

EXECUTIVE

A meeting of the Executive was held on Tuesday 7 June 2022.

PRESENT: Mayor A Preston (Chair) and Councillors D Coupe, TA Grainge, S Hill, L Mason, E Polano, M Smiles and S Walker

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Councillor R Arundale, Councillor C Dodds, R Dodds, G Hadfield, Councillor J Hobson, Councillor B Hubbard, T Livingstone, J Maunder, Councillor D McCabe, Councillor D Rooney, J Slater and G Sullivan

OFFICERS: C Benjamin, S Bonner, R Horniman, A Hoy, D Johnson, T Parkinson, S Reynolds and I Wright

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Councillor B Cooper

22/1 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest received at this point in the meeting.

22/2 **MINUTES - EXECUTIVE - 29 APRIL 2022**

The minutes of the Executive meeting held on 29 April 2022 were submitted and approved as a correct record.

22/3 **MINUTES - EXECUTIVE - 10 MAY 2022**

The minutes of the Executive meeting held on 10 May 2022 were submitted and approved as a correct record.

22/4 **ADOPTION OF STAINSBY COUNTRY PARK AND MASTERPLAN**

The Executive Member for Regeneration and the Director of Regeneration and Culture submitted a report for the Executive's consideration. The purpose of the report was to seek adoption of the Stainsby Country Park and Masterplan, which had been finalised following public consultation, and delegate authority to the Director of Regeneration and Culture, in consultation with the Executive Member for Regeneration, to make any subsequent minor amendments to the Stainsby Country Park and Masterplan.

Adoption of the Stainsby Country Park and Masterplan planned to protect the best interests of Middlesbrough and would provide the Council the best possible control over the development of the land between Acklam and the A19. Adoption was crucial as the first of a number of planning applications relating to the site had already been submitted and was currently under consideration.

The masterplan set standards for a country park alongside new community facilities, sports facilities and play areas, as well as hundreds of new homes. The new housing was necessary to deliver the required number of homes by 2029.

The aim of adopting the masterplan was to give the Council more sway when considering planning applications. The vision for a country park would support nature, wildlife, trees and healthy living, and be key in creating a high quality place to live.

Not adopting the masterplan would leave the Council with limited power to influence how the area was developed, including the design of any roads.

Without a masterplan, private developers would have more freedom to develop housing and infrastructure - including a road - as they saw fit. That was because while the land was allocated for housing in the Council's Local Plan, adopted in 2014, the Local Plan did not contain sufficient information to control the level of detail the Council wanted to achieve. The Local Plan was the main document that would be considered in any application, the

masterplan supplemented the Local Plan and set out how the Council wanted to see any development delivered.

The Executive was not being asked to approve housing or a road, simply the design standards and principles that developers would be expected to meet.

The masterplan had been amended to make clear that as much as possible of Mandale Meadow would be retained in its current condition and incorporated into the wider country park. If the masterplan was implemented it would lead to a significant increase in high quality and accessible open space for the community thanks to the country park.

A Member commented on the importance of building eco-friendly homes that were energy efficient.

A Member queried the reason for Highways England making no commitment to the provision of the link road. The Director of Regeneration and Culture explained that Highways England would not comment until a full planning application had been submitted and further information was available to fully assess the impacts upon the highway network.

A Member made reference to paragraph 26 of the submitted report and enquired whether funding was available from the Tees Valley Combined Authority (TVCA). In response, the Director of Regeneration and Culture explained that the option to provide an alternative route across the A19 had been assessed and discounted due to the significant additional costs associated with its construction and the increased visual intrusion for existing housing. Further information on the alternative options was detailed on the Council's website. It was added that funding options for the link road were being explored/considered and representations would be made to the TVCA.

Two members of the public commented that they were in support of the masterplan but objected to the proposal of the link road, outlining concerns associated with the impact on biodiversity and the health of residents.

OPTIONS

Not to adopt the Stainsby Country Park and Masterplan - That would have meant that there would have been an absence of guidance on the expectations for the country park and the key layout principles, type of housing and quality of development that the Council would be seeking at Stainsby. There would have been less certainty for future developers and a potentially higher risk that the country park would not have been delivered.

ORDERED

- 1. That the Stainsby Country Park and Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document be adopted, to enable the Council to control development proposals brought forward by private sector landowners and developers in the area; and**
- 2. That authority be delegated to the Director of Regeneration and Culture, in consultation with the Executive Member for Regeneration, to make any subsequent minor amendments to the Stainsby Country Park and Masterplan.**

REASON

The Stainsby Country Park and Masterplan was a key Council document that reflected the Council's ambitions for high quality housing alongside the provision of a country park. The masterplan planned to help to clarify the Council's expectations for the delivery of a high quality development scheme whilst, at the same time, reducing risk and uncertainty for future developers.

The decision(s) will come into force after five working days following the day the decision(s) was published unless the decision becomes subject to the call in procedures.