appreciate acknowledgement of receipt of this email by return.</p>	
<p>Patricia Brittan</p>	<p>I am writing to voice my concerns to the above development.</p> <p>My email is to appeal to the Councils belief in our</p>	<p>The Hemlington GrangeSouth development brief makes provision for the retention of green edges to the site.</p>

Environment and the future of our indigenous wildlife.

Most of the Hedgerow, shrubs and trees have been torn out, all the way to the new Police Hub and only a small section remains from The Gables to Beckenham Gardens. I implore the council to leave this part alone.

That area has always been a haven for many wildlife species, especially birds (this I know as in the 30+ years I have lived in Hemlington I have fed them) this Spring and Summer I have noticed a massive decline, and this can only be attributed to the loss of their environment and homes. And as a wildlife fan, I find this incredibly sad.

The Council are making strides in the wonderful wild flowers on roundabouts and around the perimeters of grassland areas that are kept by you. And for this I congratulate and thank you.

Keeping this in mind, please consider the wildlife at the above development and leave the Hedgerow and Shrubbery (the very small part that is left) alone, so the birds and wildlife, may have some place to nest in the spring.