

DELEGATED

**AGENDA NO
PLANNING COMMITTEE
[Insert date]
REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF FINANCE,
DEVELOPMENT AND BUSINESS SERVICES**

23/1406/LA

2 Speeton Close, Billingham, Stockton-On-Tees

Change of use from residential dwelling (C3) to a childrens care home (C2)

Expiry Date 9 November 2023

UPDATE REPORT

Further comments have been received from Councillor Clare Gamble, Councillor Marc Besford, 15 Etton Road and 56 Bielby Avenue sending their apologies, see comments attached. Further comments have also been received from 3 Speeton Close.

In summary the comments raise concerns regarding the location of the use, anti-social behaviour, ability to control residents, security recommendations from Cleveland Police and inadequate parking facilities at the property which will lead to highway safety concerns which have been set out in the original report. Whilst it is noted the comments raise concerns regarding obstructions for emergency services and dangerous on street car parking and the need for these to be conditioned, unfortunately on street car parking is not within the gift for the Local Planning Authority to control outside of the considerations of this planning application.

In respect of ensuring adequate incurtilage car parking will remain at the property, this can be secured by a condition. See suggested wording below.

Incurtilage Carparking

The development hereby approved shall retain a minimum of 5 incurtilage car parking spaces via the existing driveway in accordance with SPD3: Parking Provision for Developments 2011. The parking provision shall be retained thereafter for the lifetime of the development.

Reason; To provide the requisite in curtilage car parking provision in the interests of highway safety in accordance with planning policy SD8.



Big plans, bright future

Councillors Clare Gamble & Marc Besford
Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council
Municipal Buildings
Stockton on Tees
TS18 1LD

Email: clare.gamble@stockton.gov.uk
marc.besford@stockton.gov.uk

REF: Planning Application No: 23/1406/LA

CC: Simon Grundy, Planning Services Manager.

Dear Cllr Stoker,

We are writing to you in your capacity as Chair of the Planning Committee as we are unable to attend the committee meeting on Wednesday 8th November.

As ward councillors, we have spoken to most of the residents of Speeton Close as well as residents from the immediate surrounding area. As you will be aware from the Officer report, these residents are opposed to the change of use and have registered their objections in the appropriate manner on the public access planning portal. We are aware that residents will be attending the planning committee on Wednesday.

Ultimately, the decision on whether this application is approved or rejected rests solely with the planning committee. As ward councillors, our primary concern is ensuring that our residents have the opportunity to put the reasons for their objections to yourself and the committee. As stated in the report, some of the objections cannot be classed as material planning considerations. However, there are many objections which are material considerations and therefore it is important to us that all residents are given the opportunity to raise their concerns directly with the committee so that they can be considered as part of the decision making process.

In the event that the application for the change of use is approved, we would like to request the following conditions be attached to the decision:

We wholeheartedly support condition 3 of the Officers report which states

Approved Use

The premises shall be used for a three person children's home and for no other purpose including any other purpose in Class C2 of the Schedule of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 2020 (or any order revoking or re-enacting that order with or without modification), without planning permission being obtained from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To adequately control the use of the site having regard to the nature of the site and the circumstances of the application to protect the amenity of the area and in the interests of resident's amenity.

Parking

Reasonable measures are put in place to control street parking outside the property.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 November 2023 17:22
To: Planning Administration
Subject: PROPOSAL - CHANGE OF USE FROM RESIDENTIAL DWELLING (C3) TO A CHILDRENS CARE HOME (C2) - 2 SPEETON CLOSE BILLINGHAM STOCKTON ON TEES APPLICATION NO. 23/1406/LA CASE OFFICER JADE HARBOTTLE

Dear Sirs,

Thank you for your letter dated 30th. October 2023 received 3rd. November 2023 regarding the forthcoming Planning Committee Meeting on the 8th. November 2023 at 1.30 p.m.

Unfortunately we will not be able to attend due to mobility issues and carers responsibilities and a previous health related appointment.

As we therefore have no voice as to our objections to this proposal we wish to make it clear that our previous objections still apply and due to having served in the Lancashire and Cleveland Police Forces for the whole of his career my husband is fully conversed with the reality of necessary intervention on a professional and regular basis with these institutions.

Our premises sit diagonally across from this property in question (at the rear of the houses) and we feel we will become unable to relax in our own home and garden thus disrupting our already somewhat diminished quality of life. It is to have similar consequences on many others in the surrounding area and seems a callous method imposed on the many to solve (for the few) your own responsibilities as a Council.

Surely not all possibilities to be fair to all parties have been explored.

Yours faithfully,

With regret that we have to ask that our objections to the proposed change of use of the above property to a children's home be presented to the Committee prior to any decision. As long standing health care professionals we have provided services to the type of prospective residents and are aware of the difficult challenges they face.

All statistics are from Sir Martin Narey's excellent 'Independent review of children's residential care' July 2016, commissioned by HM Government.

Our objections are based on the following issues:

-
- 1) Unsuitable location. The demographics of our estate are of an increasingly ageing population. Many residents, ourselves included are the original house owners. There are very few facilities locally that would be suited to the needs of children, especially teenagers, the most likely client group.
 - 2) Concern re increase in crime and antisocial behaviour. Residents of such homes are six times more likely to be the subject of criminal proceedings. This is in spite of both the police and home managers being disinclined to do so. The average period of residency is 3 months meaning there will be a turnover of some 12 children annually to be expected. One cannot expect roots to be set down by the children – average age 14.7 years- in such a time frame . In 2013 about 62% had clinically significant mental health difficulties and 74% were reported to have been violent or aggressive in the past 6 months'
 - 3) Difficulty in controlling residents. Whilst the Council may see itself as a surrogate parent, there is a huge degree of discrepancy between the influence a parent can exert compared to a professional carer. Narey records the very difficult job this can be with resultant difficulties in recruitment let alone retention of appropriately qualified staff. It is highly likely that outside influences will identify the residents as being vulnerable and bring antisocial influences to bear.
 - 4) Cleveland Police have made a number of security recommendations. Assuming these are implemented this will change the appearance of the property that we fear

a monstrous carbuncle developing on a much loved landscape.

- 5) Inadequate parking facilities. Speeton Close is very narrow and on-road parking, even by one car will in all probability result in significant congestion. We are already aware of photographs in circulation of Council Staff parking outside the property without consideration of the welfare of other residents. Such indiscretions are highly likely given there are only 2 spaces for cars as the house is currently configured without others having to manoeuvre on the public highway- which includes onto Low Grange Avenue, a busy thoroughfare. We are aware of factual concerns as to how there is the assumption there are spaces for 5 cars at any one time.
 - 6) We record our probity concerns around how this process has been conducted but leave it to others to expand on this point given time restriction.
-
-
-

We do not dispute the need for children's homes per se, but the proposal here is unsuitable for need and hope the application is rejected.