

Update Sheet

Page No

7. Update List September 2022

1 - 24

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING COMMITTEE
SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION
1st September 2022 - Update list

Agenda Item	Application number and Parish	Respondent	
1	21/00966/REM Brafferton and Helperby	Officer	<p>The applicant has provided a new brick option to replace the buff coloured one originally proposed. An updated materials layout drawing has been provided. The principle of the chosen brick is considered acceptable subject to provision of samples. As such it is recommended that condition 3 be altered to the following wording: No above ground construction work shall be undertaken until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development have been made available on the application site for inspection (and the Local Planning Authority have been advised that the materials are on site) and the materials have been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be constructed of the approved materials in accordance with the approved method.</p>
		Officer	<p>The applicant has submitted updated drawings relating to House types E and H. Condition 2 therefore should be updated to reflect the revised drawings numbers as follows: HOUSE - E - ELEVS, TYPE- E - ELEVS rev-D Received 26.08.2022 HOUSE - E - PLANS, TYPE- E - PLANS rev-D Received 26.08.2022 BUNGALOW - H -RH, TYPE-H -RH rev-C Received 26.08.2022 The revised drawings contain a minor amendment to the size of bedroom 3 on House E and Bedroom 1 on House H to bring them up to NDSS standards. These amendments do not have any impact on the overall mix.</p>
		Officer	<p>Clarification was sought from the agents regarding the gradient of the access road. They have indicated that the road sections/gradient will be agreed with Highways in accordance with the outline permission. Taking into account the land level difference they estimate the gradient will be roughly 1 in 20 (5%).</p>

		Officer	The Lead Local Flood Authority have clarified that the drainage scheme is linked to the layout in that the layout may require amendments to facilitate the drainage scheme. The drainage scheme, however, is required by condition on the outline permission and therefore not technically required at this stage, although it may be more efficient to agree it now. Should the application be granted planning permission and subsequent alterations are required to the layout an amended scheme could be submitted.
		North Yorkshire Police Designing Out Crime Officer	A response was received which was broadly positive in relation to the proposed layout. The Officer notes that access to and movement within the site provides appropriate levels of permeability. The street design provides for natural surveillance. The car parking is commendable and complies with best practice with the exception of Plot 28 where the parking is to the rear of the garden. This could encourage on street parking. The Officer recommends that private drives are provided with lighting for BS 5489-1:2013 standard. The layout has clear areas of defensible space and the proposed boundary treatments are appropriate.
		Officer Response	It is recommended that a condition be included which requires the submission and approval of a lighting scheme. Prior to the occupation of the dwellings a lighting scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include the details of external lighting of the site and private areas. The lighting shall be installed in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of the dwellings.
2	21/01579/FUL Aisling O'Driscoll Husthwaite	Officer	The Officer has been copied into correspondence between Historic England and the applicant which clarifies their position in relation to the application. As Cote House is now to be retained they no longer maintain an objection to the application. They do however have <i>concerns</i> about the proposal. These concerns centre around the loss of the outbuildings (retention and reuse would be preferred) and the impact of development on the open space to the rear of the dwelling and resulting impact on the appreciation of the form and character of the settlement. Historic England have gone on to say that whilst they are unlikely to welcome development of this site they are happy to assist in discussions on amendments to reduce harm further.

			<p>The above has been taken into account in the planning balance and it is considered that the clarification of Historic England's position does not change the level of harm identified which remains at less than substantial. The recommendation remains as outlined in the report with the following text amendments:</p> <p>Paragraph 5.41 is updated to read as follows:</p> <p>Historic England objected to the original scheme which included the loss of Cote House. Following amendments to the scheme to retain Cote House, Historic England provided updated comments. Whilst Historic England no longer objects they still have concerns relating to the principle of development of the site and the loss of the historic outbuildings.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.44 is updated to read as follows: The second point of concern is the loss of historic ancillary outbuildings. As detailed above the outbuildings contribute to the legibility of past development of the village. The applicant argues that the outbuildings have been significantly altered over time and that little remains of the original buildings. Officer site visits have confirmed that alterations have indeed occurred, however, the southern elevation of the most westerly building appears to be intact in its original form. In any case the concerns revolve around the outright loss of the buildings and the significance they hold in revealing the historic form and layout of the settlement and not in their individual architectural merit.</p>
		Officer	An updated floorplan for Plot 7 has been received, drawing number 1786/21B. The dwelling is now shown as 4 bedrooms, however, the overall size/footprint remains the same.
		Officer	Further archaeological work was required prior to decision and the final report of this work is awaited. North Yorkshire County Council Heritage Service indicate that this information is required prior to decision as it may impact on the layout.
		Applicant	The applicant wishes to point out that the Landowner was not willing to sell the land unconditionally and that Cote House is unlikely therefore to come onto the market as a standalone dwelling. Refurbishment of Cote House is therefore unlikely to be delivered independently.

			The applicant also wishes to point out that they are willing to work with the Council and look at reducing the size of the units if required.
3	21/02338/FUL East Cowton	Additional Representation from a Member of the Public	<p>The member of the public has raised the following objections (as summarised below): The full representation is appended to the update list.</p> <p><u>Objection 1</u> – The planning application requests permission to use the site from 6am to 6pm Mon-Fri and 6am to 12:30pm Sat, however the objector states that vehicles are currently being operated from the site before and after these requested operating hours. If planning permission is granted then the operating hours should be in keeping with the hours as proposed within the application... Vehicles should also not be using this class of road, when larger, more suitable routes are available... This noise and vibrations from the vehicles passing at speed is louder than any other vehicles using this road. Vehicles can be heard exiting the site, some hundreds of metres away, the noise and vibration intensifies as they pass properties on West Lane. It is inconceivable that this would be allowed during anti-social hours (7am to 11pm).</p> <p><u>Objection 2</u> – The Local Highway Authority’s comments (within their consultation response) that West Lane (C8) is wider than 5.5m and therefore able to allow two HGVs to pass is disputed by the objector, who states that the West lane road width is consistently under 5.5m wide, and thus not suitable for two HGVs to pass... approval for HGVs to operate in this area should not be granted on this point alone based on non-compliance with Highway’s policy and public safety. If this is not consistent with Highway’s information, a further independent review should be completed.</p> <p><u>Objection 3</u> - This area of West Lane from Dalton Meadows to the B1263 Richmond Road is also the most populated and condensed part of West Lane, which along with the rest of West Lane, does not have footpaths. Residents are therefore forced to walk in the road with oncoming traffic... The existing verges offer some safe space for pedestrians but are not maintained and are being eroded by HGVs and wide vehicles. The erosion of the verges is enabling HGVs to pass without incident, but whilst also endangering the public.</p> <p><u>Objection 4</u> - Whilst the Local Highway Authority have not raised an objection to the application in their consultation response, they have acknowledged that the entrance to the site does not meet the standard for safety under the Design Manual for Roads [but are not objecting due to the history of use - including caravan storage and other businesses that use the access – and the low traffic speeds to this point].</p>

Objection 5 - The entrance to this site is on a 60mph road with below standard visibility. Vehicles entering the site from Dalton on Tees must cross into oncoming traffic to navigate the entrance, they must do this with no sight of what is coming in the other direction. I would also ask the planning committees opinion for how many developments are rejected due to poor visibility splays. It seems inconsistent this safety issue would be overlooked when considering the speed of the road and size of vehicle in question.

Objection 6 - The site in question and the immediate surrounding area (less than 50 metres) contains a number of existing businesses which operate HGVs.... There must be a question of how much HGV and trailer use is sensible and permissible on one stretch of road, which in this case is a C class road, with questionable suitability for HGVs.

Objection 7 – The objector disputes the assertion made in para.5.22 of the Officer Report that the caravan storage facility (that shares the same access road) accounts for the majority of weekend and bank holiday vehicle movements, stating that this seems to be pure speculation without any evidence put forward to support this assertion.

Objection 8 – Although para.5.23 of the Officer Report states that the access to the site does not serve any residential properties, the objector notes that there are however two residential properties within 25m of the site.

Objection 9 - The planning application details operating hours of 6am to 6pm, Mon-Fri. . Therefore, granting 24 hr access should result in an amendment to the application of which members of the public should be notified.

Objection 10 – In response to the assertion within para.5.23 of the Officer Report that imposing a condition restricting hours of operation would not prevent the operator from driving on the public road at 5:00, the objector has stated that if any permission restricted the hours of operation to those stated on the application form, then they would not be using the road during hours outside this time., particularly as there is no parking available on the lane.

Objection 11 – In response to the conclusion within para.5.23 of the Officer Report that as the site is not near any residential properties it is therefore considered that the development does not result in any significant impact on amenity, the objector has pointed to the number of objections; evidence of anti-social hours; the issue of highway and verges impact; noise/vibration as providing insight into the impact of the development on amenity.

Objection 12 – The objector states that there is a precedent established regarding the imposition of restricted operating hours as a result of an application relating to a local business

		<p>Clarification regarding delivery times, opening/ operating times and daily vehicle movements</p>	<p>(1/17/7D/PA) that went to judicial review and resulted in a condition that stated that no delivery, unloading, nor vehicle movements in relation to operations should take place on Sundays, Bank Holidays nor any other day, except between 7am and 18pm.</p> <p><u>Objection 13</u> – The objector notes that the planning application is for the bagging, unloading and movement of aggregates, although the objector has provided details that seem to show that the site also accommodates a business called ‘Loads of Stone’ whose website appears to offer the sale of aggregates to businesses and the public, and with collection from the site available. Sales from the site to businesses and the public is not authorised or covered by the current planning application.</p> <p><u>Objection 14</u>- There is local concern over the ability of the area to sustain the growing number of vehicles, particularly HGVs. Concerns are raised over the continued increase in water run-off and the impact this weight of vehicles is having on watercourses, that date from the mid-19th century, which run under the Lane... It also seems highly likely that due to the narrow road and the frequent heavy loads passing along the lane, the road surfaces are also taking an abnormal strain resulting in a poor state of repair being the norm, something which has not been considered.</p> <p><u>Objection 15</u> - The speed limit along West Lane / C8 is largely 60mph, with a reduction as you approach Dalton Meadows though to the B1263 of 40mph. The increased volume of HGVs should result in a road speed review and consideration for a reduction of the speed limit, either to the whole lane, or, to part of the lane already with a lower limit of 40mph. (Members can view the full representation via the attached appendices.)</p> <p>In order to clarify the nature of the current aggregate bagging operations, the applicant has confirmed the following (via email):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Delivery Activities/Times</u> – has some AM vehicle movements from the site. Tipper trucks leave the site between 5am and 6am each morning. Although these are destined for a quarry to collect material for onward delivery to customers, these returning tipper trucks will backload aggregates from local quarries to our yard as stock for the bagging plant returning to the site later in the day. Bagged aggregate vehicles (accounting for less than a third of the fleet) take the bagged material from the bagging plant for onward delivery to builder’s merchants throughout the North East and Yorkshire and typically depart from the site at around 6am to ensure they are with customers when they open. Occasionally a
--	--	---	--

			<p>slightly earlier departure is required (in line with the other delivery vehicles) to service customers further afield.</p> <p>2. <u>Staff Working Hours and Staff Traffic Movements</u> - The bagged aggregate plant on site employs 10% of the 50 total on site personnel. Their typical working hours are 7am until 6pm Mon to Fri, with occasional variation when customer requirements dictate. Staff also tend to work half a shift each Saturday during the peak (summer) months. Staff commuting to work in cars accounts for the majority of traffic entering and exiting the site from 6am – 7am and 5pm – 6pm.</p> <p>3. <u>Commercial Vehicle Movements</u> - The Haulage business operating from the site (Greenford Haulage) operates 13 commercial vehicles. All leave and return at least once each day with a handful of vehicles accessing the site a few times each day.</p>
4 and 5	22/01263/FUL and 22/01264/LBC Nathan Puckering Snape with Thorpe	Supporting information from BHPD on behalf of the applicant Officer response to above	<p>A supporting document has been provided. The document has been appended to the update list in full. The agent compares the plans approved under the extant permission, which was granted under application 20/01546/LBC, to those put forward in this proposal. Furthermore, the agent has set out the design evolution the applicant has gone through to address Officer's concerns.</p> <p>The points raised above have been addressed in the Officer report.</p>
6	22/01350/FUL Marc Pearson South Kilvington	Applicant	<p>The applicant has provided financial evidence and that at another site operated by the applicant the business hours of 6.00am to 9.00pm are popular slots as opposed to the business hours of 7.00 am – 7.00pm stipulated by officers set out in condition 3.</p> <p>The applicant has provided further information regarding the management of the site which sets out how the site would be managed and how any complaints would be dealt with in terms of noise together with clarification on how the operational management of the site booking and overruns would be dealt with. This can be controlled via the suggested condition 4.</p> <p>The applicant has clarified that the proposal would restrict to a maximum of 6 dogs per 1 hour booking but that this does not limit the number of people that may attend during each 1 hour slot.</p>

		Officer	<p>The site is covered by Local Plan E4 Green Infrastructure Corridors. The proposal can satisfy the requirements of this policy through the proposed landscaping condition no.6.</p> <p>The parking layout (including number of vehicle spaces) and surface material can be controlled via a suitably worded condition in order to prevent any overspill on to the surrounding highway network.</p> <p>Add further condition regarding boundary hedgerows is recommended as set out below:</p> <p>“The existing boundary hedgerows shall be maintained to height of no lower than 2m.”</p> <p>The site is identified as grade 2/3 agricultural land on the Natural England website mapping. The land is not allocated as grade 1 agricultural land and could easily return to agricultural use given the limited material change of use of the land where no structures are proposed.</p> <p>The supporting paragraphs 4.68 and 4.70 Local Policy EG 7 require a business case where necessary. Given the nature of the application it is not considered a business is required on this occasion.</p>
		Environmental Health	<p>Environmental Health have provided a formal response following the receipt of a suggested Management Plan as stated below:</p> <p>“I now understand that there will be a maximum of 6 dogs and that booking slots will be 50 minutes with 10 minutes between each slot to allow changeover. I also understand that some management controls are proposed presented as ‘rules’ and ‘terms and conditions’. If you are minded to approve the application, I would recommend that a condition is applied which requires the production and agreement, in writing by the local planning authority, of a Management Plan. Any changes to any approved plan would need to be agreed in writing with the local planning authority.”</p>
		Additional Objection from	<p>Objection noting the four points below:</p>

		member of the public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I note that to our astonishment and against huge local opposition the Planning Officer has recommended approval of the application. • Please can you tell me what criteria were used to evaluate this application. • We remain firmly against this unnecessary proposal and will contact elected members in the hope that they will make a sensible decision and reject it. • As Liz Truss said only yesterday, Agricultural land should be used for producing food! <p>Officers consider the points raised have been dealt within the officer report and additional information as noted on this update list.</p>
7	22/01740/FUL Nathan Puckering Danby Wiske with Lazenby	Councillor Comments	<p>Cllr Fortune in anticipation of being unable to attend the meeting has pledged her support for the approval of this application. Her comment is as follows: "I am sorry I cannot make the planning Committee this month, However I wish to have my support for the above application noted. I know the existing property and I am fully aware of the need to replace this with a new and purposeful dwelling. Given the profound need to changed family circumstances, which I know are not listed as planning considerations. The existing could not accommodate wheelchair access, nor is the bathroom capable of accommodating hoists etc. The existing home is a damp and not at all energy efficient small property. A new build would accomplish all the issues and provide a discreet and purposeful home for the family and the future. I will not go on, yet I feel I must say that I fully support our planner's decision and ask that my support in the recommendation of GRANTING this application."</p>
8	21/02217/FUL Craig Allison Winton, Stank & Hallikeld		None

Planning Reference 21/02338/FUL

Retrospective change of use of potato store to aggregate bagging depot, with no alterations to existing buildings. At: Greenford Haulage & Aggregates Dept, Unit 5, Dalton Gates, Dalton on Tees
For: Mr James Ford

Subject: Objections post planning officer's report.

I would like to raise the following objections and submit the following evidence for review by the planning committee in advance of the review meeting on 01/09/2022.

1.0 Site, Context and Proposal

1.3 The business operates in terms of tippers leaving the site between 5am and 6am each morning. These lorries are typically destined for a quarry to collect material for onward delivery to customers, either locally or further afield. Later in the day, normally after customer deliveries are complete, returning tipper trucks will backload aggregates from local quarries to the applicant's yard as stock for the bagging plant. Bagged aggregate vehicles take the bagged material that is produced by the bagging plant for onward delivery to builder's merchants throughout the North East and Yorkshire.

Objection 1: Vehicles are being operated from the site before the requested operating hours. The planning application requests permission to use the site from 6am to 6pm Mon-Fri and 6am to 12:30pm Sat. Therefore, the grant of permissible use should be as a minimum in keeping with these hours. I enclose evidence (also in planning document 02099839) which shows loaded vehicles operating at 4.49AM. It is now the norm for vehicles to exit the site at this time on a daily basis.

Vehicles are also operating later than 6pm. I personally encountered a HGV using the Moulton, Back Lane, at 10.15pm 15th August. Vehicles should also not be using this class of road, when larger, more suitable routes are available.

This noise and vibrations from the vehicles passing at speed is louder than any other vehicles using this road. Vehicles can be heard exiting the site, some hundreds of metres away, the noise and vibration intensifies as they pass properties on West Lane. It is inconceivable that this would be allowed during anti-social hours (7AM to 11PM). Please also see Objection 12 for local precedent of operating restrictions.

4.0 Consultations

4.2 "North Yorkshire County Council (Highways) has raised no objections to the application"

Objection 2: As per document 2092366. The NYCC Highways department commented that the C8 / West Lane was wider than 5.5m and it was accepted that two HGVs could pass at this width.

As per the objection on the 08/04/22 (doc. 2096385). I have measured the road width on West Lane, from the turning by Dalton Meadows to the junction with the B1263, Richmond Road. This

road is consistently under 5.5m wide (see diagram 1) and therefore is not suitable for two HGVs to pass. There are many other places along the C8, when exiting the site to the right towards Dalton on Tees, which do not meet the criteria of 5.5m wide. Namely, Moorhours Bridge, which is one of the narrowest and most poorly sighted positions on the Lane.

By default, approval for HGVs to operate in this area should not be granted on this point alone based on non-compliance with Highway's policy and public safety. If this is not consistent with Highway's information, a further independent review should be completed.

Objection 3: This area of West Lane from Dalton Meadows to the B1263 Richmond Road is also the most populated and condensed part of West Lane, which along with the rest of West Lane, does not have footpaths. Residents are therefore forced to walk in the road with oncoming traffic.

The existing verges (see Appendix Item 2) which offer some safe space for pedestrians, are not maintained are being eroded by HGVs and wide vehicles. It seems the erosion of the verges is enabling HGVs to pass without incident, but whilst also endangering the public. It is the Council's and Highway's Authority's duty to maintain highways and verges for the public.

S130 Highways Act 1980.

(1) It is the duty of the highway authority to assert and protect the rights of the public to the use and enjoyment of any highway for which they are the highway authority, including any roadside waste which forms part of it.

(2) Any council may assert and protect the rights of the public to the use and enjoyment of any highway in their area for which they are not the highway authority, including any roadside waste which forms part of it.

(4) ... it is the duty of a local highway authority to prevent any unlawful encroachment on any roadside waste for which they are the highway authority.

(6) If the council of a parish represent to a local highway authority ... (b) that an unlawful encroachment has taken place on a roadside waste comprised in a highway for which they are the highway authority, it is the duty of the local highway authority, unless satisfied that the representations are incorrect to take proceedings accordingly and they may do so in their own name.

Objection 4: Whilst Highways have not raised an objection, they have stated formally that the entrance to the site does not meet the standard for safety under the Design Manual for Roads.

"The visibility available at the existing access has been assessed as falling below the standards set out in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges. However, due to its history of use (including a caravan storage facility and other business served by the same access) and low traffic speeds expected at that point of the C8 due to the road alignment a refusal on highways grounds would be difficult to sustain."

Objection 5: The entrance to this site is on a 60mph road with below standard visibility. Vehicles entering the site from Dalton on Tees must cross into oncoming traffic to navigate the entrance, they must do this with no sight of what is coming in the other direction. I would also ask the planning committees opinion for how many developments are rejected due to poor visibility splay. It seems inconsistent this safety issue would be overlooked when considered the speed of the road and size of vehicle in question.

Objection 6: The site in question and the immediate surrounding area (less than 50 metres) contains a number of existing businesses which operate HGVs. At present, no less than 6 companies have license to operate a total of 21 HGVs and 17 Trailers in this area. There is also a pending license application to increase this to 23 HGVs and 19 Trailers. These figures exclude Greenford's operating license and use of this site, which will take the total to 36 HGVs and 25 Trailers. There must be a question of how much HGV and Trailer use is sensible and permissible on one stretch of road, which in this case is a C class road, with questionable suitability for HGVs. *The planning committee must take this into consideration when considering the amenity of local residents.*

5.0 Analysis

5.22 *"A number of businesses operate within the yard and make a number of deliveries throughout the day and night. Another business who shares the same access road, albeit into a separate site, accounts for the majority of weekend and bank holiday vehicle movements due to the delivery and collection of caravans from the caravan storage facility."*

Objection 7: No data on the use of the wider site is readily available, and, as stated in Objection 6, the immediate site area is home to a further 21 HGV and 19 Trailer licenses. To state the remainder of the traffic using this site at weekends and Bank Holidays, which I would question the legitimacy of, seems pure speculation. As a resident of the area, I have not seen a single caravan pass my house, particularly at 5:00AM. If the planning team can prepare evidence to the contrary, then it should be made public.

5.23 *"Comments have also been received stating that HGV's travel past residential properties along West Lane as early as 5:00am and this is causing harm to residential amenity. However, the access to the site does not serve any residential properties. Properties in the wider area are otherwise located on a public road. Therefore, imposing a condition restricting hours of operation would not prevent the operator from driving on the public road at 5:00am. As the site is not near any residential properties it is considered that the development does not result in any significant impact on amenity and as such is in accordance with the Council's Local Plan Policy E2."*

Objection 8: *"However, the access to the site does not serve any residential properties."* Yes. Site access on serves the "site", it's kind of in the name!?! There are however two residential properties within 25 metres of the site.

Objection 9: The planning application details operating hours of 6am to 6pm, Mon-Fri (see Appendix Item 3). Permission to use the site should follow the application. Granting 24 hr access is in excess of the appliques requirements and if required should result in an amendment to the application. Members of the public have reviewed the application on the basis of these operation hours alone, they should therefore legally be notified of any amendment and intention to alter from this application.

Objection 10: *"Therefore, imposing a condition restricting hours of operation would not prevent the operator from driving on the public road at 5:00am"*. If the operator was allowed to operate in the hours applied for, they would not be using the road at hours outside of this time. There are no parking spaces available for HGVs on the lane. It is nonsense to assume the operator would use the road, at their expense, for no other purpose than to access the site.

Objection 11: *“As the site is not near any residential properties it is considered that the development does not result in any significant impact on amenity and as such is in accordance with the Council’s Local Plan Policy E2.”*

I would like to assume that the number of objections, evidence of anti-social hours, inability to use the highway and verges, as well as the description of noise and vibrations, would give the planning committee some insight into the impact on amenity.

Objection 12: Precedent for restricted operating hours on local business. Intertrac (council ref 1/17/7D/PA). There is local precedent following a planning inspectorate judicial review relating to a similar business operating immediately near the site. It was stated that “no delivery, unloading, nor vehicle movements in relation to operations should take place on Sundays, Bank Holidays nor ANY other day, except between 7am and 18pm”. These conditions were applied post planning approval for the site and following three years of residents’ objections being raised, finally to be acknowledged by the planning inspectorate judicial review.

Planning Balance

5.29 The application is for a change of use of an existing building and surrounding land for the running of an aggregate bagging depot.

Objection 13: I have previously raised (document 02099836 17/05/22) the site is also linked to a business called Loads of Stone (website: [Loads of Stone - High quality, sustainable aggregates!](#)) the contact details and location of which are below. This business is offering the sale of aggregates to businesses and the public, furthermore, collection is available at the site (see Appendix item 4).

The planning application is for bagging, loading, and movement of aggregates. A license to operate from the site to the public and other businesses is in breach of the licensing agreement and is outside of the planning application. This activity if therefore being conducted outside of planning authorities control.

Taken from the above website:

Loads of Stone,
Greenford Haulage & Aggregates Ltd,
West Lane, Dalton Gates,
Dalton-on-Tees,
Darlington,
County Durham,
DL2 2PP, United Kingdom

Additional objections

Objection 14: I have been in discussion with residents, some with over 40 years of experience of living in this community. There is concern over the ability of the area to sustain the growing number of vehicles, particularly of this size. Concerns are raised over the continued increase in water run-off and the impact this weight of vehicles if having on watercourses, that date from the mid-19th century, which run under the Lane. In my time I have seen what I would deem an unusual and frequent issue with water supplies break and needing repair on the lane. It also seems highly likely

that due to the narrow road and the frequent heavy loads passing along the lane, the road surfaces are also taking an abnormal strain resulting in a poor state of repair being the norm. I would challenge that no considering or inspection of this impact has taken place or been included in the review.

Objection 15: Speed limit. The speed limit along West Lane / C8 is largely 60mph, with a reduction as you approach Dalton Meadows though to the B1263 of 40mph. The increased volume of HGVs should result in a road speed review and consideration for a reduction of the speed limit, either to the whole lane, or, to part of the lane already with a lower limit of 40mph. It is logical that as the use of the road develops and evolves, so should the speed limit. I would also question, as in Objection 2, that as the Lane is narrow, 5.5m or narrower, is it appropriate that HGVs should be allowed to pass at a speed of 60mph or 40mph.

Appendix

Item 1 – area measured and found less than 5.5m.



Item 2 – pictures of verges being eroded with lack of space for pedestrians

2.1 Verges have been eroded by 1-2 feet, the natural course of the road is evident and shows how much additional space is required for HGV vehicles.



2.2 Dip in the road on West Lane which causes additional noise from the vehicles



2.3 View up West Lane, further erosion of verges with lack of footpaths



2.4 Tyre marks in the verges



2.5 erosion of verges to the left as vehicles pass one of the narrowest points on the road



Item 3

20. Hours of Opening				
If known, please state the hours of opening (e.g. 15:30) for each non-residential use proposed:				
Use	Monday to Friday	Saturday	Sunday and Bank Holidays	Not known
Bagging Aggregates	6am - 6pm	6am - 12:30pm	—	

Item 4 Loads of Stone website offering collection of products from the site at Dalton Gates

Sample 20kg 20kg x 10 20kg x 25

1/2 bulk bag (450kg) bulk bag (850kg)

Quantity: - 1 +

Add to Cart

Buy with [shopPay](#)

More payment options

✓ Pickup available at Dalton Gates
Usually ready in 24 hours

[View store information](#)

CHARCOAL GREY SLATE 40MM
Sample

Dalton Gates

✓ Pickup available, usually ready in 24 hours

West Lane, Dalton Gates,
Dalton on Tees
Darlington DL2 2PP
United Kingdom
+441325526151

These natural slate chippings are charcoal grey black colour when wet, charcoal grey slate 40mm piece.

Slate is perfect for garden pathways and drives. 40mm allows the slate to bed down in use, ensuring a smooth surface.

All slates are low maintenance. Ideal for weed growth.

22/01264/LBC and 22/01263/FUL – Snape Castle Barn Supporting Information

In considering the applications for a garden room at Snape Castle Barn, it is important to take account of the extant permission for a garden room, approved in 2020. The image below shows the approved plans of the north elevation of Snape Castle Barn with the glazed garden room extension.



The approved garden room extension would have an expanse of glazing with an aluminium frame. After permission was granted, Mrs Hanson realised that the garden room may not be able to be constructed as approved as the ceiling height would be less than 2.1 metres, and therefore would not meet building regulations requirements. As such, she explored a different design approach to achieve an attractive extension to her property which would meet the necessary ceiling heights.



The plan above shows the original design of the garden room extension with a steeper pitch of the lantern and heavier moulding and finials. The Case Officer raised concerns regarding these elements of the extension, and as such the design was amended as shown in the image below to address the Case Officers concerns.



This amended design to be considered by Members at the Committee Meeting shows finials removed, pilasters removed, a lower pitch on the lantern and a reduction in width by 700mm resulting in a much smaller scale and footprint.

This clearly shows how the design of the garden room has evolved, resulting in an attractive and sympathetic heritage style garden room which would be entirely in keeping with the character and

setting of the property as it stands today and its grounds, which also features a heritage style greenhouse which has a lantern and finials. This greenhouse was granted permission by the Council, and therefore the heritage style design approach has already been established as being acceptable by the Council within the setting of Snape Castle Barn.