

	<p>team who have successfully dealt with all applications submitted for the Teesworks site since the STDCs inception. If it is considered that external design review is appropriate then the Council needs to be clear that it does not have the necessary 'additional' resources that might be required to support that process and that if additional resources are required to support this process then RCBC considers this should be the responsibility of the applicant.</p>
<p>DCO.3.1 Discharge of Conditions</p>	<p>At RCBC the discharge of conditions (requirements) is a matter which is fully delegated to the Director of Growth and Environment and to officers within the planning team. At present the team have one Principal Planning officer who deals with the majority of submissions for the Teesworks site but the discharge of conditions can equally be dealt with by technical staff within the team under the supervision of planning officers. RCBC has no concerns in respect of the provisions of Schedule 13 and is satisfied it can resource this requirement.</p>
<p>GH3.1 Requirements in respect of contamination</p>	<p>RCBC is satisfied that the revision to requirement 13 of the draft DCO meets its original requirement . Although articulated in different form to the standard condition routinely used by RCBC, it nevertheless meets the Council's requirements in respect of this matter</p>
<p>GH3.2 Requirements in respect of contamination</p>	<p>RCBC is satisfied that the approach adopted in respect of contamination will deal with matter satisfactorily. RCBC can confirm that planning permission was granted on 11 8 2022 for engineering operations associated with ground remediation and preparation of the DCO site RCBC ref R/2021/1048/FFM</p> <p>████████████████████ ████████████████████████████████████████████████████████████████████████████████</p>
<p>GH3.3 Services</p>	<p>RCBC is satisfied that the requirement set out in the DCO will provide an appropriate level of detail and control over this matter</p>
<p>HE3.1 Archaeology</p>	<p>RCBC can confirm it is satisfied with the approach set out in respect of the archaeological investigation of the site and requirement 14 of the draft DCO in respect of archaeology</p>
<p>HE.30 Heritage Trail</p>	<p>The issue of the proposed heritage trail was explained at D6 (REP121/REP6-144) RCBC cannot add to the questions already answered. RCBC supports the development of a Heritage Trail on Teesworks as set out in Development Principle STDC8 of the South Tees Area SPD and notes the submission of the STDC that this is likely to be based on an existing PROW on the site; it also notes the submission of the applicant that no part of any proposed trail would cross the site because of the nature of the DCO development. The Council, will as Local Planning Authority, continue to work with STDC and interested parties to promote the delivery of a Heritage Trail but at present no progress has been made on the framework for the delivery of such a project and no funding / resources are identified to support this work. RCBC accepts that it would not be appropriate at this time to place any planning obligation or requirement on the applicants in respect of this matter.</p>

<p>HE.3.4 Cleveland Industrial Archaeology Society</p>	<p>RCBC can confirm that it is content with the form of requirement 14 and the consultation with CIAS can take place, at the discretion of the Council, on any archaeological issues along with advice from its appointed advisors at North East Archaeological Research (NEAR)</p>
<p>HE3.5 Impact on Heritage Assets</p>	<p>The issue of Huntcliffe and Saltburn and the impact of the development was raised by the RCBC Conservation Officer who took a more wide ranging view of the LVIA and the impact on Saltburn and the Cliffs as areas of special control (Conservation Area and Heritage Coast) There are viewpoints from key public highways on the Cliffs to the north to the DCO site which will be visible but from a planning point of view RCBC is content that the LVIA is appropriate to the development proposed. RCBC is in agreement with the applicant's detailed assessment of the impact on the heritage asset, Marsh Farm (REP7-010)</p>

<p>NV 3.1 Noise and Vibration</p>	<p>RCBC are in agreement that matters relating to vibration can be appropriately dealt with in the final CEMP.</p>
<p>PPL.3.1 Planning Policy</p>	<p>RCBC are not aware of any new additional local or national policy or guidance which has been issued since the preparation of the Planning Statement in May 2022.</p>
<p>SET.3.1 Socio Economics and Tourism</p>	<p>RCBC can confirm that it is satisfied in respect of the applicant's response provided on the impact of the development on Redcar Town Football Club (REP3-011)</p>
<p>TT.3.1 Traffic and Transport</p>	<p>RCBC would wish to keep its suggested revised specification of a 2-week link count with a Tuesday to Thursday peak period junction turning count, in order to provide a more robust evidence base, 4-week link counts would be preferable. RCBC feel that the applicant's proposal for link counts for one week may not fully reflect conditions on the ground.</p>
<p>TT.3.2 Traffic and Transport</p>	<p>Westgate Roundabout - RCBC understands that two of the approaches are over their effective capacity but are willing to accept this for the duration of the construction period</p> <p>Kirkleatham Lane Signals - The all-red pedestrian phase when this is called is required here for residents' connectivity. RCBC therefore ask that the (suitable) mitigation measures are put in place in the Construction Worker Travel Plan to mitigate the impact of the works on this junction and RCBC would welcome similar mitigation for workers coming from the west via Westgate Roundabout.</p>

**Action 11 Scope
of Requirement
32
Decommissioning**

RCBC do not have any particular concerns in respect of the drafting of requirement 32, the Council notes the submission of a decommissioning application will be made AFTER consultation with the EA and Sembcorp placing the obligation to decide on the need to consult those interests on the applicant.

RCBC do have concerns in respect of requirement 37 (Consultation with Sembcorp Utilities (UK) Limited which places a responsibility on RCBC officers to decide whether any submission in respect of the DCO requirements may impact on the interests of Sembcorp. This places a responsibility on RCBC and requires RCBC officers to make a judgement in this respect. RCBC do not hold records of Sembcorp's land ownership nor does it have detailed knowledge of its operations and so this requirement is considered unreasonable. RCBC suggests that if any of the requirement in the DCO might have an impact on the interests or operation of Sembcorp then consultation should be a procedure set out in individual requirements.

If requirement 37 remains in the draft DCO as drafted, RCBC is concerned that it will either have to arrange to consult Sembcorp on all submissions in respect of the DCO or risk omissions. It may be possible to add an additional layer to its GIS system to ensure that all submissions are subject to standard consultation but this will potentially result in consultation where Sembcorp's interest are not impacted and will add to the administrative burden of the Council.