

David Pedlow
Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council
Redcar & Cleveland House
Kirkleatham Street
Redcar & Cleveland
TS10 1RT

Date: 11 August 2021

Our ref: 63455/01/NW/JMa/19952696v3

Your ref: R/202/0465/FFM

Dear David

R/202/0465/FFM - Land at South Bank Wharf

We write in response to the letter dated 14th July 2021 from PD Ports Ltd (PDP) commenting on our client's planning application for the erection of 3,396 square metres of B2/B8 floorspace at South Bank Wharf. These comments are addressed in turn below and we note and welcome the support of PD in respect of the wider project.

Highway safety and traffic generation intended through the private roads within the Teesport Estate

We can confirm that, in light of PDP's objections, the current planning application will **not** require access via the PD Ports private road system. A new planning application is to be submitted imminently to secure a direct connection to Dockside Road.

Lack of Highway safety and traffic generation assessments where access is not acceptable through the private roads belonging to PD Teesport but instead directly onto the public highway network.

The additional floorspace proposed as part of this detailed planning application is not forecast to generate any additional jobs beyond what has been considered in the Transport Assessment prepared for the South Bank outline application. Accordingly, this application is not expected to generate any additional trips on the surrounding highway network beyond those assessed as part of the wider South Bank Planning Permission (R/2020/0357/OOM). Further, should additional trips be generated as a worst-case scenario, these would not have a material impact on the highway network, as the additional proposed floorspace is less than 1% of the total consented floorspace and would fall within the daily variations in traffic flows. There is, therefore, no requirement for the provision of additional traffic generation assessments in this instant.

PD Ports suggest that with access / egress to the application site coming only via Dockside Road, there is a requirement for the traffic generation to be modelled with 100% of the traffic using this route and all routes from the west i.e. for the A19 and A66. This is incorrect. The Transport Assessment for the South Bank site forecast that 60% of trips would use the new Smiths Dock Road/Dockside Road access roundabout with the remaining 40% to the east via Tees Dock Road.

The current application for GE Renewables and LM Wind represents less than 20% of the 418,000m² which has outline planning permission. As such, any access rights onto Tees Dock Road are not relevant at this time.

Notwithstanding, access from South Bank onto Tees Dock Road is possible for the land-owners and for those tenants who have negotiated the right to do so with PDP. As such, whilst future tenants would require PD Port's permission to access Tees Dock Road, via No1 Quay Road, the land-owners do not. It is, therefore, entirely reasonable to continue to assume 40% of traffic will access and egress on this basis. Additionally, in the alternative, the wider Teesworks internal road could be used to provide additional connectivity to the adopted highway, as shown on the approved parameter plan.

Failure to ensure the drainage from the site has been properly considered.

There is no requirement for full drainage details to be provided with this application. Approval of the drainage details for the entirety of the LM Wind site are to be secured through the discharge of condition 13 of the South Bank outline consent. Work is ongoing to prepare this submission which will follow shortly.

Procedural failure to consult with or serve notice on all the relevant parties to the application.

We are not aware of any such procedural failure. PD Ports does not own any of the land with the planning application boundary and so there was no requirement for notice to be served upon them.

Misleading labelling on drawings used to support the application.

This concern appears to relate to the labelling of the public and private road network. This is not a planning requirement and the Council is well aware of the extent of the public road network.

Failure within the application pro-forma to properly delineate a planning boundary showing the public highway in relation to the application boundary.

As explained above, a planning application for a new access road into the South Bank site is to be submitted imminently. This will serve both the LM Wind site and the wider South Bank development site. The access parameters for the South Bank site have already been agreed through the outline consent and there can be no suggestion that it will not be possible to secure access to the LM wind factory site from the public road network. The access strategy has been shared with the Council and hence there is no need for the current application site boundary to be extended to meet the current public highway.

Conclusion

We trust that this letter covers to your satisfaction all the points raised by PD Ports in their recent submission. If there are any matters on which you feel you need further clarification then please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely



Justine Matchett
Planning Director

Copy Michael McConnell, PD Ports
 Chris Bell, Highways England