

REGULATORY COMMITTEE

Thursday, 12 December 2024

REGULATORY COMMITTEE

A meeting of the Regulatory Committee was held on Thursday, 12 December 2024 at the Civic Centre, Ridley Street, Redcar, TS10 1TD.

PRESENT Councillor S Smith (Chair)
Councillors R Clark, S Crane (substituting for Councillor J Thompson), I Hart, S Martin, M O'Donoghue, M Ovens (substituting for Councillor Head), C Quartermain, P Thomson, V Rider

OFFICIALS R Assadi, E Dale, C Griffiths and E Garbutt, S Houldsworth and D Pedlow

IN ATTENDANCE Councillor McInnes and Salvin

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors J Neal, M Fletcher, M Head, L Pallister and J Thompson.

207 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Ovens declared an interest in application R/2024/0602/FF as a member of the Corporate Parenting Board.

Councillor Quartermain declared an interest in application a R/2024/0709/F3 as the Cabinet Member.

208 **TO CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 13 NOVEMBER 2024**

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on the 13 November 2024 be confirmed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

209 **TO NOTE THE ATTENDANCE MATRIX FROM THE LAST MEETING**

RESOLVED that the attendance matrix be noted.

Thursday, 12 December 2024

210 **R/2022/0895/00M OUTLINE APPLICATION (SOME MATTERS RESERVED) FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT COMPRISING 12 (NO) DWELLINGS AND APARTMENT BLOCK (16 APARTMENTS) (DEMOLITION OF EXISTING PUBLIC HOUSE BUILDING) THE SMITHS DOCK INN SKIPPERS LANE NORMANBY**

The Executive Director for Growth, Enterprise and Environment summarised the officer report which had been pre-circulated.

Members sought questions of clarification around the following matters;

- Are we able to include a condition in relation to alternative deliveries of nutrient neutrality as concerned that we were giving another authority cart blanche;
- The War Memorial was grade ii listed and yet the report did not contain the Conservation Officer's comments;
- The War Memorial would be visible from this site;
- Does the fact that there appeared to be no demand for flats in the area have any bearing;
- The flats had been moved to the back of the site but would still be visible behind the houses;
- Was the site identified in the Local Plan;
-

The objector present made the following comments;

- There have been 401 objections which demonstrated that residents were not happy with the application and the apartments in particular;
- The apartments would dominate the street scene;
- There was no demand for apartments in the area;
- There were a number of blocks of flats close by which had been demolished;
- There was a threat to a rise in the water table from this development;
- The ground near the War Memorial was soft and boggy;
- Northumbrian Water never object to any application;
- The development would have an over bearing effect on the Grade ii War Memorial;
- The development would create traffic problems and the residents had been assured in the past that Skippers Lane would not be opened up.

Members questioned the objector on the following points;

- The properties you referred to as having been demolished in Spencerbeck were different to those proposed here so are you against any development here?

The Ward Member present made the following comments;

REGULATORY COMMITTEE

Thursday, 12 December 2024

- In support of the residents who objected to the application as submitted;
- Want to see development as the current buildings were in a state of disrepair and were currently a magnet for vandals;
- In the first application in 2023 the flats were located to the front of the development causing obstruction to the Bowling Club and there followed a residents meeting attended by 135 residents. Subsequently the apartments were moved to the back of the development overlooking the War Memorial;
- At the second residents meeting it was made clear that residents did not want apartments at all;
- Further down Skippers Lane there had been a major housing development;
- The fields in this area had been reduced by over development with a further 134 houses given permission at High Farm, when was it going to end?
- There would be an increase in traffic;
- Residents would prefer to have seen smaller family homes as there was no demand for apartments;
- Recommend that the application be amended to remove the apartments and replace with houses.

Members questioned the Ward Member on the following points;

- Are you accepting of the site being developed?
- Are you objecting to the over development as the apartments were too dominant as the height was only slightly higher than the adjacent buildings;
- You referred to the impact on the highway, do you have any information on traffic flow;
- 30 car parking spaces are to be provided does this reflect your concern?
- Did the planning consultant attend the residents meetings?
- Residents want to see development so is it the apartments that were the stumbling block?

The agent present made the following comments;

- The proposal was to demolish the existing public house and construct a residential development;
- The original application was submitted in December 2022 and became valid in 2023;
- The access, layout and scale were agreed;
- This was a brownfield site perfect for development;
- The site was in a sustainable location with local transport and services;

REGULATORY COMMITTEE

Thursday, 12 December 2024

- The development would get rid of a building that was currently attracting anti-social behaviour;
- All aspects of the proposal were compliant with policy;
- The numerous objections were not material considerations;
- Nutrient neutrality had been resolved;
- The flats were only minimally higher than the dwellings;
- The nearest property was 45-50 metres from the War Memorial;
- The scheme would add to the shortage of housing;
- The proposal complied with policy H20 as it provided an appropriate mix of housing.

•

Members questioned the agent on the following points;

- Were the flats integral to the application?
- The plans had taken two years to develop, what had been the issues?
- Have you inherited the site plan from the previous architect?
- Why had the original architect not continued with the proposal?
- One of the concerns was the expected level of traffic. Have you seen any surveys which had indicated the likely traffic flow levels?
- What were your views in terms of site development and was there any opportunity for reconsideration?
- Why was the applicant not present at the meeting?
- Was there any research carried out as to determine the demand for apartments in the area?
- The entrance was via a lane and not a road, did you see that as a problem?

Members debated the application and made the following comments;

- The site should be developed but concerned that the development of apartments appeared to be over development;
- Moving the apartments from one part of the site to another had not changed the fundamental principle of the application;
- The agent appeared not to be conversant with the history of the site;
- Requested further consideration of the application as to whether the magnitude of the apartments could be reviewed;
- Acknowledged that it was a brown field site and that residents and Ward Councillors were comfortable that some sort of development should go ahead;
- There was a heritage asset close by that sat in its own unique site;
- The part of the site closest to the War Memorial at present was a car park however the apartment block had now moved to the back of the site closer to the War Memorial making a negative impact on the site;
- The proposal contravened Policy HE2 of the Local Plan;
- Disappointed that the Conservation Officer was not present at the

Thursday, 12 December 2024

- meeting;
- The site was to be over developed contrary to Policy SD4
 - Appropriate housing was required, a block of flats was not acceptable;
 - The application should be deferred as there was an opportunity to progress in an appropriate fashion and have proactive discussions with the developer in regard to the design of the site;
 - In relation to the provision of car parking there was not enough information to make a decision.

Following the debate members resolved to refuse planning permission for the following reasons:-

1. The proposal due to the inclusion of an apartment block would result in overdevelopment of the site contrary to part j of policy SD4 of the Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan.
2. The proposal due to the scale and location of the apartment block would result in an adverse impact on the setting of the Grade II Listed War Memorial. The proposal is therefore contrary to part f of policy HE2 of the Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan.

At this point Councillor Thomson left the meeting.

211

R/2024/0602/FF CHANGE OF USE FROM DWELLING (CLASS C3) TO CHILDREN'S HOME (CLASS C2) 16 BRANSDALE GUISBOROUGH

Councillor Ovens declared an interest in the following application as a member of the Corporate Parenting Board.

The Officer summarised the officer report which had been pre-circulated and advised Members that two additional comments had been received since the preparation of the report querying the use of the property for a business and asking whether officers had visited the site.

Members sought questions of clarification around the following matters;

- Planning Permission was granted for the property in 2021, why had it not gone ahead and why was it before the committee again?
- The report advised that there were 4 car parking spaces provided including 1 in the garage however the storage of bikes in the garage would restrict the parking of a car and 3 cars would not be able to park on the hardstanding;
- Concerned about the original comments from the engineer on the 30 September 2024 where he submitted lengthy objections in which he mentioned a travel plan and the potential for displaced

REGULATORY COMMITTEE

Thursday, 12 December 2024

parking. On the 3 December 2024 the engineer made an additional response however he gave no evidence as to why he had changed his mind and there was no evidence of a travel plan being submitted;

- Sat on the previous application and highway issues were a major concern;

The objectors present at the meeting made the following comments;

- Having previously lived in the property there were visibility issues when reversing off the driveway with many near misses;
- The garage was small and only suitable for one small car and there would not be room to park three cars on the driveway;
- The road had a blind corner, was on an incline and had double bends so this property could not be in a worse location;
- When the current owner visited the property there was no regard for highway safety;
- There was no available space for on road parking;
- 60 objections had been received including Guisborough Town Council and Ward Members;
- Members were obliged to responsibly review all the evidence and make the right decision to protect the residents;
- Similar evidence was presented in 2021 and officers had come to the same conclusion as now ignoring our concerns;
- Legal action would be taken if an accident occurred as we have provided evidence that the road was not safe;
- The application stated that the property would generate the same amount of cars as a family home but we have now collected evidence from other premises run by the applicant that showed that this type of business would generate parking beyond that of a family home;
- At another of the applicants premises there were 6 cars parked so 3 parking spaces here just will not be enough;
- Access for pedestrians, pushchairs and wheelchairs would be problematic;
- It would be a business first and foremost;
- There would be support staff coming and going throughout the day and night;
- Residents close to the applicants other premises have had no end of difficulty accessing their properties and near misses had occurred;
- There had never been a commercial business operating previously;
- One of our residents had worked at a similar business in Leeds and was of the opinion that the property was not suitable in size or location;
- Why have you not taken into account the evidence and the witness statements provided?

Members questioned the objectors on the following points;

REGULATORY COMMITTEE

Thursday, 12 December 2024

- We have heard a lot of information regarding parking, was it a daily issue?
- What had the house been used for since the 2021 application?
- Was the issue the highway element or the fact that it would be operating as a children's home?

The Ward Member present made the following comments;

- 70 objectors and the residents of Bransdale disagree with planning strategy stating that it would not give rise to prejudicial highway safety and the Ward Members agreed with the objectors;
- Guisborough Town Council agreed that the proposal did not comply with policy H5d;
- The initial reports from the Highways Engineer were sensible stressing that the location was unsuitable only for that to be withdrawn;
- The only change to the original application was that bikes were now to be stored in the garage;
- The proposed parking for 3 cars was small and if 3 cars parked on the driveway they would not be able to get out of their cars;
- A resident who lived close to the applicants premises in Acklam stated that there were 4/5 cars parked;
- There would not be only 2 members of staff at the property;
- There were too many ifs and buts;
- The property would accommodate 3 children and 2 adults, so where would they sleep, would they be expected to share spaces inside the property?

Members questioned the Ward Member on the following points;

- What was the age demographic of the area and did the properties all have parking spaces on their drives?

The applicant present at the meeting made the following comments;

- There will be up to 3 young people accommodated at the premises;
- Staff would always be present at the premises;
- It would not be a behavioural home;
- The reason this area was chosen was that it is a nice area which was safe;
- The staff would be trained;
- There was as much of a chance that a family could move in with antisocial behaviour and with children who all drove too;
- They would be investing in the property;
- The company had two other homes with no police call outs;
- Any parking concerns had been addressed by extending the driveway. 3 cars could now park and that had been tested;
- There should be no more than one visitor at any one time;

REGULATORY COMMITTEE

Thursday, 12 December 2024

- The car at the neighbouring property parks on the roadside;
- Neighbours need only knock on the door if there was a car in their way;
- There would not be two staff sleeping at any one time and there would be no sharing of bathrooms with the young people.
-

Members questioned the applicant on the following points;

- In respect of the parking arrangements was there a wall that could be removed to give extra space?
- Other similar premises had more than 3 cars visiting in 1 day and here there was no extra space for parking so where would they park?
- How many of these homes do you run?
- Do the premises have a travel plan?
- Have you managed other properties?
- What would be the age range of the young people?
- Was there a requirement for 3 spaces on the drive?
- Would any of the young people have physical disabilities?
- Was there joint access with next door?
- Would you consider gravelling over more of the driveway?
-

Members debated the application and made the following comments;

- Could we take the parking issues experienced elsewhere into consideration;
- Looking at the site and the nature of the space available for parking and the availability of parking elsewhere people would be parking on Farndale Drive;
- Was it a suitable location for this home;
- Speakers had referred to the fact that it would be difficult to get 3 cars parked on the driveway;
- Not happy with a gravel driveway and could we ask for a more permanent surface;
- The garage was to be used for the storage of bikes but could access be gained to the garage when cars were parked on the driveway;
- A similar property in New Marske was well looked after;
- Sat on the committee in 2021 when there were the same objections.

Following the debate members resolved to grant Planning Permission subject to the following conditions:-

1.The development shall not be begun later than the expiration of THREE YEARS from the date of this permission.

REASON: Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town

Thursday, 12 December 2024

and Country Planning Act 1990.

2.The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Location plan received by the Local Planning Authority on 03/09/2024

Site plan with parking received by the Local Planning Authority on 03/09/2024

Existing and proposed plans and elevations (003) received by the Local Planning Authority on 03/09/2024

REASON: To accord with the terms of the planning application.

3.The use of the property hereby approved shall be restricted to that of a small children's care home of not more than five residents within Class C2 (Residential Institutions) of the Town and Country Planning Use Classes Order 2020 (as amended) and for no other purpose including any other purpose within Class C2 of the Order.

REASON; To accord with the terms of the application and allow the Local Planning Authority to exercise appropriate control over any other use within Class C2 in the interests of protecting the amenity of the area.

4.Prior to the commencement of the use hereby approved the three parking spaces shown on the submitted site plan shall be provided on the site, be available for use and maintained as such. In addition, the existing vehicle crossing shall be extended in accordance with details to be agreed with the Council's highways engineers and the extended crossing shall be installed prior to the commencement of the use. The enlarged parking area shall either be made of porous materials, or provision is made to direct run-off water from the hard surface to a permeable or porous area or surface within the curtilage of the property.

REASON: To ensure the development is provided parking in accordance with the Council's adopted standards, that access from the adjoining highway is improved to the required standard and that provision is made for the disposal of surface water without increasing flood risk.

212

R/2024/0709/F3 INSTALLATION OF 6(NO) CCTV COLUMNS WITH CAMERA, CAGE AND ANTI-CLIMB COLLAR BLACK PATH SOUTH BANK NORMANBY

Councillor Quartermain declared an interest in the following application as the Cabinet Member.

The Officer summarised the officer report which had been pre-circulated.

Members sought questions of clarification around the following matters;

REGULATORY COMMITTEE

Thursday, 12 December 2024

- There had been CCTV in the past and were these posts in the same position as those previously?
- Were the cameras viewed 24/7?
- Would the police have direct access?
- Were these part of the digital roll out or part of the old system?

RESOLVED that Planning Permission be granted subject to the following conditions:-

1.The development shall not be begun later than the expiration of THREE YEARS from the date of this permission.

REASON: Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2.The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

CCTV Location 1 (H1128/3/1) received by the Local Planning Authority on 23/10/2024

CCTV Location 2 (H1128/3/2) received by the Local Planning Authority on 23/10/2024

CCTV Location 3 (H1128/3/3) received by the Local Planning Authority on 23/10/2024

CCTV Location 4 (H1128/3/4) received by the Local Planning Authority on 23/10/2024

CCTV Location 5 (H1128/3/5) received by the Local Planning Authority on 23/10/2024
CCTV Location 6 (H1128/3/6) received by the Local Planning Authority on 23/10/2024

Anti Vandal Poles (WEC-000-1083-05) received by the Local Planning Authority on 23/10/2024

Anti Climb Guard (WEC-001-018-1) received by the Local Planning Authority on 23/10/2024

Clamp on cage (WEC-482845/A2) received by the Local Planning Authority on 23/10/2024

REASON: To accord with the terms of the planning application.

213

R/2024/0379/CA CONVERSION OF PART OF FORMER CHAPEL INTO 2 NO. 2 BEDROOM HOUSES; WORKS TO INCLUDE THE DEMOLITION OF SINGLE STOREY SIDE TOILET EXTENSION; NEW WINDOWS AND DOORS FORMER METHODIST CHAPEL CHAPEL STREET SKINNINGROVE

Deferred to the next meeting.

REGULATORY COMMITTEE

Thursday, 12 December 2024

214 **R/2024/0322/FF 2 NO. GLAMPING PODS, DOG EXERCISE AREA AND ASSOCIATED CAR PARKING THE WILLOWS 1 & 2 PLANTATION COTTAGES LOW STANGHOW ROAD STANGHOW**

Deferred to the next meeting.

215 **DELEGATED DECISIONS**

The Executive Director for Growth, Enterprise and Environment circulated a schedule of delegated decisions determined by the Executive Director for Growth, Enterprise and Environment under the delegated power procedure.

216 **APPEAL INFORMATION**

The Executive Director for Growth, Enterprise and Environment presented members with a schedule of the appeals which had been received.

:-NOTED.

217 **ENFORCEMENT SCHEDULE**

The Executive Director for Growth, Enterprise and Environment presented Members with a schedule of the appeals which had been received.

:-NOTED.

218 **DEEMED CONSENT APPLICATIONS**

R/2024/0709/F3 Installation of 6(no) CCTV columns with camera, cage and anti-climb collar Black Path, South Bank, Normanby.

Deemed Consent granted subject to the following conditions:-

1.The development shall not be begun later than the expiration of THREE YEARS from the date of this permission.

REASON: Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2.The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

CCTV Location 1 (H1128/3/1) received by the Local Planning Authority on 23/10/2024

CCTV Location 2 (H1128/3/2) received by the Local Planning Authority on 23/10/2024

CCTV Location 3 (H1128/3/3) received by the Local Planning Authority on

REGULATORY COMMITTEE

Thursday, 12 December 2024

23/10/2024

CCTV Location 4 (H1128/3/4) received by the Local Planning Authority on 23/10/2024

CCTV Location 5 (H1128/3/5) received by the Local Planning Authority on 23/10/2024
CCTV Location 6 (H1128/3/6) received by the Local Planning Authority on 23/10/2024

Anti Vandal Poles (WEC-000-1083-05) received by the Local Planning Authority on 23/10/2024

Anti Climb Guard (WEC-001-018-1) received by the Local Planning Authority on 23/10/2024

Clamp on cage (WEC-482845/A2) received by the Local Planning Authority on 23/10/2024

REASON: To accord with the terms of the planning application.

R/2024/0626/CA Construction of brick buttresses following the demolition of the methodist chapel (dangerous structure) Loftus Methodist Church, Arlington Street, Loftus.

Deemed Consent granted subject to the following conditions:-

1.The development shall not be begun later than the expiration of THREE YEARS from the date of this permission.

REASON: Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2.The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Location plan received by the Local Planning Authority on 18/09/2024

Proposed site layout plan received by the Local Planning Authority on 16/09/2024

North elevation received by the Local Planning Authority on 16/09/2024

Western elevation received by the Local Planning Authority on 16/09/2024

Eastern elevation received by the Local Planning Authority on 16/09/2024

REASON: To accord with the terms of the planning application.

3.Prior to construction above ground level, full details and/or samples of the facing bricks to be used shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.

REASONS: To safeguard the special character of the conservation area as required by Policy HE1 of the adopted Local Plan.

R/2024/653/F3M Improvements to facilities within King George V

REGULATORY COMMITTEE

Thursday, 12 December 2024

Playing Fields to include a new skate park, wheeled play provision, replacement of recreation apparatus and landscaping enhancements King George V Playfields, Park House, Howlbeck Road, Guisborough.

Deemed consent granted subject to the following conditions:-

1.The development shall not be begun later than the expiration of THREE YEARS from the date of this permission.

REASON: Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2.The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Location plan received by the Local Planning Authority on 02/10/2024
Proposed site plan received by the Local Planning Authority on 02/10/2024

REASON: To accord with the terms of the planning application.

3.Within 12 months of the commencement of development a landscaping scheme shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include size, type and species and a programme of work. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To ensure that the development would respect the site and the surroundings in accordance with policy SD4 of the Local Plan.

4.All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the occupation of the buildings or the completion of the development, whichever is sooner, and any trees or plants which within a period of ten years from the completion of the development die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

REASON: To ensure the satisfactory implementation of the approved scheme in the interests of the visual amenities of the locality.

5.The development shall not commence until a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (the HMMP), prepared in accordance with the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (received by the Local Planning Authority on 16/10/2024) and including:

REGULATORY COMMITTEE

Thursday, 12 December 2024

- (a) a non-technical summary;
- (b) the roles and responsibilities of the people or organisation(s) delivering the [HMMP];
- (c) the planned habitat creation and enhancement works to create or improve habitat to achieve the biodiversity net gain in accordance with the approved Biodiversity Gain Plan;
- (d) the management measures to maintain habitat in accordance with the approved Biodiversity Gain Plan for a period of 30 years from the completion of development; and
- (e) the monitoring methodology and frequency in respect of the created or enhanced habitat to be submitted to the local planning authority, has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.

Notice in writing shall be given to the Council when the:

- (a) HMMP has been implemented; and
- (b) habitat creation and enhancement works as set out in the HMMP have been completed.

The created and/or enhanced habitat specified in the approved HMMP shall be managed and maintained in accordance with the approved HMMP.

Monitoring reports shall be submitted to local planning authority in writing in accordance with the methodology and frequency specified in the approved HMMP.

REASON: To ensure the development delivers a biodiversity net gain on site in accordance with Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

6. Prior to the construction of the final surface treatment, for any hard surfaced areas, details of the materials to be used on that area shall have first been submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To ensure that the appearance of the development would respect the site and the surroundings in accordance with policy SD4 of the Local Plan.

7. Prior to the commencement of development in relation to the MUGA, full

REGULATORY COMMITTEE

Thursday, 12 December 2024

details of the MUGA (including fencing and surface treatments) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To ensure a satisfactory form of development in accordance with policy SD4 of the Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan.

8. Prior to the installation on site, full details of the play equipment shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To ensure a satisfactory form of development in accordance with policy SD4 of the Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan.

9. Prior to the commencement of development in relation to the bike track, full details of the bike track (including sections) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To ensure a satisfactory form of development in accordance with policy SD4 of the Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan.

10. Prior to the commencement of development in relation to the skate park, full details of the skate park (including sections, layout and materials) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To ensure a satisfactory form of development in accordance with policy SD4 of the Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan.

11. Prior to their installation, full details of any CCTV, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To ensure a satisfactory form of development in accordance with policy SD4 of the Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan.

12. Prior to their installation, full details of any lighting, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To ensure a satisfactory form of development in accordance with policy SD4 of the Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan.

13. Prior to their installation, full details of any benches and tables, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.

REGULATORY COMMITTEE

Thursday, 12 December 2024

REASON: To ensure a satisfactory form of development in accordance with policy SD4 of the Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan.

14. Prior to their installation, full details of any fences / means of enclosure, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To ensure a satisfactory form of development in accordance with policy SD4 of the Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan.

15. Prior to any installation on site, full details of any gateway features, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To ensure a satisfactory form of development in accordance with policy SD4 of the Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan.

R/2024/0729/F3 Removal of 1 Altron CCTV Column and CCTV camera and installation of 1 CCTV column (8m high) with CCTV camera Bevanlee Road South Bank, TS6 6QT.

Deemed consent granted subject to the following conditions:-

1. The development shall not be begun later than the expiration of THREE YEARS from the date of this permission.

REASON: Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Location plan received by the Local Planning Authority on 30/10/2024
Site plan received by the Local Planning Authority on 30/10/2024
Proposed CCTV Column received by the Local Planning Authority on 30/10/2024

REASON: To accord with the terms of the planning application.

R/2024/0719/F3 Tarmac constructed MOT bays and dropped crossing; realign palisade fence land at Fairway House, Limerick Road, Dormanstown, Redcar.

Deemed consent granted subject to the following conditions:-

REGULATORY COMMITTEE

Thursday, 12 December 2024

1.The development shall not be begun later than the expiration of THREE YEARS from the date of this permission.

REASON: Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2.The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Location plan received by the Local Planning Authority on 29/10/2024
MOT proposed layout (H1127/3/2) received by the Local Planning Authority on 29/10/2024

REASON: To accord with the terms of the planning application.

R/2024/0756/F3 Installation of 2(no) sets of gates land at allotment gardens, between Churchill Close and Westminster Close, Eston.

Deemed Consent granted subject to the following conditions:-

1.The development shall not be begun later than the expiration of THREE YEARS from the date of this permission.

REASON: Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2.The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Location plan received by the Local Planning Authority on 13/11/2024
Site plan 1 received by the Local Planning Authority on 13/11/2024
Site plan 2 received by the Local Planning Authority on 13/11/2024
Proposed fencing received by the Local Planning Authority on 13/11/2024
Elevation 1 received by the Local Planning Authority on 13/11/2024
Elevation 2 received by the Local Planning Authority on 13/11/2024

REASON: To accord with the terms of the planning application.