

31 MARCH 2022

**REGULATORY COMMITTEE**

A meeting of the Regulatory Committee was held on 31 March 2022.

**PRESENT.** Councillor Stuart Smith (Chair),  
Councillors Ayre, Baldwin, Foggo,  
Foley-McCormack, Gray, Head, Lockwood and  
Watts.

**OFFICIALS.** E Dale, E Garbutt, C Griffiths, H Oakes and  
R Rynn

**APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE** were submitted on behalf of Councillors  
L Holmes, Morgan and Ovens.

**Councillor Smith declared an interest in application R/2021/0858/F3  
and took no part in the discussion nor voted thereon.**

76. **MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting of the Taxi Panel held on 28  
February and Regulatory Committee held on 3 March 2022 be confirmed  
and signed by the Chair as correct records.

77. **REVIEW OF HACKNEY FARES.**

The Managing Director asked Members to consider the proposed table of  
fares that could be charged by proprietors of hackney carriage vehicle to  
passengers and to put forward recommendations to Cabinet for  
implementation.

**RESOLVED** to recommend that Cabinet agree the proposed  
amendments to the table of fares as follows: -

Tariff 1

From 6.00am until midnight on any day except on a public bank holiday or  
all hirings on 24 and 31 December.

- £3.50 for the first mile, or part thereof (currently £3)
- £0.20 for each 1/10th of a mile thereafter (currently £0.15)

Tariff 2

From midnight until 6.00am on any day and all hirings on a public bank  
holiday and the 24 and 31 December.

- £4.00 for the first mile, or part thereof (currently £3.50)
- £0.25 for each 1/10th of a mile thereafter (currently £0.18)

31 MARCH 2022

**78. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION.**

**78.01 R/2022/0069/FF First Floor Extension, Front Extension and Detached Double Garage, West Lodge, Stokesley Road, Guisborough.**

The Managing Director reported that Permission was sought for an extension to the existing bungalow at West Lodge, Stokesley Road, Guisborough. The application site was a single storey detached dwelling located on a L shaped plot. The properties within in this part of Stokesley Road were of an individual design with the majority of properties being two storey detached dwellings. The property was set back from Stokesley Road in the northeast corner of the site.

The proposal sought to provide for the addition of a first floor to the bungalow to create a two-storey dwelling house. The existing property measured approximately 21.3m in length by 10.7 m width with an eaves height to 2.5m and ridge height to 4.7 and 5.5 / 5.7m. The proposal would result in a property measuring approximately 21.9m by 10.7m with heights to 5.5m eaves and 7.6m ridge. The proposal would also sought to provide a redesigned frontage to the property and a newbuild detached garage measuring 6.5m by 6.5m with a pitched roof to heights of 2.7m eaves and 5.4m ridge.

The consultation exercise had resulted in 6 representations having been received making the following comments:-

- Impacts on overshadowing to neighbouring property and loss of light,
- Over development of the site
- Out of character with the area
- Overlooking to Westmead and Oak House
- Oppression to Westmead and Oak House
- The application was below the 21m separation distance requirement
- Access to maintain gutters would be impeded
- Impacts on land stability
- Loss of views
- There was a restrictive covenant on the land
- Impact on property prices
- Reduction of natural light to neighbouring properties
- Impacts on right to light

Guisborough Town Council previously objected subject to neighbours. They now objected due to overshadowing and over development.

Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council (Development Engineers) advised that there were no highway objections subject to no unauthorised

## REGULATORY COMMITTEE

---

31 MARCH 2022

storage of building materials on the adopted highway at any time.

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

Policy SD4 amongst other requirements at criteria J, K and L required that proposals respected the character of the area and sought to improve the character and quality where possible along with being sustainable in design.

The comments in relation to objecting on the grounds of overdevelopment of the site were noted.

In this regard the proposal was noted as increasing the scale of the development on the site. However, the property and garage would be seen as being set well back from the highway and between existing properties. The locality was formed by a variety of house design styles and materials. In this regard the proposal would provide a well-designed and proportioned frontage to Stokesley Road and would not result in any significant impacts upon the character and form of the area.

The proposal was considered therefore to comply in this regard with policy SD4 (J, K and L) of the Local Plan.

Policy SD4 amongst other requirements at criterion B required that proposals “will not have a significant adverse impact on the amenities of occupiers of existing or proposed nearby land and buildings”.

The key impacts for consideration of this type of proposal were considered to be, the effects from overlooking, overshadowing, and oppression from size scale and massing.

The Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (May 2013) (Design Guide) at para 2.9 sets out the generally accepted separation distances between properties sought in developments. The relationship from front elevation to rear elevation was advised at 21m, side to rear was set at 13m.

The proposal had its side elevations toward the properties at Westmead (to the east of the application site) and Oak House (to the west of the application site).

Westmead was set forward of the proposal property and had a separation

## REGULATORY COMMITTEE

---

31 MARCH 2022

of 10.9m between side elevations. The offset and separation along with the proposal having only 2 en-suite windows and a bedroom window to this elevation were considered to not result in impacts of overlooking, to such a degree to warrant resistance on these grounds. The property would impact upon Westmead with a change in outlook but given the scale of the garden area and the layout would not have impacts of overshadowing or oppression to significant levels.

Brown House to the southwest would be sufficiently separated to not have any significant effects of overlooking, overshadowing or oppression.

Oak House was located to the west of the proposal and had its rear elevation facing the proposal with a number of living room and bedroom windows to its rear. The comments from the neighbour indicated that the existing property measured 18.7m separation distance. The proposal plans showed that the proposal would be approximately 20.8m separation distance from the rear elevation of Oak House. The plans also noted a drop in levels from the property at Oak House to the proposal site. The plans indicated 300mm difference in levels. Paragraph 2.11 of the Design Guide noted that a "lower site level may benefit a development by lessening its impact on neighbours". In this instance it was considered that the change in levels served to offset the distance separation between the properties. As such it was considered that on balance this separation distance was acceptable. The proposal had been amended through its submission to provide for an en-suite window level with the rear corner of the garden to Oak House with the further 3 bedroom windows offset from the rear garden. Given this and the noted separation distance it was not considered that there would be a significant impact of overlooking. The property at 5.5m eaves and 7.6m ridge would be toward the lower height expected of a two-storey dwelling, again at the separation distance proposed and with the change in levels it was not considered that there would be a significant impact of overbearing from the massing proposed. Given the location of the property against this neighbour it was not considered that appreciable impact of shadowing would occur. As such the relationship in this regard was considered to be acceptable.

The relationship to the properties to the north on Whincatt Trail were separated by approximately 16m and with no upper floor windows looking in this direction and with mature boundary planting it was not considered that there would be any significant impacts of overlooking, overshadowing or oppression to warrant refusal in this regard.

The proposed garage was considered to be located with sufficient separation distance for its size, scale and massing and would not result in significant impact of overlooking, overshadowing or oppression upon any of the neighbouring properties.

The proposal was considered to be acceptable in this regard with policy

31 MARCH 2022

SD4 (B) of the Local Plan.

Policy SD4 criterion P required that proposals 'provide suitable and safe vehicular access and parking suitable for its use and location'. The application had been consulted on with the Highways Officer and no objections were raised. Given the available car parking and the ability to turn within the site, it was not considered that there would be any significant impacts upon highways safety. It was considered that the proposal was acceptable in this regard with policy SD4(p).

The comments in relation to the storage of building material off the highway were noted. However, as the highway was protected by its own legislation in this regard a condition to this effect was not considered to be necessary and should therefore not be attached to any approval granted.

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.

The comments received as result of the consultation period were noted however, for the reasons set out in the report none were considered to raise material planning considerations that would support a refusal of planning permission. Members would be aware that some of the points raised throughout the consultation period were not matters for planning control.

For the reasons outlined 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 was acceptable and the proposals would respect the character of the site and surroundings.

The proposals accord with policies SD3 and SD4 of the Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan.

The objectors at the meeting made the following comments:-

- The proposal does not accord with the principles of the SD policies within the Local Plan;
- The proposed extension would overlook all the windows and doors of Oak House which all served habitable rooms;
- The whole of the mid section of the proposed extension would protrude meaning that the separation distance was 18.7 metres, 2.3 metres under the acceptable limit;
- The drop in ground levels did not lessen the impact;
- The en suite window of the proposed extension would be immediately adjacent to the neighbouring garden;

## REGULATORY COMMITTEE

---

31 MARCH 2022

- There would be a total loss of amenity for neighbours;
- Requested a site visit;
- The neighbouring garden was small meaning the impact would be huge;
- Previously an application for a garage had been refused due to the harm to the neighbours living conditions;
- Requested refusal due to loss of amenity, loss of privacy and the development would be oppressive;
- Asked Members to focus on the recommendations of the Residential Extensions and Alterations SDP;
- 2 storey extensions were unacceptable close to party boundaries;
- The property was 1.8 metres from the boundary fence of Westmead and would run the whole length of the rear garden;
- The proposed extension would be over dominant and oppressive;
- The neighbours garden would be dominated by the extension;
- The double garage contravened the restrictive covenants.

The applicant's agent was present at the meeting and made the following comments:-

- Took inspiration from the design and character of neighbouring properties;
- The extension was set back from site lines;
- The roof design was double hipped to soften the outlook;
- Confirmed measurements were accurate as they had been taken with a laser;
- Windows had been repositioned;
- Account had been taken of the different ground levels;
- Considered over looking, materials and the roof design to avoid the extensions being over bearing.

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

- The extensions increased overlooking and over shadowing;
- The impact on the neighbours was not sufficient to warrant refusal;
- Would be allowed on appeal;
- Meets with the guidance and policies.

**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

31 MARCH 2022

Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:  
Proposed Plans ref DWGNo. 002 Rev A dated received by the Local Planning Authority on 18.02.2022

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

3. The external elevations of the extension(s) hereby approved shall be built in materials as outlined on the approved plan ref DWGNo. 002 Rev A dated received by the Local Planning Authority on 18.02.2022.

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

**78.02 R/2022/0010/FF Detached Single Storey Dayroom/Storage Building and New Detached Stable Block Land off Middlesbrough Road Guisborough.**

The Managing Director reported that Permission was sought for a detached single storey dayroom/storage building and new detached stable block.

The application related to land south of Middlesbrough Road, Guisborough. The site had an area of 1.6 hectares. There was an existing access track to the west of the application site which connected to the A171 and served all the existing stables. The land around the application site was a mix of agriculture and horsiculture. The applicant had an existing 'L' shaped stable building adjacent to the access track and a hay barn to the south of the stable. The proposed day room would be to the north of the existing stable block with the proposed stable block located in between the existing stable block and hay barn.

The applicant had control over the field to the east and south of the application which was used for the grazing of horses. There were existing similar horsiculture developments to the north and south of the site.

This application sought consent to install a detached single storey dayroom/ storage building. The building would measure 7m in length, 4.3m wide and roof ridge height of 3.5m. the front elevation of the building would contain double doors and two windows. The dayroom/storage building was to be positioned in the north west corner of the site adjacent to the vehicular access into the site. The stable building would provide 3 stables and would be located to the south of the existing stable building. The rear elevation would be positioned adjacent to the rear elevation of

## REGULATORY COMMITTEE

---

31 MARCH 2022

the existing stables. The stables would be 11.4m in length, 3.9m wide and 3.4m high. The applicant proposed to relocate three of his other horses to the site. The horses would be kept for the personal use of the family. The dayroom would provide space to store items used in association with the horticultural use as well as a dry space for changing and sheltering from inclement weather.

The application had been accompanied by a site location plan, site plan, plans and elevations and a planning statement.

The consultation exercise resulted in six written representations had been received. The comments were summarised as follows:

- *So-called "day room" (which looks like a mini house) is already built in what appears to be a total disregard for planning laws. In my opinion there is no need for a house there and there are no grounds for the council to grant approval for one on agricultural land.*
- *Object that the amount of development that has already been approved in a small area far outweighs any need*
- *Size of fields do not require stables and haybarns the like of which have been erected let alone accommodation to be near their animals*
- *No account taken regarding very busy A171*
- *Development a back hand way of getting full residential status*
- *Plot in an agricultural field outside development limits*
- *Local and national planning policies are a matter of law that protect the open countryside from inappropriate and unnecessary development that harm the character and appearance of the area*
- *Ploy to get permanent developments that are not for an agricultural or forestry need or for farming operations on agricultural land*
- *Previous stables which included a tack/storage area, built of inappropriate materials and no conditions attached*
- *Does not comply with ED13 relating to equestrian development, the area open countryside and no access to bridleways regarding riding routes, yet now needs extra stabling and day storage building. No exceptional need, overdevelopment*
- *Supporting statement full of discrepancies, no screening, site highly visible, public footpath, vantage viewing points, within 5 metres of a stream, not timber buildings but block work painted and tiled roof, blots on landscape*
- *Significantly harming the character and appearance of area and local environment and visual impact of the wider landscape and do not respect or enhance the rural area*
- *Concerns ignored on character and appearance and highway safety*
- *Site has existing stable and hay barn. No hay stored in barn, used*



## REGULATORY COMMITTEE

---

31 MARCH 2022

- to house digging and bulldozing plant machinery*
- *Couple of horses on small patch of land do not use the stables being rugged up and outdoors day and night. There is a caravan constantly on site already which could be used for “dayroom”*
- *Is dayroom built in order to be residential building like the one on the plot beside it*
- *Nearest bridleway on opposite side of A171*
- *Field beginning to look like shanty town, completely out of character and appearance of the open countryside*
- *Will impact on highway safety, as well as construction traffic the daily visits to put horses in and out of stables and remove all muck and deliver feedstuffs*
- *Questions why neighbours to site not consulted*
- *Location plan misleading doesn't show all the other developments adjacent to site*
- *Access extremely dangerous, sometimes vehicles queuing up to enter or leave the site. Vehicles continually use the crossing points along this street of road in wrong direction as a short cut to access the site*

Guisborough Town Council made the following comments:-

*“Object to this proposal*

*Yet again another application for a building on this area of land.*

*We object on the same grounds as for previous applications and raise the following points:*

- *The entrance to and exist from the site is dangerous – from and onto the very busy A171. At the moment larger vehicles needing access have to move into the outside lane to negotiate access to the entry on the left. Such vehicles include horse boxes and delivery vans. This has been pointed out on numerous occasions. There are no deceleration or acceleration lanes.*
- *On the application for no provision has been made for the storage or collection of waste*
- *The current use of land is stated as agricultural – no change of use has been applied for – the erection of a building. The applicant is not a farmer who is trying to diversify.*
- *Details of material to be used are to be agreed – to match those used for existing buildings. Which other buildings do they refer to – the ones for the other dayroom? Full details of the proposed materials should be provided before planning permission is considered. Although a floor plan has been submitted for the stables no such as been provided for the dayroom/storage*
- *This area of natural beautiful open countryside is becoming*

## REGULATORY COMMITTEE

---

31 MARCH 2022

*overdeveloped. It is state that the area is “generally” open countryside. This is rapidly changing with the number of buildings being built. This application is not for an essential building(s)*

*All the buildings on this site do have a negative visual impact on the surrounding area – it gets worse as more buildings appear. A stop has to be made!*

*We have asked for site visits in the past so that the overall picture can be seen. Again we ask for an immediate site visit. Covid can't be used as an excuse anymore.*

*We ask that this application be refused.”*

Councillor Waterfield representing the Ward made the following comments:-

*“The stated requirement of this development is for an additional 3 stables for horses that are not actually 'resident' there in addition to 4 existing stables would seem unnecessary.*

*However, in accordance with the relevant parts of the Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan (Adopted May 2018) ' specifically: SD3 Development Limits - i. other development requiring a countryside location due to technical or operational reasons.*

*ED13 Equestrian Development.*

*And as long as the additional requirements that have been specified by the Strategic planning team are adhered to then there appears to be no tangible reason to object under current Planning legislation, despite the obvious local issue of the degradation of the surrounding countryside.”*

Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council (Development Engineers) advised that the site would make use of an existing access off Middlesbrough Road, the start of which was the beginning of a public footpath. There were no Highways objections subject to no unauthorised obstruction or interference with the adopted highway or the public footpath at any time.

Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council (Planning Strategy) advised that the proposed development was for an additional stable on land already used for horsiculture to accommodate a further 3 horses (adding to the current capacity of 4). A 'dayroom' was also proposed as ancillary to the stables for storage, changing and shelter.

The site was located outside of development limits and therefore to be considered acceptable in planning policy terms the proposal must meet one of the exceptional criteria in Policy SD3. Criteria (i) allowed for

31 MARCH 2022

development requiring a countryside location due to technical or operational reasons. It could be considered that horsiculture required a countryside location and the proposed development was required for technical/ operational reasons. The proposal was deemed to be in accordance with Policy SD3.

Policy ED13 applied specifically to proposals for livery stables and other commercial equestrian development. The case officer should ensure all of the criteria of Policy ED13 were complied with, particularly ensuring the character, scale and design of the proposal was appropriate to its rural surroundings and any external facilities were appropriately located and adequately screened to avoid adverse visual impact. The development should also have appropriate manure storage and dirty water handling facilities.

All development should be well designed in accordance with Policy SD4, including ensuring it would not have a significant adverse impact on the amenities of occupiers of existing or proposed nearby land and buildings, minimising the loss of the best agricultural land and respecting or enhancing landscape, biodiversity and the surrounding area.

The site was located within a Restoration Landscape Area and, as such, opportunities should be taken to repair or reinstate the landscape as part of the development where possible. It should be ensured that the impact on the landscape was acceptable in accordance with policy N1. The principle of development was acceptable in planning strategy terms.

Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council (Environmental Protection) (Contaminated Land) and (Environmental Protection) had no objections.

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 proposed development was on agricultural land outside development limits. Local Plan policy SD3 restricted development beyond development limits to certain development types. Criteria i permits 'other development requiring a countryside location due to technical or operational reasons'.

The proposal sought consent for a detached dayroom/storage building and new detached stable block which were to be used in conjunction with the horses that were currently grazing on the land, the relocation of other horses under the ownership of the applicant and the existing stable block. The building had to be located in this area as that was where the horses were located. In addition, criteria b permitted development of a

## REGULATORY COMMITTEE

---

31 MARCH 2022

recreational or tourism proposal requiring a countryside location. The horses kept in this location were for personal recreational use.

As the proposal was linked to the existing land use and was the same ownership it would not give rise to any significant change in the number of journeys and was therefore considered to be broadly in compliance with policies SD1 and SD3 (criteria b and i) of the Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan.

Comments had been received regarding the lack of compliance with Local Plan Policy ED13 – Equestrian Development. Policy ED13 related to commercial equestrian developments and not buildings for personal recreational use and as such the requirements of the policy were not applicable in this instance.

The buildings proposed were of a suitable scale for the location and were of a similar design and appearance to the existing stables, hay barns and buildings in the area. The proposed stable would be located to the rear of the existing stable building which would help shield the majority of any view of the proposed building and the proposed dayroom/storage building would be positioned against the northern boundary of the site and a neighbouring building. It was considered the buildings would have a limited impact on the character and appearance of the area. Given the sloping nature of the site and the existing vegetation and structures the proposals would largely be screened from view from Middlesbrough Road.

In terms of impact on the area there had been a recent appeal decision for the site to the south of this application. Regulatory Committee refused an application to vary the approved plans for the detached single storey day room/storage building in connection with outdoor riding arena.

In terms of proposed materials a condition could be included to ensure these details were agreed with the Local Planning Authority.

The proposals were 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 of the Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan.

Given the location of the development and the nature of the works proposed the application raised no issues in relation to loss of privacy or overbearing impacts.

The proposal 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.

## REGULATORY COMMITTEE

---

31 MARCH 2022

The application site was accessed from the existing track to the west of the site which served a number of stables in the area including the stables in the same ownership as the application site.

The proposed building was to be used in conjunction with the existing stables and haybarn within the site and therefore the application was unlikely to create additional traffic above that which already used the access track.

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.

The comments received as result of the consultation period were noted however, for the reasons set out in the above report none were considered to raise material planning considerations that would support a refusal of planning permission. He advised that Members would be aware that some of the points raised throughout the consultation period were not matters for planning control.

For the reasons outlined above the proposal was considered acceptable. The proposed dayroom/storage building and stable building hay barn would not have any significant adverse impact on neighbouring amenity and the proposal raised no issues in terms of highway safety or crime prevention. The scale and design was acceptable and the proposal would respect the rural character of the site and surroundings. The proposal accords with policies SD3 and SD4 of the Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan

The objectors at the meeting made the following comments:-

- This was an agricultural field outside development limits;
- The policy framework protected open countryside;
- Horses and stables did not come under agriculture;
- The stables had never been used so why was there a need for 3 more?;
- The site was highly visible from both the public footpath and the road;
- Policy SD4 had been ignored;
- Questioned how the previous proposal for a day room had been approved?;
- Requested a site visit;
- So many applications in one field;

## REGULATORY COMMITTEE

---

31 MARCH 2022

- Not sufficient room for horses to graze;
- Over development on open countryside;
- Visual impact;
- More horses meant more horse boxes;
- Not room for horses to be exercised on the land which meant they would be ridden along the A171;
- The A171 was a busy and fast moving road and would not like to see those dangers added to;
- What would happen with sewerage as there was a stream close to the site;
- Think carefully before rubber stamping this application.

The applicant's agent was present at the meeting and made the following comments:-

- The applicant lived locally and kept a variety of horses and this proposal would facilitate that use;
- There would be no significant change to the number of car journeys;
- The proposal complied with Policies SD1 and SD3;
- This was a small scale development which was the same design as others on the site and was at the rear of existing stables;
- A similar building had been allowed by the Inspector on appeal;
- The design and location complied with Policy SD4;
- There would be no significant impact on adjacent occupiers;
- There would be no additional vehicular movements and therefore no issues of highway safety;

**RESOLVED** that the application be deferred for a site visit.

78.03 **R/2022/0061/RSM Outline Planning Permission (with appearance reserved) for a mixed use development over 3 floors to include 3 Retail Units; Public House and 11 residential apartments including balconies and associated car parking (amended scheme) Former Normanby Hotel, 514 Normanby Road, Normanby.**

The Managing Director advised that the above application was deferred.

**Councillor Smith declared an interest in the following application as the Ward Member and took no part in the discussion nor voted thereon.**

**Councillor Head took the Chair for this particular item.**

78.04 **R/2021/0858/F3 Creation of new car park (25 spaces) Land East of Cat Nab Car Park Saltburn.**

## REGULATORY COMMITTEE

---

31 MARCH 2022

The Managing Director advised that the application site comprised some 0.1125ha of land located between Saltburn Bank to the west and the A174 to the east. The land sat adjacent to an existing NWL pumping station and the Millholme Beck ran along the eastern and northern boundary of the site. A property known as Mill Farm lay to the east. The site was relatively flat and sat at the base of rising land to the north, south and east and was currently fenced off.

In the south eastern corner of the site there was a pedestrian access to the network of footpaths and walkways that ran along the coast and through Saltburn Gill to the south, which was an SSSI managed by the Tees Wildlife Trust.

The application proposed the development of an (overflow) car park to serve the sea front area. The car park would provide 25 additional parking spaces with associated groundworks and drainage, the project also included additional traffic calming measures but these were outside the application site and in the public highway. Access would be taken from the adjoining Saltburn Bank

The consultation exercise had resulted in six representations having been received in respect of the application making the following comments;

- Though I am in support of the traffic calming measures felt that the 'pinch point' on the bridge would not be useful for pedestrians and would only serve to be a hindrance to road traffic in an already restrictive bend in the road
- Felt that this proposal had not considered the wider use of this area throughout the year. In particular the use of this road during the very popular and longstanding Saltburn Historic Hill Climb, which had run for approximately 30 years. This used the full width of the carriageway on Saltburn Lane, in particular when negotiating the tight bend at start of the course, on the bridge; this proposed modification (pinch point) in particular had clearly not taken this very popular event into account and believe should be given further careful consideration given the need to increase tourism and associated events in the area.
- The development would be detrimental to the character of old Saltburn in an area recognised by the council of being of heritage value
- The project lay at the base of a steep and narrow road with considerable congestion and would raise highway safety issues
- The current car park attracted campers and caravans which gave rise to issue because of lack of facilities, this would be exacerbated unless measures were employed to prevent overnight parking
- The current car park was subject to anti-social behaviour and this may spread to the proposed parking area

## REGULATORY COMMITTEE

---

31 MARCH 2022

- The development would have a negative outlook to the current appearance of the area encompassing the Cleveland Way and entrance to the nature reserve
- The development was likely to result in disturbance and affect my personal role as an on-call clinician in the NHS
- The development had many negative effects which negated the financial benefit hoped to be achieved; park and ride should be considered as an option
- The proposed new road layout on the bridge appeared to be some form of chicane; any permeant structure would adversely affect the safety of the RCBC sponsored Saltburn Historic Gathering
- Surface wate run -off down the road floods through the SMR gates blocking the track and points, extra water for the undrained car park would make matters worse
- Children/adults leaving the car park had to cross the road adjacent to the railway, they would tend to access the railway as a short cut rather than using the pavement on the bridge, there needed to be a continuation of the fence from the bridge to the SMR gates.
- An increase in parking space was contrary to the council's plan to lead by example on climate change; this was a short-sighted plan creating small amount of parking; where was the incentive to use public transport? if the council insisted on such car parks they should be reserved for blue badge holders
- The site was not appropriate for increased traffic, the bridge over the beck was too narrow and this would be more difficult where cars were queuing to use the car park as well as creating a highways hazard

Saltburn, Marske and New Marske Parish Council made the following comments:-

*“Plans are unprofessional and do not show if there is a chicane on the road or preferential arrows. A chicane will interfere with the annual historical Hill Climb. Safety access for the public means they will cross over to the miniature railway - needs proper crossing facilities, pavement and fencing. Flooding already runs down the bank and off the proposed car park and onto the railway line so drainage needs to be considered - see comment on R/2021/0859/F3 regarding self-draining car parks”.*

Natural England had no objections.

Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council (Natural Heritage Manager) had no objections.

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



## REGULATORY COMMITTEE

---

31 MARCH 2022

*"I refer to the application and would offer the following comments on highway grounds:-*

*The proposal creates an extra 25 car parking spaces – the layout of which is considered acceptable with the proviso that the 6No parallel car parking bays are lengthened to 6m to allow sufficient space for manoeuvrability to be able to gain access into these bays. The improved pedestrian facilities in the form of an extended footway must also include dropped crossings with tactiles on both sides of the carriageway. The footways will form part of the adopted highway and will be constructed to our adoptable standards.*

*The surfacing to the car park is considered acceptable albeit to a greater standard than we would require -it will not become highway maintainable at public expense although it will fall within the council's ownership. The right turn arrow, as shown on the proposed drainage plan is misleading and should not be implemented.*

*A TRO will be required for the reduction in the speed limit from 20mph to 30mph and will be subject to the usual consultation process in due course.*

*I would offer no objections to the build out arrangements and therefore, subject to the previous comments, would offer no objections on highway grounds."*

Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council (Rights of Way) made the following comments:-

*"The proposal will impact on the routes of Saltburn Public Footpaths 5 and 5A. Temporary path closure orders will be required during the construction period and the footpaths will need to be appropriately accommodated within the car park following completion of the works"*

Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council (Local Lead Flood Authority) had no objections.

Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council (Environmental Protection) (Contaminated Land) made the following comments:-

*"The Site Investigate Report states asbestos presence was confirmed in one sample of the upper fill of the made ground. Testing revealed that the sample contained bitumen bound chrysotile fibres. Therefore, a plausible risk exists to receptors from asbestos in soils across this site, however, this is considered relatively low. The area where asbestos has been identified is assumed to be located in an area of proposed car parking and will therefore be covered by hardstanding materials.*

*The applicant should be aware of their responsibilities under para 178 of*

## REGULATORY COMMITTEE

---

31 MARCH 2022

*the NPPF (a) a site is suitable for its proposed use taking account of ground conditions and any risks arising from land instability and contamination. This includes risks arising from natural hazards or former activities such as mining, and any proposals for mitigation including land remediation (as well as potential impacts on the natural environment arising from that remediation) and (b) that after remediation, as a minimum, land should not be capable of being determined as contaminated land under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990.*

*As a precaution I would therefore recommend the following conditions to cover ACM materials and unexpected contamination that may be encountered during the development;*

- Prior to the development being brought into permitted end use, the developer must submit an asbestos mitigation plan to reduce risks to potential workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors.*

*Reason : To ensure that risks from asbestos to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors.*

- In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken, and where remediation is necessary a remediation scheme must be prepared which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report must be prepared, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority*

*Following completion of the development a report must be submitted confirming that unexpected contamination was not encountered during the development*

*Reason : To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors*

- The offsite disposal of any material shall be in accordance with the Cl:aire*

*Definition of Waste: Development Industry Code of Practice (Dow CoP).*

*Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to*

31 MARCH 2022

*controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors.”*

Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council (Environmental Protection) (Nuisance) had no objections to the proposal.

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

### **First response**

*“Objection. Firstly, it must be established that the proposal site is just beyond the boundary of Saltburn Conservation Area, and this response is therefore founded on the negative impact the proposal will have on the setting of the conservation area.*

*It is also acknowledged that parking issues do pose a significant problem, the heart of the foreshore being characterised on busy days by slowly re-circulating vehicles and Saltburn Bank frequently being a static zigzag of vehicles, their occupants looking out on those who succeeded in arriving earlier participating in the pleasures of the foreshore, beach, pier and sea.*

*However, despite the above, this proposal is considered to be harmful. Saltburn is chiefly characterised by the Victorian clifftop resort town and associated foreshore development, epitomised by the pier. The remaining detached vernacular hamlet of Old Saltburn, which illustrates the historic origins of the settlement, acts as a contrasting counterfoil to the regimented purpose-built tourist development. That very contrast is a key facet of the conservation area, the dichotomy between a small historic hamlet being overlooked and visually dominated by a purpose-built tourist resort being something unimaginable in today’s planning frameworks.*

*For that reason, it is considered important to protect that defined change in character between the two parts of the conservation area. Views from Marine Parade across to the former mill and its surroundings have been partially compromised by the building housing the pumping station, though the setting of the mill at the bottom of Saltburn Gill, framed by the steep valley escarpments, still provides a picturesque view of rurality no doubt recognised by the resort’s creators as a suitable view for the residents of the clifftop hotels. It is that bucolic aspect in particular that will be adversely affected by the proposal. The strip of tarmac will have an urbanising visual impact, the surroundings of the hamlet being unjustifiably impinged upon to serve the attractions of the later resort and simultaneously damaging the delicate relationship between the two extremes of the conservation area, thus failing to accord with Policy HE1 of the adopted Local Plan.*

### **Second response**

31 MARCH 2022

*No objection to the amended scheme due to the specification of an alternative earth coloured surfacing which is considered to have a more organic appearance. It is accepted that the site frequently had a bare denuded appearance due to it being used for ad-hoc parking and, although that was recently stopped by the installation of fencing, it is anticipated that the change will address concerns about the imposition of dark grey tarmac. The inclusion of the lower part of the bankside in the application site means that landscaping can be controlled, and a condition to ensure the bank is left in a wild natural state mitigates the visual impact, especially from closer views.*

*The setting of the GII listed Valley Gardens is considered to be preserved, with the existing larger car park interposed between views into and out of the gardens and overall the scheme is considered to comply with policies HE1 and HE2 of the adopted Local Plan.*

*The following conditions are suggested:*

- No development shall commence until there has been submitted to and agreed in writing with the local planning authority a scheme of landscaping which shall include indications of all planting, to provide visual mitigation of the development. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.*

*REASON: To preserve the character of the nearby conservation area and other heritage assets, as required by policies HE1 & HE2 of the adopted Local Plan.*

- Prior to surfacing work commencing, details and/or samples of all materials to be used for all surfaces within the site shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.*

*REASON: To preserve the character of the nearby conservation area and other heritage assets, as required by policies HE1 & HE2 of the adopted Local Plan.*

- No development shall take place within the area indicated until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, have secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by the local planning authority.*

*REASON: The site is of archaeological importance and to accord with Policy HE3 of the adopted Local Plan.*

The main considerations in the assessment of the application were;

## REGULATORY COMMITTEE

---

31 MARCH 2022

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

The application site was located outside development limits identified under Local Plan policy SD3. As such, it was required to meet one of the stated exceptions in that policy.

It was noted that although outside development limits the site was located within the environs of the lower promenade area, bound by the physical barrier of the A174 and Saltburn Bank and hosting existing development in the form of the NWL pump house. The development was presented as an extension to the Cat Nab parking facilities to support the development of the tourism offer and, in this respect, was consistent with policy SD4(b) being a development linked to tourism development.

Assessment of the application in respect of the character and appearance of the area included the impact in terms of heritage matters and the Conservation Area; the Heritage Coast and landscape designations.

S72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 required, when making decision on application for development within Conservation Areas to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area; this test was met in legal terms where the development had a *neutral* impact on such matters.

In terms of the impact of the development on the Saltburn Conservation Area it was noted the application site lay on the boundary of the Conservation Area lying to the immediate south of the pumping station. Whilst in strict terms the provision of s72 may not fully apply to the application site, along with policy in the NPPF and Local Plan, the application submission did deal with this impact since the development was in the immediate environs of the area of special control and had the capacity to affect its setting.

The focus of the Conservation Officer's response was in respect of the impact of the development on the setting of the Conservation Area. Initial concerns were raised in respect of those impacts, the appearance of the development and in particular key views from Marine Parade. It was recognised that those views were already partially compromised by the development of the pumping station although the land form still provided an element of rural character; of particular concern was the potential appearance of a 'strip' of black tarmac.

Further discussions had taken place with the project team and the

## REGULATORY COMMITTEE

---

31 MARCH 2022

development had been amended to use buff coloured surface treatment to significantly reduce the visual impact of the development; the Conservation officer commented;

*“The alternative earth coloured surfacing is considered to have a more organic appearance and it is accepted that the site frequently had a bare denuded appearance due to it being used for ad-hoc parking, recently stopped by the installation of fencing. The inclusion of the lower part of the bankside in the application site means that landscaping can be controlled, and a condition to ensure the bank is left in a wild natural state mitigates the visual impact, especially from closer views. The setting of the GII listed Valley Gardens is considered to be preserved, with the existing larger car park interposed between views into and out of the gardens and overall the scheme is considered to comply with policies HE1 and HE2 of the adopted Local Plan.”*

Planning conditions were suggested which planning officers agreed met the tests under the NPPF.

The officers concur with the view expressed by the Conservation Officer that as a result of the key amendment to the surface treatment of the development the proposal would not adversely affect the setting of the adjoining Conservation Area and raised no issue in respect of policy HE1 and HE2 of the Local Plan.

Policy N1 of the Local Plan sought to protect and enhance the borough's landscape.

The application site was located in an area identified as *sensitive* landscape and was in the designated Heritage Coast.

In sensitive landscapes, the policy prioritised the retention of elements that made up the landscape character. To be considered appropriate in these locations development should be; (a) carefully designed (b) retain important elements that make up the landscape and (c) screen or integrate development into the landscape.

The development had been amended to use surface materials that would significantly reduce the visual impact of the development and so it had been carefully designed to minimise impacts on the area.

The development would not result in the loss of any specific elements that made up the character of the landscape and the development would be co-located with the existing pumping station and nearby buildings which would partially screen the development, which would also be subject to additional landscaping.

Officers concluded the development would not have an unacceptable

## REGULATORY COMMITTEE

---

31 MARCH 2022

impact on the appearance and character of the local landscape.

Finally, in terms of the Heritage Coast, officers considered the development met the criteria of being small scale development linked to leisure or tourism. In addition, it was noted that the development was on the (western) boundary of the Heritage Coast designation in an area already compromised to an extent by existing development in the presence of the NWL pumping station and appearance of the application site. Officers concluded that, in its context, the development did not unacceptably adversely impact the special character of the Heritage Coast designation.

In view of the above assessment no policy conflict arose in respect of policy N1 of the Local Plan.

The development site was located adjacent to several ecological designations in the Local Plan.

Saltburn Gill SSSI lay to the south; Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) lay adjacent to the application site on all sides along with an identified wildlife corridor.

The application was supported by an ecological assessment.

The submission noted there was likely to be an increase in footfall from the proposed site into the SSSI but this was likely to be negligible and on Public Rights of Way. The report set out a methodology to the survey which was a combination of desk top and field survey it then set out the results of the site surveys against national and local designations, habitats and specific species

In terms of mitigation the report suggested control over site clearance in the bird nesting season (March to August) and careful design of any on site lighting to minimise impact on nocturnal wildlife. In terms of biodiversity net gain the report suggested this could be achieved on the site as part of the landscaping provision or within the Saltburn Valley Gardens SSSI.

The supporting study had been reviewed by both Natural England and the Council's countryside team who raised no objections to the development subject to mitigation in respect of landscaping and the matters identified in the ecological assessment. In view of this, no issues were considered to be raised in respect of policy N4 of the Local Plan.

The application site was located on the outskirts of the main town some distance from the nearest main residential areas. It was noted that a residential property lay to the immediate east of the site but this was separated by the Millholme Beck and there was no reason to conclude that the use of the car park would give rise to conditions prejudicial to the

## REGULATORY COMMITTEE

---

31 MARCH 2022

amenities of the occupiers of that property.

In this respect no issues were considered to arise in respect of policy SD4(b) of the Local Plan.

The Council's highways engineers confirmed the scheme was generally acceptable subject to the agreement on technical issues some of which lay outside the application site boundary.

The application was supported by a ground investigation report which had been reviewed by colleagues in the Environmental Protection Team. There was no technical reason why the development should not proceed subject to some of the suggested planning conditions.

In terms of drainage the site was supported by a drainage strategy and drainage plans; the report concluded;

*“Based on the evidence collected from the site visit, historical records, EA flooding maps and the discussion with LLFA, this strategy concludes that the proposed development and the resulting surface runoff can be accommodated by the introduction of gullies and pipe network. The new impermeable areas will discharge to the nearest watercourses without increasing the risk of flooding elsewhere in the catchment”*

The drainage proposals had been reviewed by colleagues in the Local Lead Flood Authority and were considered acceptable, subject to condition that required the development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted details.

The site lay within a minerals *safeguarding area*. DPD Policy MWC4 stated that development would only be permitted where it would not sterilise or prejudice the future extraction of mineral resources or if it could be demonstrated that the need for the non-mineral development outweighed the need for the mineral resource. As the car park was only at surface level, it would be relatively easy to access any mineral deposit at such time they may be required and no issues were raised in respect of policy MWC4.

The application proposed the development of a small car park as part of the place making and development strategy for the Saltburn area. The Design and Access Statement concluded;

*“In summary, there are a number of benefits that would arise from the proposal, including:*

- *Regeneration and economic benefits - the proposal would encourage more people to be able to access and enjoy the health and wellbeing benefits of the seafront and would also act as a*



## REGULATORY COMMITTEE

---

31 MARCH 2022

- destination gateway to Saltburn Gill.*
- Mitigating the impacts of queuing traffic.*
- Creating an additional disabled car parking bay.*
- Introducing greenspace and ecological improvements to the wider Saltburn area*
- The treatment/remediation of the land and its low level of contaminants.*
- Making efficient use of land with low development value.*

*Collectively, these benefits are considered to outweigh any minor impacts that would arise.”*

Officers concurred with that assessment and concluded that although some impacts would result from the proposal, the development was acceptable. .

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

- Parking was always a problem in Saltburn and therefore any improvement would be of benefit;
- Previously this land had been used illegally for parking therefore this would prevent illegal parking on the hillside;
- An extra 25 spaces would solve the problems of parking on the hill and more parking was required;
- This car park was a road safety initiative.

**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:

HGP-CAP-LPN-SPS-DR-CH-1001 P01 Location Plan received by the Local Planning Authority on 13 October 2021  
HGP-CAP-LPN-SPS-DR-CH-1002 P01 Existing Site Plan received by the Local Planning Authority on 13 October 2021  
HGP-CAP-LPN-SPS-DR-CH-1003 P02 Proposed Site Plan received by the Local Planning Authority on 17 March 2022  
G083-002 Topographic Survey received by the Local Planning

## REGULATORY COMMITTEE

---

31 MARCH 2022

Authority on 13 October 2021

HGP-CAP-LPN-SPS-DR-CH-1004 P01 Sections received by the Local Planning Authority on 13 October 2021

HGP-CAP-LPN-SPS-DR-CH-1001 P01 Provisional Drainage Layout received by the Local Planning Authority on 13 October 2021

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

3. Prior to surfacing work commencing, details and /or samples of all materials to be used for all surfaces within the site shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To preserve the character of the nearby conservation area and other heritage assets, as required by policies HE1 & HE2 of the adopted Local Plan.

4. No site clearance shall take place during the bird breeding season (March to August) unless the site has first been inspected by a qualified ecologist to check for the presence of active nests, where it is confirmed that the site does not have active nests works shall commence within 48 hours.

REASON; In order not to prejudice the ecology of the area.

5. Prior to the development approved being brought into use, 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.

6. 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

## REGULATORY COMMITTEE

---

31 MARCH 2022

approved scheme in the interests of the visual amenities of the locality.

7. In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified, it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken, and where remediation is necessary a remediation scheme must be prepared which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report shall be prepared, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority and following completion of the development a report shall be submitted confirming that unexpected contamination was not encountered during the development

REASON: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors

8. No development shall take place within the area indicated until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, have secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: The site is of archaeological importance and to accord with Policy HE3 of the adopted Local Plan.

9. The development shall be completed in accordance with the drainage strategy and approved plans submitted as part of the application

REASON: To comply with the terms of the planning application and to ensure that appropriate drainage infrastructure is provided to dispose of surface water without increasing the risk of flood elsewhere within the catchment.

10. The working hours for all construction activities on this site are limited to between 08:00 and 18:00 Mondays to Friday and 08:00 to 13:00 Saturdays and not at all on a Sunday or Public Holiday.

REASON: To ensure that the any activity during the construction

31 MARCH 2022

development would not have a significant adverse impact in relation to noise and disturbance in accordance with policy SD4 of the Local Plan.

**Councillor Smith resumed the Chair for the remainder of the meeting.**

**79. 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.**

**80. APPEAL INFORMATION.**

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

**:-NOTED.**

**81. ENFORCEMENT SCHEDULE.**

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

**:-NOTED.**

**82. SECTION 106 AGREEMENTS.**

The Managing Director presented a response to a recommendation of the Tees Valley Audit and Assurance TVASS report (April 2016) in respect of the reporting of progress on the completion of Section 106 Agreements.

**:-NOTED.**

**83. DEEMED CONSENT APPLICATIONS.**

**83.01 R/2021/0858/F3 Creation of new public car park (25 spaces) land east of Cat Nab Car Park Saltburn.**

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

## REGULATORY COMMITTEE

---

31 MARCH 2022

accordance with the following approved plans:

HGP-CAP-LPN-SPS-DR-CH-1001 P01 Location Plan received by the Local Planning Authority on 13 October 2021  
HGP-CAP-LPN-SPS-DR-CH-1002 P01 Existing Site Plan received by the Local Planning Authority on 13 October 2021  
HGP-CAP-LPN-SPS-DR-CH-1003 P02 Proposed Site Plan received by the Local Planning Authority on 17 March 2022  
G083-002 Topographic Survey received by the Local Planning Authority on 13 October 2021  
HGP-CAP-LPN-SPS-DR-CH-1004 P01 Sections received by the Local Planning Authority on 13 October 2021  
HGP-CAP-LPN-SPS-DR-CH-1001 P01 Provisional Drainage Layout received by the Local Planning Authority on 13 October 2021

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

3. Prior to surfacing work commencing, details and /or samples of all materials to be used for all surfaces within the site shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To preserve the character of the nearby conservation area and other heritage assets, as required by policies HE1 & HE2 of the adopted Local Plan.

4. No site clearance shall take place during the bird breeding season (March to August) unless the site has first been inspected by a qualified ecologist to check for the presence of active nests, where it is confirmed that the site does not have active nests works shall commence within 48 hours.

REASON; In order not to prejudice the ecology of the area.

5. Prior to the development approved being brought into use, 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.

6. All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding

## REGULATORY COMMITTEE

---

31 MARCH 2022

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.

7. In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified, it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken, and where remediation is necessary a remediation scheme must be prepared which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report shall be prepared, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority and following completion of the development a report shall be submitted confirming that unexpected contamination was not encountered during the development

REASON: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors

8. No development shall take place within the area indicated until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, have secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: The site is of archaeological importance and to accord with Policy HE3 of the adopted Local Plan.

9. The development shall be completed in accordance with the drainage strategy and approved plans submitted as part of the application

REASON: To comply with the terms of the planning application and to ensure that appropriate drainage infrastructure is provided to

## REGULATORY COMMITTEE

---

31 MARCH 2022

dispose of surface water without increasing the risk of flood elsewhere within the catchment.

10. The working hours for all construction activities on this site are limited to between 08:00 and 18:00 Mondays to Friday and 08:00 to 13:00 Saturdays and not at all on a Sunday or Public Holiday.

REASON: To ensure that the any activity during the construction development would not have a significant adverse impact in relation to noise and disturbance in accordance with policy SD4 of the Local Plan.