

Planning Committee

A meeting of Planning Committee was held on Wednesday, 17th August, 2016.

Present: Cllr Norma Stephenson O.B.E(Chairman), Cllr Stephen Parry(Vice-Chairman), Cllr Helen Atkinson, Cllr Carol Clark, Cllr Steve Nelson (sub Cllr Nigel Cooke), Cllr Gillian Corr, Cllr Philip Dennis, Cllr Lynn Hall, Cllr Elsi Hampton, Cllr Norma Wilburn (sub Cllr Paul Kirton), Cllr Allan Mitchell (sub Cllr Mick Stoker), Cllr Tracey Stott, Cllr Mrs Sylvia Walmsley, Cllr David Wilburn

Officers: Barry Jackson, Peter Shovlin, Simon Grundy, Jade Harbottle (EG&D) Julie Butcher (HR,L&C), Gayle Nertney (DCE),

Also in attendance: Applicants, Agents and Members of the Public.

Apologies: Cllr Nigel Cooke, Cllr Paul Kirton, Cllr Mick Stoker

P Declarations of Interest

47/16

There were no Declarations of Interest.

P Recording of Council Meetings

48/16

The Chair informed Members of the Committee and Members of the Public that the Planning Committee meeting was to be recorded as part of the Council's commitment to legislation permitting the public recording of public meetings, and in the interests of ensuring the Council conducted its business in an open and transparent manner. These recordings would be made available to the public via the Council's website. Members of the public present who preferred not to be filmed/recorded/photographed, were asked to make it known so that so far as reasonably possible, the appropriate arrangements could be made to ensure that they were not filmed, recorded or photographed.

P Evacuation Procedure

49/16

The Evacuation Procedure was noted.

P Minutes from the meeting which was held on the 15th June 2016.

50/16

The minutes of the meeting held on 15th June 2016 were signed by the Chair as a true record.

AGREED that the minutes were signed by the Chair as a true record.

P 16/0846/LAO

51/16

**Land at Former Blakeston School Site, Junction Road, Norton
Outline application for a crematorium with associated memorial garden,
access roads, car park and landscaping with all matters reserved other
than access.**

Consideration was given to a report on planning application 16/0846/LAO Land at Former Blakeston School Site, Junction Road, Norton.

The Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government had received a call in request and the Local Authority formally agreed to not issue a decision on the application if the Planning Committee were minded to approve the

application to enable the Secretary of State to consider the proposal. The Secretary of State would normally only call in the application unless it conflicted with national policy in important ways, or is nationally significant.

The application site was the former Blakeston School playing fields. Junction Road was to the south and directly north of the site was a railway line. To the east was the remainder of the former school fields and beyond was a residential housing estate. To the west was the Roseworth Community and Social Club, Crossley's Bungalow Jewson's Builders Merchants and the Tesco Supermarket. The application site was identified in the local plan as Blakeston School Playing Field.

Outline Planning permission was sought for the erection of a crematorium with associated memorial garden, access roads, car park and landscaping with all matters reserved other than access which would be taken from Junction Road. Indicative plans show the crematorium on the northern part of the site, along with the car park and various landscaping features. 120 car parking spaces would be provided on site and the proposed crematorium was anticipated to provide around 1,500 cremations per year with 6-8 staff. The opening hours for Registration and Bereavement Services linked with the crematorium would be Monday to Saturday 08:30 – 17:30. However the crematorium itself would have an operating time of 09:15 to 16:00 offering approximately 6 services per day. Service times would be approximately 45 minutes apart, and an additional 15 minutes would be allowed for guests to arrive and depart between each service. It was anticipated that the grounds of the crematorium would have suitable summer and winter opening hours to enable families to visit the remembrance gardens.

Stockton had a growing population and the vast majority of people (77%) opt for cremation. A high proportion were cremated at Teesside Crematorium. A feasibility study demonstrated that the demographics in the Borough would reasonably result in around 1000 cremations per year, a minimum of 750 cremations a year was required to ensure sustainability.

103 neighbour consultations letters were sent, and the application was advertised on site and in the local press along with a public consultation event prior to the application being submitted. 4 letters of objection were received from 2 local residents and 2 letters of support/no objections were also received. Comments also came via a Councillors Ward Surgery. Full details of the objections and other consultation responses were detailed in the main body of the report.

The main material considerations in relation to this application were the principle of development and loss of the playing fields, impact on the character and appearance of the area, impact on neighbours, highway safety, drainage, noise, air quality and any other residual matters.

The application site lay within the defined development limits and was an identified playing field and subject to Saved Policy REC1 which generally resisted development which would result in the permanent loss of playing space unless it could fulfil certain criteria, one of which was that alternative provision of equivalent community benefit was made available. In addition Core Strategy Policy CS6 sought to protect and enhance open space, sport and recreation

facilities in the Borough.

In 2015, a Playing Pitch Strategy (PPS) was developed in conjunction with Sport England and the National Governing Bodies of Sport. Stockton Council was supporting greater football participation by juniors on artificial grass pitches and the application site had been identified as 'disused/ lapsed'.

Sport England as consultee on the application initially raised objections. A Playing Pitch Strategy update paper was subsequently provided to them and a public letter of commitment to address the shortfall of pitches. On the basis of the letter and additional information provided Sport England withdrew the objection to the development of the site on the understanding that the work outlined in the correspondence as referred to in the letter was actioned as soon as possible and a meeting be held in the future to agree an implantation programme. This would be actioned by the Council.

Overall it was considered that with the Councils playing pitch strategy and programme to address the shortfall that the proposed scheme was not in conflict with the aims of Policies REC1 and CS6 as alternative provisions were to be made available and the principle of developing this site was acceptable.

The proposed Crematorium was located on the edge of the urban area. The submitted indicative layout plan incorporates a wide landscape buffer to the eastern and western edges which was intended to provide full screening once it reached maturity. The Junction Road frontage was indicated as formal gates and railings, with tree planting beyond to filter views towards the Crematorium building. It was the intention that a high quality entrance would be formed and these details would be agreed at reserved matters stage along with all other boundary treatment, signage and external lighting. A condition had been recommended to ensure trees were retained and incorporated into the proposed new landscape buffer and detailed landscaping plans were to be submitted as reserved matters.

The nearest residential receptors were Roseworth Estate, Blakeston Court and Crossley's Bungalow which was located close to the new entrance. The 1902 Cremation Act sets out parameters for the location of the crematorium in relation to existing dwellings and the public highway and the indicative plan complies with those parameters.

The indicative plans showed that with the sensitive siting of the building and car park and the introduction of significant landscape buffers that the development could be successfully introduced into the area without having a significant adverse impact on existing or future neighbouring properties. In terms of noise and disturbance whilst the residents may notice the additional traffic drawn to the site, visitors would generally be quiet and respectful, and it was not considered that the amenities of neighbouring residents would be adversely affected by additional noise and disturbance to such a degree to warrant a refusal of the application.

The proposal was outline with all matters reserved other than access. Highway objections had been raised in relation to the scheme and had been carefully considered. The proposed access would be taken from Junction Road, and take the form of a protected right turn ghost island which was acceptable for the

type and scale of the development. The Transport Assessment considered daily trip generation of 276 two-way movements which would arrive and depart outside of peak times along with up to 8 staff that would generally arrive and depart within the peak times. These trips would not have a significantly adverse impact on the highway network and no objections were raised on highway capacity grounds. There were good levels of pedestrian links and public transport near to the site and the submitted information sets out that 120 car parking spaces would be provided to ensure larger services could be accommodated within the site.

Objections had been raised regarding the cumulative impact of the development taking into account the approved housing schemes and the Master Plan for the Harrogate lane and Yarm Back Lane area. The master plan was not actual committed development and any proposed planning applications would be considered and the appropriate mitigation implemented.

Concerns had been raised regarding ambulances being held up in traffic, however any emergencies that arise would be dealt with as they were presently with traffic giving way to emergency vehicles and the Ambulance Service had no objections to the proposed scheme. Overall it was considered that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact upon highway safety and the proposal complied with the NPPF and policy CS2 of the Core Strategy.

Matters in relation to the railway, ecology, drainage and flood risk, contamination, air quality and archaeology had been considered and with the use of conditions it was considered that the scheme would be acceptable and full details could be assessed at reserved matters stage.

Other concerns had been raised regarding the future operator of the facility, status of the local plan queries were made over Section 106 monies and a Lottery Grant. All queries had been fully addressed in the main report and did not carry any significant weight which would count against the proposal.

The consultees that had been notified and the comments that had been received were detailed within the main report.

Neighbours were notified and the comments received were detailed within the main report.

With regard to planning policy where an adopted or approved development plan contained relevant policies, Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 required that an application for planning permissions should be determined in accordance with the Development Plan(s) for the area, unless material considerations indicated otherwise. In this case the relevant Development Plan was the Core Strategy Development Plan Document and saved policies of the Stockton on-Tees Local Plan. Section 143 of the Localism Act came into force on the 15 January 2012 and required the Local Planning Authority to take local finance considerations into account, this section s70(2) Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended required in dealing with such an application [planning application] the authority should have regard to a) the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application, b) any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application and c) any other material considerations.

The planning policies that were considered to be relevant to the consideration of the application were contained within the main report.

Overall it was considered that with the Council's commitment to adhering to the playing pitch strategy and programme to address the shortfall the principle of development was acceptable and not in conflict with the aims of policies REC1 and CS6. The proposed access was considered acceptable and the development would not give rise to any adverse highway safety issues.

The proposal would not unduly impact on heritage assets, existing amenity and privacy or adjoining land uses to a degree which would warrant refusal and would provide landscaping via reserved matters which would support ecology and bio-diversity. It was also considered that the scheme would not increase risk of flooding and would therefore be in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and the Development Plan and constitutes sustainable development.

All other matters were considered acceptable in principle and had been adequately addressed through the imposition of conditions or can be dealt with through detail to be submitted at reserved matters stage.

Objectors were in attendance at the meeting and given the opportunity to make representation. Their comments could be summarised as follows:

- Concern over the increase in traffic on Junction Road, Durham Road and the surrounding area.
- Emergency vehicles, in particular ambulances use this road on a regular basis. Would the increase in traffic/congestion affect the response times of emergency vehicles?
- Concern over potential smells?

The Ward Councillor was in attendance at the meeting and given the opportunity to make representation. His comments could be summarised as follows:

- Advised the Committee that both Ward Councillors for the area were in agreement, and in full support of the development.
- There were initial concerns over access to the site, however the protected right turn has satisfied these concerns.
- Increase in traffic would be outside the normal peak times.
- Recently installed traffic lights on the crossroads at Junction Road/Blakeston Lane/Ragpath Lane had helped the flow of traffic.
- Comments did not solely come through Ward Surgeries, but through Roseworth Residents Association, Roseworth Community Partnership and Roseworth Big Local, who were all in full support of the development

Officers addressed the Committee in response to some of the concerns/issues raised. Their comments could be summarised as follows:

- It was confirmed that although the crematorium would be open from 8:30am – 5.30pm Monday – Saturday, services would only operate between 9.15am – 4pm, and would not clash with peak times.

- The site was a former school so had its own associated traffic movements, and there would be no additional impact on the network.
- The Ambulance Service had been consulted, and did not have any concerns over emergency vehicles responded to calls.
- Designed with a priority right hand turn.
- Paragraph 64 of the report discusses air quality. Modern Cremators have sophisticated pollution abatement and are governed by the Environmental Protection Act.

Members were given the opportunity to ask questions/make comments on the application and these could be summarised as follows:

- Concern over same entry and exit roads, would have like to see them separate like at Acklam, and a full one way system within the site.
- Request for a left turn only when exiting the crematorium, as concerns over large corteges accessing and leaving the site, within 15 minutes of each service and potentially blocking up this section of road.
- The report states that the crematorium could operate up to 1500 services per year – where will these numbers be coming from? Will people be coming from outside of the area?
- Clarification required whether there would be any control over the services being staggered within the two chapels, and not held simultaneously as concern there were only 120 car parking spaces, and fears that cars would park on grass verges and within the nearby housing estates.
- Clarification was asked on whether there was a covenant on this site, and any implications associated with said covenant.
- Concern over access to the development from Junction Road, and clarification asked on how many cars could be stacked on the protected right turn– would it be sufficient for a large cortege?
- Would traffic accessing the site, delay ambulances from responding to emergency calls?
- Page 39, paragraph 16 refers to discussions with Sport England on the loss of playing fields.
- Could funeral directors be requested to take a route that would bring them down Junction Road from the Horse & Jockey in order to prevent a blockage with the right hand turn?
- Should a left turn only not be recommended on exiting, a suggestion was made for a roundabout?
- Could exiting traffic being directed onto Blakeston Lane?

Officers addressed the Committee in response to some of the concerns/issues raised. Their comments could be summarised as follows:

- The crematorium was expected to be predominantly used by residents of Stockton, who currently have to travel to Acklam.
- It was yet to be determined whether there would be one or two chapels, however the chapels would be of differing sizes in order to meet the need of the particular service.
- The aim was to provide a quality service and therefore the services would be staggered should there be two chapels.
- It was confirmed that 120 parking spaces would be sufficient to meet demand should two chapels be in use.
- Funeral Directors have the same road rights as everybody else, and are

- expected to pull over to allow an emergency vehicle past.
- Unable to dictate to funeral directors which route to take – they would take the quickest and easiest route for them to arrive for the service.
 - It was agreed at full Council several months ago that the pitch would be taken out of use and replaced elsewhere.
 - The Legal Department were not aware of any Covenants on the land, and had not been asked to check titles or documentation. However the Committee were advised that any Covenants were not a planning issue.
 - The priority right hand turn was of standard design, and would accommodate 2 vehicles. White lines would protect the ghost island.
 - A separate access and egress had been investigated, however there were limitations on sightlines and this was unachievable. It had therefore been designed with a one way system operating within the site.
 - The design of the junction was considered a safe junction, and it was not deemed necessary to operate a left turn in, left turn out.
 - Consideration had been made with other crematoriums within the region, and how they operated their access and egress into their sites. Acklam did operate a left turn only when exiting, however this was onto a dual carriageway with a nearby roundabout.
 - A left hand turn was not advised by Highways as there was no suitable turning place until the roundabout near The Green and drivers would either use Roseworth, or would ignore the left only turn.
 - A roundabout hadn't been explored as an option, however this would only be of use when the crematorium was in use, and there were concerns that this location would not be deemed safe for a roundabout.
 - Exit onto Blakeston Lane was not possible as land was not within the development site.

A vote then took place and Members were minded to approve the application and referred it to the National Casework office. The Committee required that the application be amended to address the access issues, and access becomes a Reserved Matter.

RESOLVED that:

1. Application 16/0846/LAO be minded for approval and referred to the National Casework office.
2. The Committee require that the application be amended to address the access issues and access becomes a Reserved Matter.

**P
52/16**

16/1104/FUL

20 Leven Road, Yarm, TS15 9JE

Application for the erection of 1 no 5 bedroomed detached dwelling and associated means of access.

Consideration was given to a report on planning application 16/1104/FUL 20 Leven Road, Yarm TS15 9JE.

The application site formed part of a large residential property No.20 Leven Road and occupied the southern proportion of the host properties existing rear garden. A detached bungalow No. 22 Leven Road was situated to the east and a relatively new residential development of five residential dwellings which are known as Wainstones Court were located to the east. The residential dwellings

of Hemmingford Gardens were located to the south.

Planning permission was sought for the erection of a 5 bedroomed detached dwelling and associated means of access within the existing rear garden of No. 20 Leven Road.

A total of 6 objections had been received from properties which surrounded the application site, including those of the neighbouring development Wainstones Court. The main objections related to the impact of the development on privacy, light, its dominant appearance and noise and disturbance.

In terms of the principle of development the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land and the provision of a dwelling would carry some weight in favour of the proposal. Although rear gardens were no longer classed as previously developed land the National Planning Policy Framework, does not specifically preclude the development of such sites and the acceptability of such schemes rest with the impact on the character of the area.

With regards to the visual impacts, Leven Road consisted of a mix of dwelling types and sizes with no clearly defined or distinctive character. Whilst a large dwelling this was not in itself a reason for refusal and overall its scale was considered to be comparable to those elsewhere on Leven Road. The proposed dwelling was also well set back from the street scene and would be largely screened by the existing host property.

Adequate separation distances between the habitable room windows and external terraces and the neighbouring residential properties exist to ensure that there would be no adverse impacts on the amenity of the neighbouring properties. Appropriate access for the host property (No.20 Leven Road) and the proposed dwelling could also be achieved with adequate parking provision being provided within the site for both dwellings

In view of the material planning considerations, the proposed dwelling was considered to be acceptable in planning terms and accordingly the proposal was recommended for approval subject to the planning conditions set out in the main report.

The consultees that had been notified and the comments that had been received were detailed within the main report.

Neighbours were notified and the comments received were detailed within the main report.

With regard to planning policy where an adopted or approved development plan contained relevant policies, Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 required that an application for planning permissions should be determined in accordance with the Development Plan(s) for the area, unless material considerations indicated otherwise. In this case the relevant Development Plan was the Core Strategy Development Plan Document and saved policies of the Stockton on Tees Local Plan.

Section 143 of the Localism Act came into force on the 15 January 2012 and required the Local Planning Authority to take local finance considerations into

account, this section s70(2) Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended required in dealing with such an application [planning application] the authority should have regard to a) the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application, b) any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application and c) any other material considerations.

The planning policies that were considered to be relevant to the consideration of the application were contained within the main report.

In view of the above considerations, the principle of a dwelling being located on the site was considered to be acceptable. In view of there being no defined or distinctive character and the proposed dwelling being set back from the street scene there were considered to be not adverse impacts on the character of the surrounding area. Adequate separation distances exist to ensure that there would be no adverse impacts on the amenity of the neighbouring properties and appropriate access and parking provision was provided to ensure that there were no adverse impacts on highway safety.

The proposed development was therefore considered to be acceptable in planning terms and is recommended for approval subject to those conditions set out within the report.

The Applicants Agent was in attendance at the meeting and given the opportunity to make representation. His comments could be summarised as follows:

- Development area was a large piece of land, with room for residential development
- Wide Range of housing styles in the area, some of which are substantial
- Site was very well screened from general view.
- Backland development had already been established in the area with the neighbouring Wainstones Court Development.
- Contribute modestly to the 5 year housing supply.
- Looked at planning policy, historic development in the area and relevant site constraints including trees, highway access and impacts on neighbouring residential amenity.
- Has its own designated highway access.
- Does not impact privacy of neighbouring residential occupiers.
- Privacy distances were exceeded.
- Conditions have been imposed to protect residential amenity such as hard and soft landscaping, obscure glazing, privacy screening and construction hours.
- Does not impact on neighbour's sunlight or daylight due to the orientation and the property being to the west of neighbouring Wainstones Court.
- No impact on traffic.
- Balconies are off bedrooms, not the main areas of the house.

Members were given the opportunity to ask questions/make comments on the application and these could be summarised as follows:

- Were there any changes in planning rules and regulations regarding backland development since the Wainstones Court development was completed?
- What is the height of the privacy screening – Is it high enough to prevent anybody from looking over?

- Clarification required on the orientation of the proposed development in relation to the sun rising/setting, as quite close to Wainstones Court, and concerns over shadowing.
- How close is the proposed development to 2 Wainstones Court?
- Drawing show that the development is only 1m from the boundary fence.
- Concern that the house was too large for the plot.

Officers addressed the Committee in response to some of the concerns/issues raised. Their comments could be summarised as follows:

- NPPF had been introduced since the Wainstones Court Development, however it was still acceptable to develop residential gardens.
- The privacy screening would be 1.8m high. Condition 10 advises that this detail is to be agreed with planning officers, in order to ensure that the screen detail is sufficient for both obscurity and safety, and high enough to prevent viewing into the neighbouring property.
- The orientation was confirmed that the house runs from the north to the south and it may result in some shadowing on the neighbouring property in the early morning, however this will move onto the dwelling itself, and then onto the dwellings rear garden. From a planning perspective this would not result in a loss of light.
- 7m to the neighbouring dwelling, but there is a garage between the two, with a gym above, which is not classed as a habitable room. There were minimal windows proposed in that elevation.
- It was confirmed that it the proposed development was 1m from the boundary fence, however there were substantial bushes on either side of the boundary fence, and the dwellings would have appropriate levels of amenity, privacy and light.
- It was a large property but also a large plot. In planning terms, it is accepted that a third of the plot is developed, and this development does accord with that guidance.

A vote then took place and the application was approved as report.

RESOLVED that planning application 16/1104/FUL be approved subject to the following conditions and informaties:

Approved Plans;

01 The development hereby approved shall be in accordance with the following approved plan(s);

Plan Reference Number	Date on Plan
SBC0001	12 May 2016
EC-2015-11-24 REV P5	25 July 2016
EC-2015-11-25 REV P5	25 July 2016

Materials;

02 Notwithstanding any description of the materials in the application, precise details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external walls and roofs of the building shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the construction of the external walls and roofs of the building. All windows shall be recessed from the face of the building by a minimum of 100mm or an alternative amount to be first agreed in writing

with the Local Planning Authority. The agreed details shall be retained for the duration of the development unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Site and floor levels;

03 Notwithstanding the information submitted as part of the application details of the proposed site levels and finished floor levels shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development.

Means of enclosure;

04 All means of enclosure associated with the development hereby approved shall be in accordance with a scheme to be first agreed with the Local Planning Authority before the development is occupied. Such means of enclosure as agreed shall be erected before the development hereby approved is first occupied and shall be retained for the life of the development.

Soft landscaping works;

05 A detailed scheme for landscaping and tree and/or shrub planting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the development authorised or required by this permission is occupied. Such a scheme shall specify types and species, layout contouring and surfacing of all open space areas. The works shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the occupation of the building or the completion of the development whichever is the sooner and any trees or plants which within a period of five years from the date of planting die, are removed, become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Landscape Maintenance;

06 Prior to occupation of the hereby approved development a schedule of landscape maintenance for a minimum period of 5 years shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The schedule shall include details of the arrangements for its implementation and be carried out in accordance with the approved schedule.

Hard landscape details;

07 Notwithstanding any description contained within this application, prior to the occupation of the hereby approved development full details of hard landscape works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and implemented in accordance with the approved details. These details shall include; vehicle and pedestrian access/circulation areas; other hard surfacing materials and construction methods.

Scheme for tree protection

08 No development shall commence until a scheme for the protection of the retained trees (Section 7, BS 5837:2005) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any such scheme agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority shall be implemented prior to any equipment, machinery or materials being brought to site for use in the development and be maintained until all the equipment, machinery or surplus materials connected

with the development have been removed from the site.

Obscure glazing and opening restrictions;

09 Notwithstanding the submitted plans all windows within the western elevation of the hereby approved dwelling and the eastern elevation of the proposed staircase/landing shall be non-opening and be obscurely glazed to a minimum glazing obscurity of level 4. Such measures shall be in place prior to the occupation of the hereby approved development.

Privacy screens

10 Notwithstanding the submitted information full details of all privacy screens to the western elevations of the northern and south-western terraces and the eastern elevation of the south-eastern terrace shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include, level/nature of obscurity, technical specification and all appropriate fixing mechanisms to secure the screens. Thereafter the proposed privacy screens shall be installed in accordance with the agreed details and shall be maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority for the lifetime of the development.

Construction activity;

11 No construction activity or deliveries shall take place except between the hours of 0800 and 1800 on Monday to Friday and 0900 and 1300 on Saturdays. There shall be no construction activity on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

**P
53/16**

1. Appeal. Manor House Farm, Cowpen Bewley, Billingham, TS23 4HS - 15/1895/FUL - ALLOWED WITH CONDITIONS

2. Appeal. Manor House Farm, Cowpen Bewley, Billingham, TS23 4HS - 15/1930/FUL - ALLOWED WITH CONDITIONS

3. Appeal. 28 Hillbrook Crescent, Ingleby Barwick, TS17 5BN - 16/0576/FPD - ALLOWED WITH CONDITIONS

RESOLVED that the appeals were noted.