



**PD Teesport Limited**  
17-27 Queen's Square  
Middlesbrough, TS2 1AH  
Tel: +44 (0) 1642 877 000

Our ref: MM/GEN.40

9<sup>th</sup> September 2021

Mr David Pedlow  
Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council  
Corporate Directorate for Growth, Enterprise and Environment  
Development Management  
Redcar & Cleveland House  
Kirkleatham Street  
REDCAR  
TS10 1RT

Dear David

**PLANNING APPLICATION: R/2021/0676/FF  
ENGINEERING OPERATION TO CREATE TRENCH ASSOCIATED WITH THE SUBTERRANEAN DIVERSION  
OF THE BRAVO-10 PIPE BRIDGE**

We refer to the above mentioned planning application and neighbour notification received by PD Teesport Ltd (PD).

We do not believe that the proposed development is in accordance with the Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council Local Plan (the Local Plan) nor the South Tees Area SPD. We believe the proposal will have a significant negative impact on existing businesses that have critical reliance on the services provided in the Bravo 10 Pipeline, and it is our view that the purported benefits of the proposed development relating to connectivity do not and indeed cannot exist. On this basis, we **object** to the proposed development in its current form.

Despite being an immediate neighbour we wish to emphasise that the Applicant has not provided any advanced notice or detail of the proposed development to the Bravo 10 Pipe Bridge. Any works associated with the demolition of the existing pipe bridge structure will be likely to require access and consent of PD and we would welcome early notification from the Applicant of all proposed development works in this location relating to the Teesworks development.

We note that neighbour notification has not been served on all of the parties which access over the application site including Sembcorp, MGT Power or Sabic. We would suggest that the Council and Applicant confirm that contact has been made with these parties to allow full and proper consultation to take place.

We note in the Applicants planning pro-forma in Section 22, that the site can be seen from a public road, footpath, bridleway or other public land. For the avoidance of any confusion to other consultees, No 1 Quay road is privately owned by PD so public access for site visits should be taken through the South Bank Teesworks site.

Access rights over the application site exist for PD and its tenants. PD would welcome confirmation from the Applicant that they have consulted with all appropriate parties impacted by the proposal and what measures are proposed to be put in place to ensure access rights are maintained.

It is noted that the application description is “to create a trench associated with the subterranean diversion of the Bravo 10 Pipe Bridge” and that the application red line boundary covers the area of these works only. The application boundary does not include the existing Bravo 10 Pipe Bridge nor does it make any reference to the removal of this structure. If the true intention of the removal of the Pipe Bridge proposed is to benefit ease of movement around the Teesworks area, then we struggle to understand the justification for this. We must suspect one intention may be to formulate access for potential tenants of the South Bank area across the private Teesport Estate. If this is indeed the case then the Applicant should make this clear in order to justify the development. As the Applicant has previously erroneously relied on such consent previously, but not requested this from PD, then using such connectivity as justification for the temporary disturbance caused by the loss of vital services carried in the Bravo 10 Pipeline should not be relied on in support of the proposal.

If the intention of the proposed development is to improve connectivity between the private No 1 Quay Road, owned by PD, then PD would expect the Applicant to request such rights on behalf of their tenants. The Applicant should include detail on how and when the pipe bridge structure will be removed.

We have previously commented in relation to both Outline Planning Application R/2020/0357/OOM and Planning Application R/2021/0465/FFM that the Applicant has acknowledged through legal proceedings initiated by the South Tees Development Corporation and South Tees Developments Limited that no such rights of access exist over the private Number 1 Quay Road nor are there any rights to our operational quay itself.

If the intention of the proposed development is to improve connectivity between vessels moored on the private No 1 Quay and the South Bank area in the control of Teesworks, then it should be recognised by the Council that this is not possible due to existing capacity levels on this quay. Over £35 million has been invested by PD in No 1 Quay and the 300,000sqft bulk handling facility resulting in 44 new permanent jobs. PD does not propose to jeopardise the strong growth pattern in our bulks business nor default on our customer requirements. No 1 Quay mooring and goods handling is currently not available for the Teesworks area developments.

It is noted the site of the proposed trench is on land which was subject to the South Tees Development Corporation (Land at the former Redcar Steel Works, Redcar) Compulsory Purchase Order 2019.

It is also understood that the stated Objectives of the Applicant when it was formed are:-

- a) To further the economic development and regeneration of the South Tees area, so that it becomes a major contributor to the Tees Valley economy and the delivery of the Tees Valley’s Strategic Economic Plan;
- b) To attract private sector investment and secure new, additional, good quality jobs, accessible to the people of the Tees Valley;
- c) To transform and improve the working environment of the Corporation area, providing good quality, safe conditions for the workforce and the wider community;
- d) To contribute to the delivery of the UK Industrial Strategy, by supporting the growth of internationally competitive industries with access to global markets, taking a comprehensive approach to redevelopment at a scale that enables the realisation of an international – level investment opportunity.

With that in mind we would hope that both the Applicant and Redcar and Cleveland Council will be supportive of major employers and private sector investors in the area such as PD, SembCorp, MGT, etc which have invested substantially in the local area to generate major economic benefits for the wider Tees Valley and beyond.

We believe the application is at best a piece meal proposal which does not tie in to any wider or deliverable regeneration proposal, and could be viewed as a physical impediment to actual private sector investment, employment and regeneration.

If the true intention on the part of the Applicant is not to merely dig a trench in the road to for some alternative agenda, then any application should be viewed in the context of wider deliverable development proposals which would be to the benefit of the established employers and private investors in the area.

Notwithstanding the considerable additional financial burden to the public purse if the digging of a trench further to the compulsory purchase order created a physical impediment with resultant statutory compensation claims, we do not believe that Redcar and Cleveland Council should support such a piecemeal proposal.

The Applicant has failed to provide any explanation as why it considers the proposed development will contribute towards economic and connectivity aims of the local area as required in Policy LS4. It is our view given the scant detail provided in the application, that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on existing economic activity and existing service connectivity. Further, there is no additional connectivity provided as a result of the application. It is therefore our view that this application is contrary to the aims of Policy LS4 and should be refused on such basis until additional information has been provided.

Yours sincerely



**Michael McConnell**  
**Group Property Director**

Direct: +44 (0) 164 [redacted]

E-mail: [redacted]