

REGULATORY COMMITTEE

3 FEBRUARY 2022

REGULATORY COMMITTEE

A meeting of the Regulatory Committee was held on 3 February 2022.

PRESENT. Councillor Stuart Smith (Chair),
Councillors Foggo, Foley-McCormack, Gallacher
(substituting for Councillor Lockwood), Gray,
Head, Morgan, Ovens and Watts.

OFFICIALS. T Brown, E Dale, E Garbutt, C Griffiths and
A Miller.

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE were submitted on behalf of Councillors
Ayre, Baldwin and Lockwood

61. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Regulatory Committee held on 6 January 2022 be confirmed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

62. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION.**

62.01 **R/2021/0870/CA Partial Demolition of front boundary wall to create parking area; single storey extensions at side and rear including raised patio/decking area with balcony and steps with storage underneath; pitched roof to garage and modifications to garage and side access door (resubmission) 16 Upleatham Redcar.**

The Managing Director advised that permission was sought for partial demolition of front boundary wall to create parking area; single storey extensions at side and rear including raised patio/decking area with balcony and steps with storage underneath; pitched roof to garage and modifications to garage and side access door (re-submission).

The application related to 16 Upleatham, the property was a Grade II listed semi-detached dwelling which was once a schoolhouse and adjoined the west side of the former village hall which was now also a dwelling. The dwelling was located on the south side of the road through the village. The property was within Upleatham Conservation Area. The property had a large garden which sloped away from the house towards agricultural land to the south.

This application sought consent to regularise the built alterations to a garage and the re-positioning of the side access door onto the driveway area following committee approval last year of R/2021/0015/CA and R/2021/0102/LB. Further to the committee decision there was a

REGULATORY COMMITTEE

3 FEBRUARY 2022

subsequent non-material amendment approved R/2021/0481/NM and listed building consent R/2021/0480/LB.

The dwelling had an existing garage which had been added to the property previously, this had been demolished and an extension built to the side. Planning approval R/2021/0015/CA granted consent for a garage to the side with a canopy to the front, the details of which had been altered during construction.

The extension extended 4.6m from the original side elevation of the dwelling, The side porchway extended out 1.9m to the side and the garage 2.7m. The front section of roof featured a cantilever including a timber post. The main garage was 4.8m in length with an eaves height of 2.9m and ridge height of 5.9m. The extension including the cantilever measured approximately 8.3m in length. This revised application proposed double timber doors in place of garage doors and, whilst the plans stated garage doors, the opening was 1.7m wide which was not wide enough to fit a car through. A doorway had been inserted into the west side elevation of the main dwelling. Consent had been granted for a door and window on the west side elevation, this application sought consent for only a door which was 1.9m back from the front elevation of the side porchway.

The application included the removal of a section of wall running up the driveway. The wall was listed and this was considered as part of parallel application for listed building consent.

The application included a single storey extension to the rear which was currently under construction. The extension would project out 3.5m from the rear of the property along the boundary with the Village School, be 5.9m in length and had a flat roof 3.2m high with a central roof lantern

A further element the applicant was seeking consent to construct, was a raised patio/decking area with balcony and steps and storage underneath. The existing finished floor level was approximately 1.5m higher than the garden below. The property had an existing smaller area of raised patio area adjacent to the boundary with the Village School. Stairs would lead down into the garden next to the proposed rear extension and a raised patio area would extend across the full rear elevation of the dwelling and proposed side extension. The patio would be enclosed with a glass balustrade and brick columns approximately 1m high. The rear elevation of the patio would include double timber doors to allow for access into storage underneath. A set of French doors would replace two existing windows to allow for greater access into the patio area.

The proposed extensions and alterations would be constructed with stone to match the existing property .

REGULATORY COMMITTEE

3 FEBRUARY 2022

The application had been accompanied by a site location plan, site plan and existing and proposed floor plans and elevations.

The consultation exercise had resulted in written representations having been received from seven addresses. One comment was in support and six objecting to the proposal making the following comments:-

- *For approximately 10 years No 16 has had little or no maintenance done on it. In the 3 years prior to the property being sold, no maintenance was done, and it had become derelict and dangerous. It was only after the purchase of The School House by its current owners that things improved remarkably. The property is being renovated, both internally and externally, using high quality materials and skilled craftsmen in accordance with the planning permissions given.*
- *This new application, consisting of minor adjustments to the existing approved plans, does nothing to change our support for the work done so far*
- *Cement mortar has been used in works to wall. House does not deserve listed building status now*
- *Fabric of house has been destroyed and hasn't enhanced 'aesthetic significance of the building'*
- *The proposed side extension with sloping roof is disproportionately large and restricts the light afforded to the neighbouring house at No.17.*
- *The rear balcony is likewise disproportionately large, out of all keeping with the traditional building, and is visible from the main road between Guisborough and Saltburn.*
- *Garage misrepresented in proposed plans, it is an extension to the house, with much narrower doors. Reducing car parking capacity. Wall has been adapted and rebuilt using incorrect cement mortar. Sets an unwelcome and dangerous precedent in the village. Wall spans the majority of the length of the village street and is integral to its aspect. Should be preserved and not adapted for modern parking convenience. There's ample parking available on the main village street immediately outside the property. Wall should be returned to original position and correct lime mortar used to ensure its future longevity*
- *Sandstone exterior of building has had its dark patina removed. Lighter buff stone appearance is total out of keeping with the rest of the historic village and stands out 'like a sore thumb'*
- *Boundary wall cleaned with electric sander, now a pale fawny, grey colour, absolutely out of keeping with rest of the walls*
- *Replacement of garage has led to significant reduction in light and need lights on. Height of extension previously dismissed as windows on side elevation are non-occupied rooms. Do not believe the impact on my property or 'green issues' have been*

REGULATORY COMMITTEE

3 FEBRUARY 2022

considered

- *Platform at the rear which runs along the whole length of the house will overlook my garden due to sloping nature of the land*
- *Conservatory is in process of being built, object as proposal is large dominant and does not following the line of building at each side of No. 16*
- *House looks like a new build and not a Grade 2 listed building*

Guisborough Town Council made the following comment:-

"We quite agree with Mrs Lawton re: the lime mortar. We have lost track of what is happening now because of the number of alterations. The plans are not very clear as to what rooms are what?"

Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council (Strategic Planning)
(Conservation Advisor) advised as follows:-

No objection. The proposals generally preserve historic fabric whilst enhancing the aesthetic significance of the building, thereby complying with policies HE1 & HE2 of the adopted Local Plan. The majority of alterations relate to the modern extension and flat roofed garage, which was considered to have a negative impact upon the listed building and the conservation area.

The new side extension, which has a narrower footprint than that shown on earlier plans, has a pitched roof to match the roof of the house and includes fascia boards resulting in a clear visual improvement. The re-configured porch arrangement at the side is well detailed with rock faced sandstone and dressed stone mullions, lintels and cills which preserve the aesthetic significance of the house and contribute to the appearance of this key part of the conservation area. The proposals to the rear also improve the aesthetics of the rear elevation, which was characterised by late 20th century alterations.

The re-positioning of the front garden wall and the lengthening of a rear window aperture has resulted in the loss of a small amount of historic fabric, but both of these interventions are, on balance, considered to be acceptable given the clear aesthetic improvements they facilitate, which addresses former unsympathetic interventions.

The following conditions are suggested:

- *All rainwater goods yet to be installed are to match the existing cast iron rainwater goods already in situ.*

REASON: To ensure the use of satisfactory materials and to safeguard and enhance the special character of the listed building and the character of the conservation area.

REGULATORY COMMITTEE

3 FEBRUARY 2022

• *Prior to installation on the rear platform, full details and/or samples of the balustrade and glazing 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 the use of satisfactory materials and to safeguard the special character of the listed building and the character of the conservation area.

Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council (Development Engineers) made the following comments:-

The property appears to be at least a four-bedroom house, but this is not made clear in the application documents. This will require at least three off-street car parking spaces, three for the first three bedrooms plus an extra space for each additional bedroom.

The development would remove outside car parking space and the two remaining spaces indicated on the plans are of insufficient length to satisfactorily accommodate parked vehicles and are insufficient in numbers.

Either planning permission should be refused on the grounds of the removal of all satisfactory off-street car parking from the site or additional information should be requested as below:

1 - Properly identify the proposed number of bedrooms in the property and the required number of off-street car parking spaces.

2 - Indicate the required car parking spaces on a site plan in a properly accessible manner. All external spaces need to be 4.8m length by 2.4m width with at least an additional 0.5m clear at each end of a row to allow car doors to be opened.

The Managing Director advised that the main considerations in the assessment of the application were;

- The principle of development
- The impacts on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area
- The impacts on neighbour amenity
- The impacts on highways safety

The existing dwelling and front garden were within development limits but the limit boundary ran along the rear of the dwelling as such the rear extension and patio area would be outside of development limits. The Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan Policy SD3 restricted development outside development limits to specific criteria. Criteria g. permits 'a

REGULATORY COMMITTEE

3 FEBRUARY 2022

suitable scaled extension to an existing building'. It was considered the development to the rear was suitably scaled and was consistent with Policy SD3.

The application site was within Upleatham Conservation Area. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 required that in exercising an Authority's planning function special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of Conservation Areas.

The Council's Conservation Advisor had assessed the application and raised no objection making the following comments;

The proposals generally preserved historic fabric whilst enhancing the aesthetic significance of the building, thereby complying with policies HE1 & HE2 of the adopted Local Plan. The majority of alterations related to the modern extension and flat roofed garage, which was considered to have a negative impact upon the listed building and the conservation area. The new side extension, which had a narrower footprint than that shown on earlier plans, had a pitched roof to match the roof of the house and included fascia boards resulting in a clear visual improvement. The re-configured porch arrangement at the side was well detailed with rock faced sandstone and dressed stone mullions, lintels and cills which preserved the aesthetic significance of the house and contributed to the appearance of this key part of the conservation area. The proposals to the rear also improved the aesthetics of the rear elevation, which was characterised by late 20th century alterations. The re-positioning of the front garden wall and the lengthening of a rear window aperture had resulted in the loss of a small amount of historic fabric, but both of these interventions were on balance considered to be acceptable given the clear aesthetic improvements they facilitated, which addressed former unsympathetic interventions. The Conservation Advisor had suggested two conditions relating to the rainwater goods and details of the balustrade and glazing to the rear platform. These conditions would be included as part of the listed building consent application.

The proposals were considered suitable in relation to the proportions, massing, height, size, scale, materials and detailed design features and the application would respect the character of the site and its surroundings. The application accords with part (j) of policy SD4 and HE1 of the Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan.

Several objections had been received from Upleatham residents.

Concerns had been raised regarding the impact of the proposed garage on the occupiers of No. 17 Upleatham. The height of the garage had increased to 5.9m. The neighbouring property had three windows on the east side elevating facing onto the extension. The windows were either

3 FEBRUARY 2022

secondary windows or served a non-habitable room. The extension did not project beyond the existing rear elevation of the dwelling and this combined with the existing relationship with No. 17 would not result in a sufficient detrimental impact on the amenity of the occupiers of No.17 to warrant refusal of the application.

Further concerns had been raised regarding the impact of the raised patio area on the privacy of the occupiers of No. 17. The dwelling had an existing raised platform area to the rear before works commenced, the previous area was built against the boundary with The Village School and did not project as close to the boundary as the proposed raised area. The dwelling had an existing path running alongside the driveway and garage which allowed access to the rear garden. The stairs were positioned against the boundary with No. 17.

This application proposed a new set of steps in the same position and then the raised platform. The proposed platform would be a maximum of 3.5m wide. The south west corner adjacent the boundary with No. 17 would be at an angle away from the boundary. The south west corner would be approximately 3m from the boundary with No. 17. The concerns regarding overlooking were noted, however it was considered due to the position of the platform, the existing relationship, and the difference in land levels this element of the proposals was acceptable.

The rear extension would project out adjacent to the boundary with The Village School. The neighbouring property had recently been granted consent for a single storey extension with the same projection as the extension subject of this application. The extension was considered acceptable.

It was considered the proposed works to the side and rear of the dwelling would not have a sufficiently detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers at No. 17 or The Village School and the proposals were in accordance with Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council Local Plan Policy SD4.

The Council's Development Engineer had raised concerns regarding the proposed lack of parking. However, there were no highway objections to the original approval for the works R/2021/0015/CA.

The original garage that was demolished measured 2.5m wide and 4.5m in length. The garage approved as part of R2021/0015/CA measured 2.5 x 4.5m, which was less than the required 3m x 6m garage to accord with highway standards. This application proposed the same size extension but had a smaller opening of 1.7m which was not wide enough to be practically used as a garage space. Therefore, whilst it was acknowledged the current application removed a 'garage' from the proposal a car would not have been able to park in the garage and, as

REGULATORY COMMITTEE

3 FEBRUARY 2022

such, the parking provision remained the same as the existing with a space on the driveway. It was therefore considered the proposal would not raise any greater issues in terms of highway safety than existed.

The proposal raised no issues in terms of highways safety and the application accords with part p of policy SD4 of the Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan.

The application raised no issues in terms of crime prevention and the application accords with part m of policy SD4 Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan.

For the reasons outline above the proposals were considered acceptable. The proposals would not have a significant adverse impact on neighbouring amenity and the proposals raised no issues in terms of highway safety or crime prevention. The scale and design were acceptable, and the proposals would respect the character of the site and surroundings. The proposals accords with policies SD3, SD4 and HE1 of the Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan

The objectors present at the meeting made the following comments:-

- The property had been on the market for a number of years so the sale had been welcome and they had anticipated that repairs would take place;
- Objections were raised in early 2021 when alterations were commenced to protect the front wall but these concerns were ignored;
- There was a specific requirement that there should be no demolition of the front wall and several amendments were submitted however the protected wall had been altered;
- The changes to the garage and the conservatory had resulted in the overshadowing of the house, having been extended beyond the line of houses to the left and to the right and it was now visible from both the Skelton and Guisborough Roads;
- Overlooked the garden and terrace of the property next door and no possible barrier would be high enough to protect their privacy;
- Reasonable alterations would have been acceptable however disappointed that works have been carried out without Planning Permission and believed the Council had failed in their conservation of the village;
- Should reasonable expect peace in our garden and house without this intrusion;
- The proposed works were detrimental to both the Conservation Area and the Village;
- This was a grade II Victorian Gothic property;
- The application submitted in April 2021 was for a single storey

REGULATORY COMMITTEE

3 FEBRUARY 2022

- garage which would not have had a detrimental effect and was in keeping however, this was not what was built;
- The current build restricted the light to No 17, did not provide room for a car and there was never any intention of it being a garage;
 - The garage had now been allowed to become a two storey extension;
 - Cement mortar had been used with possibly some lime included;
 - The owner of the church opposite this property was instructed to use only authentic materials;
 - The rear extension and walkway were out of keeping and would result in a bright spot that would be visible from the Skelton and Guisborough roads;
 - The lighter colour of the sandstone now stood out due to the cleaning of the sandstone;
 - There had been numerous amendments which made the application difficult to follow and when residents had questioned the applicant/agent or builder they were met with hostility;
 - The 20 signatures objecting to this application reflected the strength of feeling in the village;
 - The renovation of this property had not been subject to the scrutiny that it deserved;
 - The installation of the glass balustrade and a patio 4 metres above the garden breached paragraphs 18 and 27 of the Local Development Framework;
 - The balustrade and patio were unacceptable due to the overlooking and overshadowing of adjacent properties;
 - There would be a huge detrimental impact on privacy especially in the neighbours back garden and the destruction of the trees would exacerbate this;
 - A modern glass structure was out of character with the property and would be visible from the main road
 - Could improve neighbour relations by stepping the wall down;
 - The applicant had removed a section of the wall to create an extra parking space when there was on street parking available and an existing parking space on the drive.

Following the presentation of the report the Managing Director and taking into account the representations, the Committee made the following comments:-

- Most of the objections were considered last year and these were only minor alterations. The overlooking was considered previously and found to be acceptable and the rest were minor changes;
- The glass balustrade was a good result as a sandstone wall 3 metres high would look worse;
- Commend the planning section as this application had not been an easy one to manage and there seemed to have been a lot of

REGULATORY COMMITTEE

3 FEBRUARY 2022

persuasion involved which had resulted in the best outcome we could have expected;

- This was a high quality conversion;
- There were concerns in respect of the garage but after listening to the Conservation Officer today am now comfortable with that aspect of the proposal;
- Did not feel there would be any impact from the road as drivers would be concentrating on their driving;
- The rear brickwork would be sandstone and had no concerns regarding the change to the windows;
- Overall the appearance would be improved.

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:

- Location Plan received by the Local Planning Authority on 18/10/2021

- Site Plan received by the Local Planning Authority on 01/11/2021

- Proposed Floor Plan (Garden Wall) received by the Local Planning Authority on 28/10/2021

- Proposed Elevations (Garden Wall) received by the Local Planning Authority on 28/10/2021

- Proposed Roof Plan received by the Local Planning Authority on 18/10/2021

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

3. The proposed new driveway shall be constructed from porous/permeable materials or provision made to direct run-off water from the hard surface to a permeable or porous area or surface within the curtilage of the dwelling house. The approved car parking layout shall be retained for the lifetime of the development.

REASON: In the interests of highway safety and to prevent

3 FEBRUARY 2022

increase risk of flooding from surface water run-off in accordance with Local Plan Policy SD4.

62.02 R/2021/0869/LB Listed Building Consent for partial demolition of front boundary wall to create parking area; single storey extensions at side and rear including raised patio/decking area with balcony and steps with storage underneath; pitched roof to existing garage modifications to garage and side access door (Amended Scheme) 16 Upleatham Redcar.

The Managing Director advised Members that Listed building consent was sought for partial demolition of front boundary wall to create parking area; single storey extensions at side and rear including raised patio/decking area with balcony and steps with storage underneath; pitched roof to existing garage modifications to garage and side access door (amended scheme)

The application related to 16 Upleatham. The property was a Grade II listed semi-detached dwelling which was once a schoolhouse and was attached to the former village hall which was now also a dwelling. The dwelling was located on the south side of the road through the village. The property was within Upleatham Conservation Area. The property had a large garden which sloped away from the house towards agricultural land. A Grade II listed sandstone wall ran across the front boundary of the property. The wall ran from No. 14 – 20 Upleatham.

This application sought consent to regularise the built alterations to the garage and the re-positioning of the side access door onto the driveway area following committee approval last year of R/2021/0015/CA and R/2021/0102/LB. Further to the committee decision there was a subsequent non-material amendment approved R/2021/0481/NM and listed building consent R/2021/0480/LB.

This application sought consent to demolish a section of the sandstone wall to the front of the property. The wall was Grade II listed and ran from No. 14-20 Upleatham. The existing wall ran across the front of the property, with a section extending towards the dwelling along the existing driveway. This application proposed to remove approximately 2m of the wall to the front of the property to create a parking area. The wall would extend along the driveway area to adjoin the front elevation of the dwelling. At the time of writing this report this work had taken place.

The dwelling had an existing garage which had been added to the property previously, this had been demolished to make way for an extension to the side. Planning approval R/2021/0015/CA granted consent for a garage to the side with a canopy to the front, the details of which had altered during construction. The extension extended 4.6m

REGULATORY COMMITTEE

3 FEBRUARY 2022

from the original side elevation of the dwelling, The side porchway extended out 1.9m to the side and the garage 2.7m. The front section of roof featured a cantilever including a timber post. The main garage would be 4.8m in length with an eaves height of 2.9m and ridge height of 5.9m. The extension, including the cantilever, measured approximately 8.3m in length. This revised application proposed double timber doors in place of garage doors and whilst the proposed plans stated garage doors the opening was 1.7m wide which was not wide enough to fit a car through. A doorway had been inserted into the west side elevation of the main dwelling. Consent had been granted for a door and window on the west side elevation. This application sought consent for only a door which was 1.9m back from the front elevation of the side porchway.

The application included a single storey extension to the rear. The extension was under construction and would project out 3.5m from the rear of the property along the boundary with the Village School, be 5.9m in length and had a flat roof 3.2m high with a central roof lantern.

In addition to the extensions to the property, this application sought consent to construct raised patio/decking area with balcony and steps and storage underneath. The existing finished floor level was approximately 1.5m higher than the garden below. The property had an existing smaller area of raised patio area adjacent to the boundary with the Village School. Stairs would lead down into the garden next to the proposed rear extension and a raised patio area would extend across the full rear elevation of the dwelling and proposed garage extension. The patio would be enclosed with a glass balustrade and brick columns approximately 1m high. The rear elevation of the patio would include double timber doors to allow for access into storage underneath. A set of French doors would replace two existing windows to allow for greater access into the patio area.

The proposed extensions and alterations would be constructed with stone to match the existing.

The application had been accompanied by a site location plan, site plan, existing and proposed floor plans and elevations and a Design and Access and Heritage Statement.

The consultation exercise had resulted in six written representations having been received objecting to the proposal and one written representation in support. The comments had been summarised as follows:-

- *No objection. The property is being renovated, both internally and externally, using high quality materials and skilled craftsmen in accordance with the planning permissions given. This new application, consisting of minor adjustments to the existing*

REGULATORY COMMITTEE

3 FEBRUARY 2022

approved plans, does nothing to change our support for the work done so far.

- *Cement mortar pointing the wall. Nothing has been done that enhances this house.*
- *Doesn't deserve listed building status now, you have allowed historic fabric of house to be destroyed. Hasn't enhance the 'aesthetic significance of the building'.*
- *Upleatham Conservation Area Appraisal 2012 details attributes of the village which stresses the need to protect the Village buildings from inappropriate alterations.*
- *Document mentions the Schoolhouse several times e.g., as one of the principal buildings in the conservation area and one of the historic buildings in the village core*
- *Modifications to building and garden wall significantly change the character and appearance of the Schoolhouse and clearly fly in the face of the Council's requirements for the Conservation Village*
- *Have letter with over 20 signatures objecting to the development by the village community*
- *Side extension with sloping roof is disproportionately large and restricts light to No. 17*
- *Balcony is likewise disproportionately large, out of keeping with the traditional building and visible from the main road between Guisborough and Saltburn*
- *150-year-old garden wall adapted using incorrect cement mortar. Sets unwelcome and dangerous precedent in the village. Should be preserved and not adapted for modern parking convenience. Ample parking available on the main village street. Wall should be returned to original position and lime mortar used.*
- *Whole sandstone exterior of original building has had its attractive darker patina removed, believed to be done with a angle grinder. Lighter buff stone is total out of keeping with the rest of the historic village and stands out 'like a sore thumb'*
- *What's been built as a garage is fraudulent, looks like it was never intended to be a garage*
- *House looks like a new build and not a Grade 2 listed building*
- *Garage has morphed into an extension with double doors, wonder what other surprises will surface before this is completed.*

Guisborough Town Council made the following comment:-

"We quite agree with Mrs Lawton re: the lime mortar. We have lost track of what is happening now because of the number of alterations. The plans are not very clear as to what rooms are what?"

Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council (Strategic Planning)
(Conservation Advisor) made the following comments:-

No objection. The proposals generally preserve historic fabric whilst

REGULATORY COMMITTEE

3 FEBRUARY 2022

enhancing the aesthetic significance of the building, thereby complying with policies HE1 & HE2 of the adopted Local Plan. The majority of alterations relate to the modern extension and flat roofed garage, which was considered to have a negative impact upon the listed building and the conservation area.

The new side extension, which has a narrower footprint than that shown on earlier plans, has a pitched roof to match the roof of the house and includes fascia boards resulting in a clear visual improvement. The re-configured porch arrangement at the side is well detailed with rock faced sandstone and dressed stone mullions, lintels and cills which preserve the aesthetic significance of the house and contribute to the appearance of this key part of the conservation area. The proposals to the rear also improve the aesthetics of the rear elevation, which was characterised by late 20th century alterations.

The re-positioning of the front garden wall and the lengthening of a rear window aperture has resulted in the loss of a small amount of historic fabric, but both of these interventions are, on balance, considered to be acceptable given the clear aesthetic improvements they facilitate, which addresses former unsympathetic interventions.

The following conditions are suggested:

- All rainwater goods yet to be installed are to match the existing cast iron rainwater goods already in situ.*

REASON: To ensure the use of satisfactory materials and to safeguard and enhance the special character of the listed building and the character of the conservation area.

- Prior to installation on the rear platform, full details and/or samples of the balustrade and glazing 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 the use of satisfactory materials and to safeguard the special character of the listed building and the character of the conservation area.

The Managing Director advised that the main issue to consider was the impact of the alterations upon the significance on the listed building in terms of its historical and architectural fabric.

Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council Local Plan Policy HE2, protected heritage assets. Development would only be permitted if proposals:

- a. preserves or enhances its significance as a heritage asset;*

3 FEBRUARY 2022

b. protects existing historically significant hard and soft landscaping, including

trees, hedges, walls, fences and surfaces;

c. retains historic plot boundaries and layouts; and

d. ensures the sensitive and viable use of the building.

The Council's Conservation Advisor had assessed the application and had no objections to the proposals, he commented:

The proposals generally preserve historic fabric whilst enhancing the aesthetic significance of the building, thereby complying with policies HE1 & HE2 of the adopted Local Plan. The majority of alterations relate to the modern extension and flat roofed garage, which was considered to have a negative impact upon the listed building and the conservation area.

The new side extension, which has a narrower footprint than that shown on earlier plans, has a pitched roof to match the roof of the house and includes fascia boards resulting in a clear visual improvement. The re-configured porch arrangement at the side is well detailed with rock faced sandstone and dressed stone mullions, lintels and cills which preserve the aesthetic significance of the house and contribute to the appearance of this key part of the conservation area. The proposals to the rear also improve the aesthetics of the rear elevation, which was characterised by late 20th century alterations.

The re-positioning of the front garden wall and the lengthening of a rear window aperture has resulted in the loss of a small amount of historic fabric, but both of these interventions are on balance considered to be acceptable given the clear aesthetic improvements they facilitate, which addresses former unsympathetic interventions.

Two conditions were suggested relating to rainwater goods and details of the rear platform balustrade and glazing. Conditions would be included as part of the decision.

The objections from local residents were noted, however it was the opinion of the officers the proposals generally preserved the historic fabric whilst enhancing the aesthetic significance of the building.

It was considered the proposed alterations would help preserve the buildings historic fabric and they were in accordance with Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council Local Plan Policy HE1.

The proposed development would not have a detrimental impact on the special architectural or historic interest of the Grade II listed building and boundary wall. The proposed development was considered to accord with the requirements of all relevant Local Plan policies, the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation

REGULATORY COMMITTEE

3 FEBRUARY 2022

Areas) Act 1990.

RESOLVED that Listed Building Consent 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 18 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) 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 18/10/2021

- Site Plan received by the Local Planning Authority on 01/11/2021
Proposed Floor Plans (Garden Wall) received by the Local Planning Authority on 28/10/2021

- Proposed Elevations (Garden Wall) received by the Local Planning Authority on 28/10/2021

- Proposed Roof Plan received by the Local Planning Authority on 18/10/2021

- Proposed window and door details received by the Local Planning Authority on 01/11/2021

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

3. All rainwater goods yet to be installed are to match the existing cast iron rainwater goods already in situ.

REASON: To ensure the use of satisfactory materials and to safeguard and enhance the special character of the listed building and the character of the conservation area in accordance with Local Plan Policy HE1 and HE2.

4. Prior to installation on the rear platform, full details and/or samples of the balustrade and glazing 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 the use of satisfactory materials and to safeguard the special character of the listed building and the character of the conservation area in accordance with Local Plan

3 FEBRUARY 2022

Policies HE1 and HE2.

62.03 **R/2021/0908/CA Detached summerhouse/ pergola and detached oil tanker at rear 16 Upleatham Redcar.**

The Managing Director advised that Permission was sought for detached summerhouse / pergola and detached oil tank in the rear garden of the property.

The application related to 16 Upleatham. The property was a Grade II listed semi-detached dwelling which was once a schoolhouse and adjoined the west side of the former village hall which was now also a dwelling. The dwelling was located on the south side of the road through the village. The property was within Upleatham Conservation Area. The property had a large garden which sloped away from the house towards agricultural land to the south. The rear garden of the property was outside development limits.

This application sought planning permission to construct a summerhouse with pergola in the south eastern corner of the garden. The summerhouse would be 5.5m in length, 3.5m deep and 2.5m high with a flat roof, it would have glazed double doors on the front elevation. The design would include a timber pergola to the front elevation of the summerhouse. The pergola would measure 3m wide and project out a further 3m into the garden. Both elements would be timber and stained/painted brown. The colour of the structures had been revised following officer concerns regarding the initially proposed Cook's blue colour being out of keeping.

The application included the siting of an oil tank. At the time of the officer's site visit in December the tank was in situ along with a timber enclosure. The 1620mm high oil tank was positioned on a 400mm concrete base. The tank was 2200mm in length and 650mm in width. The timber enclosure had been built on top of the concrete base and was 2000mm high. The oil tank had been positioned close to the boundary with No. 17 adjacent to a number of small trees running along the boundary.

Revised plans were received on the 19th January 2022 which included the change to the colour of summerhouse and pergola to brown and details of the timber enclosure to the oil tank. The plans were subject to a further public consultation with comments to be returned by 26th January.

The application had been accompanied by site plans, proposed elevations and a Design and Access and Heritage Statement.

As a result of the consultation period six written representations had been received. The comments had been summarised as follows:

- *We live in adjoining property. We have no objections to these*

REGULATORY COMMITTEE

3 FEBRUARY 2022

proposals

- *Like other applications submitted for this property oil tank in situ with oil and fence around it*
- *Proposed colour of summerhouse is not in keeping with its position in the garden*
- *Summerhouse too large for modest garden, should be scaled down*
- *Bright blue colour should be tone down to something less obtrusive*
- *Blue colour looks like corporation blue buses and will not merge into the scenery*
- *If hedge at bottom of garden cut the proposed colour of the summerhouse will be seen from the B1268 as well as from the Skelton Road*

Guisborough Town Council had no objections.

Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council (Strategic Planning)
(Conservation Advisor) made the following comments:-

No objection to the proposals which will be effectively screened from more distant views by existing boundaries. Whilst likely to be visible from raised viewpoints in neighbouring properties, the summerhouse and oil tank are typical domestic accoutrements and are not considered to be harmful to the settings of the listed host building nor nearby listed buildings. The character of the conservation area will also be preserved, and the scheme is therefore considered to accord with policies HE1 and HE2 of the adopted Local Plan.

The Managing Director advised that the main considerations in the assessment of the application were:-

- The principle of development
- The impacts on the character and appearance of the area
- The impacts on neighbour amenity
- The impacts on highways safety

The rear garden of the property was located outside the development limits of Upleatham. Nevertheless, the development would be within the existing domestic curtilage and the proposed structures would be ancillary to the residential dwelling. As such it was considered the principle of an outbuilding and oil tank was acceptable and accords with the aims of Local Plan Policy SD3.

The initial plans proposed the summerhouse to be painted a Cook's Blue colour. It was the opinion of the officers the colour would have been too bright and out of keeping with the rural setting of the garden. The proposed plans had been revised to show the summerhouse and pergola painted/stained brown, which was considered to be a more sympathetic

REGULATORY COMMITTEE

3 FEBRUARY 2022

colour.

The summerhouse would be positioned against the stone boundary wall with The Village School and a mature hedge to the rear.

The Council's Conservation officer had assessed the application and had no objection to the proposals he commented,

No objection to the proposals which will be effectively screened from more distant views by existing boundaries. Whilst likely to be visible from raised viewpoints in neighbouring properties, the summerhouse and oil tank are typical domestic accoutrements and are not considered to be harmful to the settings of the listed host building nor nearby listed buildings. The character of the conservation area will also be preserved, and the scheme is therefore considered to accord with policies HE1 and HE2 of the adopted Local Plan.

The proposals were considered suitable in relation to the proportions, massing, height, size, scale, materials and detailed design features and the application would respect the character of the site and its surroundings. The application accords with part (j) of policy SD4 and HE1 of the Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan.

Due to the ancillary nature of the development in addition to the scale and location of the structures it was considered the proposals would not have a detrimental impact upon neighbour amenity.

Concerns over the proposed colour of the summerhouse were noted and this had been revised to be more in keeping with the area.

The alterations would not have a significant adverse impact on the amenity of occupiers of existing buildings and the proposal accords with part (b) of policy SD4 of the Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan

The proposed additional structures to the rear garden would not have any impact on parking provision or highway safety. The application raised no issues in terms of highways safety and the application accords with part (p) of policy SD4 of the Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan.

The application raised no issues in terms of crime prevention and the application accords with part m of policy SD4 Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan.

For the reasons above the proposals were considered acceptable. The proposed summerhouse, pergola and oil tank would not have a significant adverse impact on neighbour amenity and the proposals raised no issues in terms of highways safety or crime prevention. The scale and design was considered acceptable and the proposal would respect the character

REGULATORY COMMITTEE

3 FEBRUARY 2022

of the site and the Conservation Area. The proposal accords with policies SD3, SD4 and HE1 of the Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan.

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

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 28/10/2021

- Site plan received by the Local Planning Authority on 19/01/2022

- Elevations of Oil Tank received by the Local Planning Authority on 19/01/2022

- Floor plan and elevations of summerhouse received by the Local Planning Authority on 19/01/2022

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

3. The external elevations of the summerhouse and pergola hereby approved shall be painted/stained brown.

REASON: To ensure the proposed development is in keeping with the rural setting and setting of the listed building in accordance with Local Plan Policy SD4 and HE2.

62.04 **R/2021/0909/LB Listed Building Consent for detached summerhouse/pergola and detached oil tank at rear 16 Upleatham Redcar.**

The Managing Director advised that Listed Building Consent was sought for detached summerhouse/pergola and detached oil tank at rear.

The application related to 16 Upleatham. The property was a Grade II listed semi-detached dwelling which was once a schoolhouse and was attached to the former village hall which was now also a dwelling. The dwelling was located on the south side of the road through the village. The property was within Upleatham Conservation Area. The property had a large garden which sloped away from the house towards agricultural

3 FEBRUARY 2022

land.

This application sought listed building consent to construct a summerhouse with pergola in the south eastern corner of the garden. The summerhouse would be 5.5m in length, 3.5m deep and 2.5m high with a flat roof and glazed double doors on the front elevation. The design included a timber pergola to the front elevation of the summerhouse. The pergola would measure 3m wide and project out a further 3m into the garden. Both elements would be timber and stained/painted brown. The colour of the structures had been revised following officer concerns regarding the initially proposed Cook's blue colour being out of keeping.

The application included the siting of an oil tank. At the time of the officer's site visit in December the tank was in situ along with a timber enclosure. The 1620mm high oil tank was positioned on a 400mm concrete base. The tank was 2200mm in length and 650mm in width. The timber enclosure had been built on top of the concrete base and was 2000mm high. The oil tank had been positioned close to the boundary with No. 17 adjacent to a number of small trees running along the boundary.

Revised plans were received on the 19th January 2022 which included the change to the colour of the summerhouse and pergola colour to brown and details of the timber enclosure shown around the oil tank. The plans were subject to a further public consultation with comments to be returned by 26th January.

The application had been accompanied by site plans, proposed elevations and a Design and Access and Heritage Statement.

The consultation exercise had resulted in three written representations having been received, one in support of the application. The comments were summarised as follows:-

- *We live in adjoining property and have no objections to these proposals*
- *the oil tank is already in position and, if the hedge at the bottom of the garden is cut the proposed colour of the summerhouse will be seen from the B1268 as well as from the Skelton Road.*
- *'Vibrant blue' aka Cook's Blue cladding for the summerhouse couldn't a colour that was more in keeping with the countryside have been chosen?*

Guisborough Council had no objections.

Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council (Strategic Planning)
(Conservation) made the following comments:-

No objection to the proposals which will be effectively screened from more

3 FEBRUARY 2022

distant views by existing boundaries. Whilst likely to be visible from raised viewpoints in neighbouring properties, the summerhouse and oil tank are typical domestic accoutrements and are not considered to be harmful to the settings of the listed host building nor nearby listed buildings. The character of the conservation area will also be preserved, and the scheme is therefore considered to accord with policies HE1 and HE2 of the adopted Local Plan.

The Managing Director advised that the main issue to consider was the impact of the alterations upon the significance on the listed building in terms of its historical and architectural fabric.

Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council Local Plan Policy HE2, protected heritage assets. Development would only be permitted if proposals:

- a. preserves or enhances its significance as a heritage asset;*
- b. protects existing historically significant hard and soft landscaping, including trees, hedges, walls, fences and surfaces;*
- c. retains historic plot boundaries and layouts; and*
- d. ensures the sensitive and viable use of the building.*

The Council's Conservation officer had no objections to the proposal and commented;

No objection to the proposals which will be effectively screened from more distant views by existing boundaries. Whilst likely to be visible from raised viewpoints in neighbouring properties, the summerhouse and oil tank are typical domestic accoutrements and are not considered to be harmful to the settings of the listed host building nor nearby listed buildings. The character of the conservation area will also be preserved and the scheme is therefore considered to accord with policies HE1 and HE2 of the adopted Local Plan.

The proposed development will not have a detrimental impact on the special architectural or historic interest of the Grade II listed building. Therefore, the proposed development was considered to accord with the requirements of all relevant Local Plan policies, the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

RESOLVED that Listed Building Consent 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 18 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

REGULATORY COMMITTEE

3 FEBRUARY 2022

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 28th October 2021
 - Site plan received by the Local Planning Authority on 19th January 2022
 - Floor plan and elevations of summerhouse received by the Local Planning Authority on 19th January 2022
 - Elevation of oil tank received by the Local Planning Authority on 19th January 2022

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

3. The external elevations of the summerhouse and pergola hereby approved shall be painted/stained brown.

REASON: To ensure the proposed development is in keeping with the rural setting and setting of the listed building in accordance with Local Plan Policy SD4 and HE2.

63. **DELEGATED DECISIONS.**

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

:-NOTED.

64. **APPEAL INFORMATION.**

The Managing Director presented Members with a schedule of the appeals which had been received.

:-NOTED.

65. **ENFORCEMENT SCHEDULE.**

The Managing Director presented Members with the schedule of enforcement actions which had been undertaken.

:-NOTED.

66. **SECTION 106 AGREEMENTS.**

The Managing Director presented a response to a recommendation of the

REGULATORY COMMITTEE

3 FEBRUARY 2022

Tees Valley Audit and Assurance TVASS report (April 2016) in respect of the reporting of progress on the completion of Section 106 Agreements.

:-NOTED.