

Planning Committee

A meeting of Planning Committee was held on Wednesday, 7th November, 2018.

Present: Cllr Norma Stephenson O.B.E(Chairman), Cllr Mick Stoker(Vice-Chairman), Cllr Helen Atkinson, Cllr Derrick Brown, Cllr Carol Clark, Cllr Lynn Hall, Cllr Elsi Hampton, Cllr Tony Hampton, Cllr Ross Patterson (Sub Cllr David Harrington), Cllr Eileen Johnson, Cllr Paul Kirton, Cllr Marilyn Surtees, Cllr Ian Dalgarno (Sub Cllr Mrs Sylvia Walmsley), Cllr David Wilburn

Officers: Elaine Atkinson, Kieran Campbell, Simon Grundy, Stephanie Landles, Joanne Roberts, Peter Shovlin (EG&DS), Julie Butcher (HR,L&C) Sarah Whaley (DCE)

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

Apologies: Cllr David Harrington, Cllr Sylvia Walmsley

P Evacuation Procedure

47/18

The Evacuation Procedure was noted

P Declarations of Interest

48/18

There were no declarations of interest.

**P Minutes from the meetings which were held on the 15th August, 5th
49/18 September and 26th September 2018**

Consideration was given to the minutes from the Planning Committee meetings which were held on the 15th August, 5th September and 26th September 2018 for approval and signature.

RESOLVED that the minutes be approved and signed as a correct record by the Chairman.

P 18/1702/REM

50/18

**Land at Urlay Nook Road, Eaglescliffe
Reserved matters application for the appearance and landscaping for an industrial estate comprising the erection 30 units for B2 and B8 use class to include appearance and landscaping and associated means of access**

Consideration was given to planning application 18/1702/REM Land at Urlay Nook Road, Eaglescliffe.

Members were asked to consider a reserved matters application for the appearance and landscaping for an industrial estate comprising the erection 30 units for B2 and B8 use class to include appearance and landscaping and associated means of access.

Outline planning permission was approved for an industrial estate comprising the erection of B2 and B8 use class units. The application gained approval for access arrangements, layout and scale of the development with matters in relation to appearance and landscaping reserved for later approval.

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.

The planning policies and material planning considerations that were relevant to the consideration of the application were contained within the main report.

The Planning Officers report concluded that the principle of development had been established on the site and the access, layout and scale had already been agreed. Matters in relation to the appearance of the building had been fully considered along with the most appropriate landscaping for the site and both reserved matters were considered to be acceptable.

It was recommended that the application be approved with conditions for the reasons detailed within the main report.

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

- A resident of the neighbouring housing development, Sadlers View explained that the boundary fence from the proposed site was only 3 yards from her front door. The plans did not give a true picture of how close the site was to residential homes.
- The proposed trees and bushes would not prevent light and noise pollution.
- Concerns were raised relating to security and the safety of local children as there appeared to be access through the tree boundary from the proposed site onto the residential estate.
- When outline permission was originally granted for the proposed site in 2008 Sadlers View had not been developed therefore those residents could not be consulted.
- The houses at Sadlers View were not built to withstand a certain amount of piling which was causing residents concern.
- One resident expressed that she would have never moved into the area had she known about the proposed development and stated that the housing developer, Taylor Wimpey who built Sadlers View had led prospective buyers to believe there was to be a further development of houses on the site not an industrial estate.
- There were more suitable areas of land within the Borough to accommodate an industrial estate such as land at Durham Lane.
- Concerns regarding Uray Nook Road were highlighted as this would be the primary route in and out of the proposed industrial site which was only a small country lane, blighted by speeding vehicles at peak times, and was used as a rat run by some.

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

- The original application was approved for units with B2 and B8 use and that permission had not lapsed.
- Approval had already been given for layout and access and the current reserved matters application was for appearance and landscaping only.
- The Applicant had addressed concerns raised by submitting amended plans on 1st October 2018.
- Where concerns had been raised in relation to the proposed development having a negative impact on house prices, this was not a material planning consideration.
- The scheme would be adequately screened with trees which would be 5 and 6 metres in height and there was to be a landscape bund / landscape buffer.
- The units were to be constructed with a contrast of white and grey cladding with metal roofing which was considered to be sympathetic to the surrounding area and fit for purpose.

Officers were given the opportunity to respond to comments/issues raised by members of the public. Their responses could be summarised as follows:

- In terms of noise and light pollution there were conditions within the original application to mitigate against this.
- The proposed landscaping was the best scheme possible. Trees would grow and expand providing significant screening.
- In terms of concerns raised relating to piling, officers explained that there was a condition included within the outline application which would need to be agreed prior to any piling being undertaken.
- In relation to concerns raised regarding residents not being made aware of the outline planning approval granted in 2008 of the industrial units, officers informed the Committee that the approved outline application was held on record and was available for anyone to access by contacting the Planning Department but could not speak on behalf of Taylor Wimpey and the advice that had been given to potential purchasers
- The proposed reserved matters application was very close to the approved master plan submitted in 2008.

Members were given the opportunity to make comments / ask questions. These could be summarised as follows:

- Clarity was sought in relation to comments received from the 'Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Cleveland', where reference to 'create a

hostile landscaping' and what this meant.

- With regards to the consultation period with neighbours, it was felt that if residents had been given a longer notice period then more residents may have attended the Planning Committee meeting to express their concerns.
- Clarification was sought in relation to the site visit which was referred to within the report.
- Members felt that residents had been let down by the housing developer, not making it clear to house buyers of the outline approval of the units in 2008.
- Discussion took place around the potential for additional fencing to be placed in the middle of landscaping between residents homes and the proposal.
- Questions were raised as to who would be in control of future Landscaping.
- Councillor Lynn Hall requested that a condition of boundary treatment be included.

Officers were given the opportunity to respond to comments/issues raised by Members. Their responses could be summarised as follows:

- In terms of hostile landscaping, officers explained that this referred to the type of landscaping which was used to obscure and deter vehicle access and visual sight lines to Cleveland & Durham Constabulary Tactical Training Facility. Hostile landscaping was a designed landscape to prevent such things as vehicle attacks, for example in London bollards would be used however landscaping was also an option.
- Confirmed that a site visit had taken place by officers, following which it was noted that Sadlers View had been missed out as part of the consultation however this was rectified and neighbours were given 21 days in which to submit comments.
- It was confirmed that in terms of fencing and landscaping maintenance there was a condition included within the outline application for the boundary treatment to be submitted for approval and future landscaping maintenance. Officers could ensure that the boundary treatment condition would not be discharged without a requirement for a fence along that elevation.

A vote then took place and the application was approved.

RESLOVED that planning application 18/1702/REM be approved subject to the following conditions and informative;

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

Plan Reference Number	Date on Plan
URLAY-RYD-00-XX-DR-L-2001-S2-P02_Masterplan	1 October 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-XX-DR-0L-2101-S2-P02	1 October 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-XX-DR-L-2102-S2-P02	1 October 2018

URLAY-RYD-00-XX-DR-L-2103-S2-P02 1 October 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-XX-DR-L-2106-S2-P02 1 October 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-XX-DR-L-2109-S2-P02 1 October 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-XX-DR-L-2110-S2-P02 1 October 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-XX-DR-L-2113-S2-P02 1 October 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-XX-DR-L-2114-S2-P02 1 October 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-XX-DR-L-2115-S2-P02 1 October 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-XX-DR-L-2116-S2-P01 1 October 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-XX-DR-L-2116-S2-P02 1 October 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-XX-DR-L-2403-S2-P01 1 October 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-XX-DR-L-7001-S2-P02 1 October 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-XX-DR-L-7002-S2-P02 1 October 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-XX-DR-L-7003-S2-P02 1 October 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-XX-DR-L-7006-S2-P02 1 October 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-XX-DR-L-7013-S2-P02 1 October 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-XX-DR-L-7015-S2-P02 1 October 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-XX-DR-L-7016-S2-P02 1 October 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-XX-DR-L-0001 P01 20 July 2018
AIA EXI EAST 20 July 2018
AIA EXI WEST 20 July 2018
AIA TPP EAST 20 July 2018
AIA TPP WEST 20 July 2018
AMS EXI EAST 20 July 2018
AMS EXI WEST 20 July 2018
AMS TPP 20 July 2018
URLAY-RYD- 00-00-DR-A-3009 P01 20 July 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-00-DR-A-3001 P01 20 July 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-00-DR-A-3002 P01 20 July 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-00-DR-A-3003 P01 20 July 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-00-DR-A-3004 P01 20 July 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-00-DR-A-3005 P01 20 July 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-00-DR-A-3006 P01 20 July 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-00-DR-A-3007 P01 20 July 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-00-DR-A-3008 P01 20 July 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-00-DR-A-3010 P01 20 July 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-00-DR-A-3011 P01 20 July 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-00-DR-A-3012 P01 20 July 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-00-DR-A-3013 P01 20 July 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-XX-DR-L-2104 P01 20 July 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-XX-DR-L-2105 P01 20 July 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-XX-DR-L-2107 P01 20 July 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-XX-DR-L-2108 P01 20 July 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-XX-DR-L-2111 P01 20 July 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-XX-DR-L-2112 P01 20 July 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-XX-DR-L-7004 P01 20 July 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-XX-DR-L-7005 P01 20 July 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-XX-DR-L-7007 P01 20 July 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-XX-DR-L-7008 P01 20 July 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-XX-DR-L-7009 P01 20 July 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-XX-DR-L-7011 P01 20 July 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-XX-DR-L-7012 P01 20 July 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-XX-DR-L-7014 P01 20 July 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-ZZ-DR-A-3601 P01 20 July 2018

URLAY-RYD-00-ZZ-DR-A-3602 P01	20 July 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-ZZ-DR-A-3603 P01	20 July 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-ZZ-DR-A-3604 P01	20 July 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-ZZ-DR-A-3605-P01	20 July 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-ZZ-DR-A-3606 P01	20 July 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-ZZ-DR-A-3607-P01	20 July 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-ZZ-DR-A-3609 P01	20 July 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-ZZ-DR-A-3610 P01	20 July 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-ZZ-DR-A-3611 P01	20 July 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-ZZ-DR-A-3612 P01	20 July 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-ZZ-DR-A-3901 P01	20 July 2018
RYD-00-XX-DR-L-2402 REV P01	23 July 2018
RYD-00-XX-DR-L-2403 REV P01	23 July 2018
RYD-00-XX-DR-A-0001 P2	31 July 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-ZZ-DR-A-3608 REV P01	1 August 2018
URLAY-RYD-00-ZZ-DR-A-3613 REV P01	1 August 2018

INFORMATIVE OF REASON FOR PLANNING APPROVAL

Informative: Working Practices

The Local Planning Authority has worked in a positive and proactive manner and sought solutions to problems arising in dealing with the planning application by seeking a revised scheme to overcome issues and by the identification and imposition of appropriate planning conditions.

Informative: Police Tactical raining Centre

The Applicants should contact the Police Tactical Training Centre prior to commencing works to engage with this neighbour who has particular requirements during construction.

Informative: Network Rail

The Applicants attention is drawn to the comments from Network Rail which contains a significant amount of information which should be adhered to during construction.

**P
51/18**

17/0389/OUT

Hollybush Farm, Thornaby Road, Thornaby

Outline application with some matters reserved for the erection of a 66no. bed hotel and banqueting building with associated means of access

Consideration was given to planning application 17/0389/OUT Hollybush Farm, Thornaby Road, Thornaby.

Members were asked to consider an outline application with some matters reserved for the erection of a 66no. bed hotel and banqueting building with associated means of access.

Outline planning approval was now sought for a hotel and banqueting facility with only the approval of the principle of development and means of access being sought at this stage. The proposal had been revised since its original submission and now sought provision for a 66no. bed hotel and banqueting building (100 covers). Indicative details had been provided with the latest

drawings showing a two storey hotel building and the application had been assessed on that basis.

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.

The planning policies and material planning considerations that were relevant to the consideration of the application were contained within the main report.

The Planning Officers report concluded that in view of the considerations set out above, the site was covered by what was the green wedge under the Local Plan, was within the 'green finger' as defined by CS10 of the Core Strategy and was within the green wedge under the emerging Local Plan (policy SD5i) which following the examination in public could be attributed weight.

In considering the associated impacts, the proposed development in its indicative form would sit across much of the site and would have a separation distance of approximately 150m from building to building and approximately 50-60 metres between property boundaries (which includes a steep wooded valley). The openness of the landscape was an important feature of the green wedge designation and such changes were considered harmful to the character and nature of the green wedge which was to prevent coalescence of settlements. Although the extant permission for the market garden centre and dwelling was noted it was considered the hotel proposal was of a different scale and nature and therefore the two situations were not directly comparable in terms of their impact.

The Highways, Transport and Design Manager had considered the implication of the development on the highway and the proposed access arrangements through the petrol filling station. The turning movements associated with the proposed development would result in a significant increase in right turning movements and whilst there had been no recorded accidents within the last 5 years there had been two recorded accidents, both of which occurred in 2012, and involved vehicles entering / exiting the petrol filling station. It was considered that the accident history at this location demonstrated that there was a risk of accidents involving right turning movements and the proposal was deemed to result in the intensification of the access / egress for the petrol filling station, resulting in significant highway safety concerns.

For those reasons set out above and elsewhere within the report the application was recommended for refusal.

Since the original report to members of planning committee an objection had been received from Ward Councillor David Harrington, who fully supported the officers' recommendation. Details of the comments were contained within the update report. No new issues were raised and both the recommendation and original material planning considerations remained as outlined in the main report.

In addition a further comment had been received from Cllr Mick Moore Ward

Councillor for The Village, Thornaby, urging the Committee to accept the application due to the creation of much needed employment. No new issues were raised and both the recommendation and original material planning considerations remained as outlined in the main report.

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

- Regarding concerns relating to the loss of green wedge, there was already extant consent for a market garden which could be built tomorrow.
- The hotel if approved could create up to 100 jobs within the local area.
- The Agent brought members attention to the number of appeals which had been lost recently within the same vicinity, in particular a recent appeal decision allowed on Low Lane which had been based on strategic gap argument.
- Ingleby Barwick residents distance was 150 meters away from the proposal and if required landscape bunding could be included.
- This was considered the perfect location next to a petrol station and all major road links.

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

- It was highlighted that in terms of highways issues, the applicant had invested his own money in the 1970's to enable Thornaby Road to be widened via a Section 278 agreement to provide a third lane for vehicles turning right into the Hollybush Petrol Filling Station. The development was for a hotel and petrol station, however only the petrol station had opened. Traffic flow into the filling station had reduced due to other filling stations operating within the vicinity. There was also two further entry points into Ingleby Barwick to allow for additional homes reducing traffic on Thornaby Road further.

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

- A resident of Hollybush Cottage raised objections in relation to the negative impact to wildlife on the proposed site. Members were presented with photographic evidence showing various species of wildlife, such as foxes, deer's, woodpeckers etc.
- The rear aspect of Hollybush Cottage could be gone if the hotel was approved.
- The resident explained to the committee that he had arrived at Hollybush Cottage 45 years ago and spent 3 years rebuilding the derelict cottages which he was wanting to pass on to family. The approval of the proposed hotel would disrupt the family's future.
- The commercial benefits of 100 jobs was not believed for the size of the proposed hotel.

- A previous application had been submitted on an adjacent piece of land to that of the proposal which had been refused and so too was an application for a secondary school, therefore, how could this application be approved?
- Concerns were raised relating to the loss of green wedge.
- Now the local plan was on the horizon the Planning Committee could look to protect the open space.

Members were given the opportunity to make comments / ask questions. These could be summarised as follows:

- Ward Councillor for Ingleby Barwick East highlighted that although the application was not on her ward it effected residents bound onto it.
- Concerns were raised in relation to traffic, music, taxis coming and going late at night should the proposal be approved.
- There was a gas pipe line which was considered a hazardous installation on the site.
- Was a hotel of this description required when the Hampton by Hilton was currently underway in Stockton Town Centre?
- Owners of the nearby industrial estate also wanted a hotel which would have been a much more appropriate site.
- It was felt by some that the hotel with banqueting suite would be welcome however not on the proposed site.
- The report stated that there was a high accident rate however there had only been one accident resulting in 1 minor incident in last 10 years. This was not a site with a high accident rate. The NPPF stated that information should be used over last 3 years, 5 if necessary, but not 10. This was the first time a scheme was promoting accident reports over a 10 year period.
- Accident rates were falling due to better cars and roads.
- Major highways improvements had been installed within the vicinity. Drivers' accessing and egressing the site no longer had to negotiate due to the yellow box allowing safe entry.
- It was not believed that the development created high levels of traffic at peak times.
- The green wedge argument was a very weak one, as other applications using this argument had been overturned at appeal.
- Some members felt that if the application was refused on grounds of green wedge and highways objections it would be lost at appeal at a cost to the local authority, as had happened in the past. In addition the land already had planning approval for a market garden.

Officers were given the opportunity to respond to comments/issues raised by Members. Their responses could be summarised as follows:

- In terms of green wedge, the green wedge was shown in the core strategy and emerging plan. It was fair to say that numerous applications had been allowed in green wedge areas for housing, primarily because the Council did not have a five year housing supply. A High Court decision had resulted in a narrow green wedge argument for applying the green wedge. The proposed site was within the green wedge and therefore significant weight could be given.

- By putting the proposed development on this site it would bring Thornaby and Ingleby Barwick closer together. The loss of the separation gap between Ingleby Barwick and Thornaby would be significant, if approved, and would set a precedent for future applications.

- All the economic benefits had been considered.

- In terms of noise and disturbance, conditions could be incorporated to mitigate against this if the proposal was acceptable.

- Where reference had been made in relation to the up and coming Hampton by Hilton Hotel in Stockton Town Centre, competition regarding the hotel was not a material planning consideration and a sequential assessment had been provided, however this did not negate it being on green wedge.

- Previously planning permission had been given on the site, for a bungalow, glass house and associated car parking and nothing else.

- Re the owners of the nearby industrial estate, this could not be considered as part of this application.

- Highway improvements to Thornaby Road and the A174 had improved the number of lanes which had seen a reduction in the length of queues on Thornaby Road, therefore a reduction in accidents, However whilst the applicant had demonstrated that the site access arrangements could operate within capacity, and that the impact on the highway network should not be severe, the intensification of use of the existing access arrangements for the petrol filling station, as a result of the proposed development, would materially increase the right turning movements at the junction. When this was considered against the accident history at this location, which clearly demonstrated that there was a risk of accidents occurring involving right turning movements, the predicted growth in traffic movements on Thornaby Road associated with extant planning permissions, the potential for accidents to occur at this location would also materially increase.

A vote then took place and the application was refused.

RESOLVED that planning application 17/0389/OUT be refused subject to the reasons set out below;

Green wedge

01. In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the proposed development

would introduce built form into the green wedge which would not only detract from its open character but also undermine its purpose which is to prevent the coalescence of settlements, contrary to Policy CS10(3) of the Core Strategy and policy SD5(i) of the emerging Local Plan.

Highways

02. In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposed development would result in the intensification of an access and significantly increase right turn movements in an area where numerous accidents have occurred as a result of right turning traffic crossing two lanes of traffic, to the detriment of highway safety and free flow of traffic, contrary to policy CS2 of the adopted Core Strategy, policy T11(12) of the emerging Local Plan and paragraphs 108 and 109 of the NPPF.

P 18/0851/COU
52/18 1 Tintern Avenue And 3 Melrose Avenue, Billingham, TS23 2JJ
Change of use from (C3) residential property to (C2) children's home.

Consideration was given to planning application 18/0851/COU 1 Tintern Avenue And 3 Melrose Avenue, Billingham, TS23 2JJ Change of use from (C3) residential property to (C2) children's home.

Planning permission was sought for the change of use of an existing residential property located on Tintern and Melrose Avenue to a care facility (C2 Use Class). The proposed facility was aimed at providing care for up to 6 children on a permanent basis, with the children residing there as their permanent home. Staff would be at the property 24/7 to provide care/support to the children and would operate in shifts.

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.

The planning policies and material planning considerations that were relevant to the consideration of the application were contained within the main report.

The Planning Officers report concluded that the principle of providing care for the vulnerable parts of society and the economic/job creating benefits of the scheme were all considered to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and the Core Strategy.

The residents' concerns over the potential for anti-social behaviour were noted, however, it was difficult for a planning decision to factor in the potential behaviour of children and it was argued that this was more of a matter for the management of the facility and others such as the police, were it to occur. Notwithstanding this, it was considered necessary to ensure the property remained to be a children's home of a limited scale as was being proposed in order to prevent future uncontrolled change. As such, a condition was recommended which limited the age to which cared for residents could be and

which restricted the number of cared for residents to 6, which was considered to reflect in part the number of children that could be accommodated within a large family home.

It was considered that there was no undue risk to highway safety, that adequate parking could be provided and although the use of the site and comings and goings would almost certainly intensify as a result of the proposal, this would not be to a degree which would substantially harm the surroundings or amenity of nearby residents taking into account the available parking provision.

In view of all of the above, it was considered that the proposal was in accordance with the Development Plan and the National Planning Policy framework and there were no material planning considerations which indicated otherwise. It was recommended that conditional planning permission be granted.

Since the main report, members were presented with an update which detailed comments received from a local resident highlighting the negative affects the proposal had had on her family's health. It was considered that the details within the update report did not alter the recommendation made within the main report.

The Applicant was attendance at the meeting and given the opportunity to make representation. Their comments could be summarised as follows:

- The Hennessy Group had 2 children's services within the area. Each one provided really good services and homes for children who could not be looked after by their own family.
- The home needed 6 car parking spaces and there was to be no more than 3 staff cars, which was less than most families. There would be no requirement for a minibus as the children would be using local public transport.
- Where other children's services had been provided by the Hennessy Group children had become part of the local community. They supported their elderly neighbours by helping with shopping.
- The proposed house was perfect and needed, and would provide a home and love for those children whose families could not take care of them.

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

- A local resident addressed the committee and asked members if they would want to buy a house next to a children's home.
- If the children's home was approved then it would have a negative impact on Tintern Avenue and the local area.
- A local resident highlighted that he had submitted a planning application in the past relating to his own property and felt he had been treated unfairly when he compared it to the proposed application in relation to what had been allowed regards the proposed six parking spaces.

- The 6 car parking spaces which were being proposed were tiny little boxes which would be difficult to get off the premises. Car number 2 would have to reverse out of the small entrance to the site.
- The opening to the property had limited visibility.
- As well as three staff cars there would also be visitor's cars to be taken into consideration.
- Comments were made in relation to the poor content of the report from the applicant which made references to the wrong town and county and there was also administration errors where dates were misstated in relation to correspondence, which made residents feel they were being treated with contempt.
- A resident of Tintern Avenue informed members that no.1 Tintern Avenue had never existed.
- Concerns were raised in relation to the negative affect the proposal would have on neighbouring property values.
- Some residents feared children from the home would cause damage to their properties.
- It was felt that the play equipment was too close to residents' property and would impinge on the privacy of local residents.
- The additional traffic associated with the proposal should have been enough to stop it going ahead.
- Adding another business into the mix on Tintern Avenue was a step too far.
- A local resident who had fostered children between 1966 and 2000 explained to the committee that she had dealt with many problems associated with children she had looked after in the past and was fully aware of the problems associated with children from care homes. The proposed property was not suitable and was in the wrong position as there was a hedge obscuring the view from the house and there was too much traffic.
- A local GP had objected to the application so why should residents say yes?
- There was a need for zebra crossings on Tintern Avenue.

Officers were given the opportunity to respond to comments/issues raised by members of the public. Their responses could be summarised as follows:

- Six parking spaces had been provided and the tracking had been assessed, although this was not desirable it was acceptable.
- There was to be no minibus however the requisite parking was provided.
- In terms of the anomalies within the report these had been noted, however officers did carry out their own assessments.

- Where issues had been raised relating to the address of No.1 Tintern Avenue and its existence, the address was stated on the GIS system.
- Regarding Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) from the children which would live at the proposed property, a family with six children could reside there with no guarantees that ASB would not occur.
- In relation to local residents privacy this would be no different to having a larger family residing at the proposed property, the external areas of the property were not being changed and the majority of the play equipment did not require planning permission.
- The property would remain looking like a residential property.
- Where a zebra crossing had been suggested on Tintern Avenue, this was not part of the planning application and not required.

Members were given the opportunity to make comments / ask questions. These could be summarised as follows:

- Members appreciated to some extent residents' concerns, however a similar situation existed previously with a children's care home in Thornaby, and this was now considered a centre of excellence.
- In relation to the much publicised Hartburn children's residential home where there had been problems initially, these had now been resolved and the home had received an outstanding accreditation from Ofsted.
- Concerns were raised in relation to parking. Six spaces were considered inadequate, and in addition there would also be visitors with cars spilling out onto the street.
- Crossing the road would be problematic.
- One of the positives in favour of the application was that there were good bus routes.
- Industrial bins would be needed for the home.
- In terms of the administration errors contained within the application this was considered appalling.
- There would be a major negative impact on the highway.
- An outstanding Ofsted accreditation for the proposal was needed immediately not 3 years in the future.
- Reference was made to a children's home in Hardwick which looked after 5 young people. The home was located opposite a home for the elderly where the children would help out and were loved by the residents.

Officers were given the opportunity to respond to comments/questions raised by

members. These could be summarised as follows;

- Previous occupancy of the proposed site was a doctor's surgery where there would have been more frequent activity regards the coming and going of traffic.

- In terms of the impact on highways, the Highways and Traffic Management Team were consistent when making decisions and comments and used policy when doing so.

- The proposal required 6 car parking spaces which were to be provided. The two original three bedroom dwellings would by applying SPD3 standards only require 4 car parking spaces in total. Visitors would have to park on the road. There could have been a better layout, however the current proposal did meet the standards and offer the ability to turn around within the curtilage whereas it was usual for cars to reverse off private drives onto the road.

- In terms of reversing off the proposed sites, there were a number of private residents in the area that had to reverse off their drives also.

- A condition had been requested to widen the dropped vehicle crossing prior to the proposal being brought into use.

A vote then took place and the application was approved.

RESOLVED that planning application 18/0851/COU be approved subject to the following conditions and informatives:

01 The development hereby approved shall be in accordance with the following approved plans;

Plan Reference Number	Date on Plan
17.91.004 REV 02	28 August 2018
17.91.002	17 April 2018

02 Limitations of Use

The use hereby approved shall be limited to serve to care for persons aged 18 and under and shall be limited to care for no more than 6 persons at any time.

03 Parking Provision

Prior to the proposed building being brought into use the vehicular parking spaces shall be provided in accordance with the submitted plan 17.91.004 Rev 02 submitted 28 August 2018. The spaces shall be retained for perpetuity of the proposed use.

INFORMATIVE OF REASON FOR PLANNING APPROVAL

Informative: Working Practices

The Local Planning Authority found the submitted details satisfactory subject to the imposition of appropriate planning conditions and has worked in a positive and proactive manner in dealing with the planning application.

Informative 2: Effective Management

The operator is advised to work alongside Cleveland Police and other safeguarding partners and to comply with the requirements of the multi-agency protocol on runaways and children missing from home or care. Effective management, staffing and procedural arrangements should be in place to prepare for potential missing episodes and management should take all possible measures to protect those at risk and work with the police to ensure a quality early risk assessment takes place.

Informative 3: Dropped Kerb

The applicant should contact Care for Your Area 01642 391959 regarding widening the dropped vehicle crossing.

**P
53/18**

18/0575/LBC

153 - 157 High Street, Stockton-on-Tees, TS18 1PL

Listed building consent for the restoration and refurbishment of The Globe with new back-of-house facilities to create a performance and multi-purpose venue. Change of use of No. 153 High Street from vacant retail unit with residential accommodation above to a bar/bistro with additional toilets and administration offices to support The Globe and to function as an occasional stand-alone unit.

Consideration was given to planning application 18/0575/LBC 153 - 157 High Street, Stockton-on-Tees, TS18 1PL.

Listed Building Consent was sought for the restoration and refurbishment of The Globe with new back-of-house facilities to create a performance and multi-purpose venue and change of use of 153 High Street to bar/bistro plus toilets and administrative offices to support The Globe.

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.

The planning policies and material planning considerations that were relevant to the consideration of the application were contained within the main report.

The Planning Officers report concluded that it was recommended that the application be approved with conditions for the reasons as specified within the main report.

Members were given the opportunity to make comments / ask questions. These could be summarised as follows:

- Clarity was sought in relation to the removal of the lift from the auditorium the impact this would have for members of the public with physical disabilities.
- Questions were raised in relation the materials being used to restore the original interior of the theatre and if materials were used which did not match

that of the original would this invalidate the listed building status.

- Members asked if the items to be removed from the theatres interior were original or those which were irretrievable from the 1950's.

Officers were given the opportunity to respond to comments/issues raised by members. Their responses could be summarised as follows:

- Although the lift and disabled toilet were to be moved there would be full access to the theatre for all.

- In terms of 'making good' specifically the interior where the building was listed this would require sympathetic restoration. Intervention in modern materials where the original was lost would be decided at the time. The building would not lose its listed status and any subsequent changes would need consent due to its listed building status.

A vote then took place and the application was approved.

RESOLVED that planning application 18/0575/LBC be approved subject to the following conditions and informative below;

01 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of Three years from the date of this permission.

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

Plan Reference Number	Date on Plan
07682-SPACE-ZZ-00-DR-A-01-0001	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-01-DR-A-01-0001	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-02-DR-A-01-0001	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-03-DR-A-01-0001	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-04-DR-A-01-0001	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-05-DR-A-01-0001	Grid Level General Arrangement 1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-06-DR-A-01-0001	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-B1-DR-A-01-0001	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-B2-DR-A-01-0001	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-01-5001	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-02-0001	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-02-0002	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-03-0001	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-03-0002	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-03-0003	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-03-0004	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-03-0005	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-03-0006	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-03-0007	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-03-0008	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-04-0001	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-04-0002	1 October 2018

07682-SPACE-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-04-0003	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-04-0004	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-04-0005	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-04-0006	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-04-0007	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-04-0008	1 October 2018

03. Works of making good

All new external and internal works and finishes and works of making good shall match the existing original work adjacent in respect of materials used, detailed execution, and finished appearance except where indicated otherwise on the drawings hereby approved or otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning authority.

04. Materials

Notwithstanding the submitted plans, construction of the external walls and roof of the new extension to the rear of The Globe (back of House) shall not commence until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the structures hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

05. Shop Front of 153 High Street

Notwithstanding the submitted plans, construction of the external surfaces of the new shop front to 153 High Street shall not commence until full details of the materials to be used have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

06. Work schedule

Notwithstanding details hereby approved there shall be no works carried out on, to or within the building which result in the removal or damage of any fixed part of the building unless in accordance with a schedule of works and working methods to be first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in respect of that part of the building. The schedule shall include but not be restricted to detailing the following areas of works;

- a. Works to any existing light fittings,
- b. Works to any plasterwork,
- c. Works to w.c's
- d. Works to all doors and fretwork grilles,
- e. Extent of repairs to the front elevation,
- f. Works to fall protection guarding,
- g. Works to the entrance including booking office, poster boxes and entrance doors.
- h. Windows.
- i. New seating
- j. Front canopy

07. Painting

Notwithstanding details hereby approved there shall be no painting of external surfaces including but not restricted to walls, windows, doors and fret work grilles unless in accordance with a scheme of painting to be first submitted to

and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

INFORMATIVE OF REASON FOR PLANNING APPROVAL

Informative: Working Practices

The Local Planning Authority has worked in a positive and proactive manner and sought solutions to problems arising in dealing with the planning application by gaining additional information required to assess the scheme and by the identification and imposition of appropriate planning conditions.

**P
54/18**

18/0574/REV

153 - 157 High Street, Stockton-on-Tees, TS18 1PL

Restoration and refurbishment of The Globe with new back-of-house facilities to create a performance and multi-purpose venue and change of use of No. 153 High Street to bar/bistro plus toilets and administrative offices to support The Globe and to function as an occasional stand-alone unit.

Consideration was given to planning application 18/0574/REV 153 - 157 High Street, Stockton-on-Tees, TS18 1PL.

Planning permission was sought for the restoration and refurbishment of The Globe with new back-of-house facilities to create a performance and multi-purpose venue and change of use of 153 High Street to bar/bistro plus toilets and administrative offices to support The Globe.

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.

The planning policies and material planning considerations that were relevant to the consideration of the application were contained within the main report.

The Planning Officers report concluded that it was considered that the proposal was in accordance with the thrust of the guidance of national planning policy and local planning policies and the development would contribute to the vitality, viability and the economic vibrancy of the town centre.

Furthermore, it would result in the reuse of long standing vacant listed buildings which would have a positive impact on the listed buildings and wider character of the conservation area.

The proposed extensions and alterations were acceptable and it was recommended that the application be approved with conditions for the reasons specified within the main report.

A vote took place and the application was approved.

RESOLVED that planning application 18/0574/REV be approved subject to the following conditions and informative below;

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

Plan Reference Number	Date on Plan
07682-SPACE-ZZ-00-DR-A-01-0001	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-01-DR-A-01-0001	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-02-DR-A-01-0001	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-03-DR-A-01-0001	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-04-DR-A-01-0001	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-05-DR-A-01-0001	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-06-DR-A-01-0001	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-B1-DR-A-01-0001	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-B2-DR-A-01-0001	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-01-5001	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-02-0001	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-01-5001	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-02-0001	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-02-0002	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-03-0001	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-03-0002	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-03-0003	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-03-0004	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-03-0005	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-03-0006	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-03-0007	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-03-0008	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-04-0001	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-04-0002	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-04-0003	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-04-0004	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-04-0006	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-03-DR-A-01-0001	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-02-DR-A-01-0001	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-01-DR-A-01-0001	1 October 2018
07682-SPACE-ZZ-00-DR-A-01-0001	1 October 2018

02. Materials

Notwithstanding the submitted plans, construction of the external walls and roof of the new extension to the rear of The Globe (back of House) shall not commence until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the structures hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

03. Shop Front of 153 High Street

Notwithstanding the submitted plans, construction of the external surfaces of the new shop front to 153 High Street shall not commence until full details of the materials to be used have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

04. Use of 153 High Street

The use hereby approved for 153 High Street shall not be brought into use until the adjacent premises (The Former Globe Theatre) has been brought into use as a performance and multipurpose venue unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

INFORMATIVE OF REASON FOR PLANNING APPROVAL

Informative 1: Working Practices

The Local Planning Authority has worked in a positive and proactive manner and sought solutions to problems arising in dealing with the planning application by seeking a revised scheme to overcome issues and by the identification and imposition of appropriate planning conditions.

Informative 2: Stellar Art /pavement protection

The applicant is reminded of the installation of the art feature within the front paving area at the Globe, adequate provision must be made during any construction works to ensure adequate protection is given to this feature and all existing paving shall be protected. Should any damage occur, this shall be repaired to match the existing materials, mortar etc.

**P
55/18** **1. Appeal - RPS Limited And Outpace Limited - Returnable Packaging Services Limited, Low Lane, High Leven, TS8 0BW
17/1912/OUT - ALLOWED WITH CONDITIONS**

The Appeal was noted.

**P
56/18** **1. Appeal - Yarm School - Yarm School, The Friarage, The Spital, Yarm, TS15 9EJ
17/2942/FUL - ALLOWED WITH CONDITIONS**
**2. Appeal - Site Plan UK - Land Associated With Hunters Rest, Uray Nook Road, Eaglescliffe
17/0775/OUT - ALLOWED WITH CONDITIONS AND COSTS ALLOWED**

A brief discussion took place around the appeal which had been allowed with conditions for Yarm School and how enforceable those conditions would be.

Officers explained that conditions were enforceable however the applicant could apply to vary them at any time.

The appeals were noted.