



Summary Evidence

Sahaviriya Steel Industries PCL
TISCO Bank PCL
Krung Thai Bank PCL
Siam Commercial Bank PCL

REDCAR STEELWORKS SUMMARY PROOF

January 2020

Our Ref: DP/19-02021

Contents

1	Introduction.....	2
2	Site and Surroundings.....	3
3	Planning Policy and Material COnsiderations.....	4
4	Alternative Proposals	5
5	Scheme A - Assessment.....	6
6	Scheme B - Assessment.....	8
7	Conclusions.....	9

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 I am Duncan Parr, a Member of the Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI). My evidence is given on behalf of Tisco Bank Public Company Limited, Krungthai Bank Public Company Limited, Siam Commercial Bank Public Company Limited, collectively known as the “Thai Banks”, and Sahaviriya Steel Industries PCL (SSI PCL). Defined terms are adopted in this Summary Evidence as set out in my full Proof of Evidence.

2 SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The land required for each Scheme, as instructed by my client, is set out fully within my Proof.

ORDER LAND AND USE CLASSES

- 2.2 The SSI Land was used for iron and steel production until 2015 and I therefore consider that it falls within Use Class B2 (General Industry). I consider those parts of the SSI Land which might be considered under another use (such as the office building known as Steel House) to be ancillary to the principal B2 use.
- 2.3 The RBT Land is in use as a port. I consider this to be a Sui Generis planning use.

NATIONALLY SIGNIFICANT DESIGNATIONS

- 2.4 To the northeast of the STDC Area are South Gare and Cotham Sands. They are both part of the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast Special Protection Area (SPA). The STDC Area is within the 6km buffer zone for the SPA.
- 2.5 The north-eastern boundary of the STDC Area is conterminous with the Teesmouth and Cleveland Ramsar site (the 'Ramsar site').

LOCALLY SIGNIFICANT DESIGNATIONS

- 2.6 The STDC Area is within:
- a 30km wind farm safeguarding area;
 - a general location for large waste management facilities; and
 - a minerals safeguarding zones for gypsum and salt.
- 2.7 Both South Gare and Cotham Sands are also locally designated environmental and community assets.

3 PLANNING POLICY AND MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Relevant planning policy documents and material considerations comprise:

- Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan - Adopted May 2018; and
- Tees Valley Joint Minerals & Waste Development Plan Documents;
 - Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD) - Adopted September 2011; and
 - Minerals and Waste Policies and Sites Development Plan Document (DPD) - Adopted September 2011.
- South Tees Area Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) - adopted May 2018; and
- South Tees Regeneration Master Plan - first published for consultation in October 2017, adopted in March 2019, and updated in November 2019.
- National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019); and
- National Planning Practice Guidance (January 2020).

4 ALTERNATIVE PROPOSALS

- 4.1 I have been asked to assess whether there are any obvious reasons why planning permission might be withheld for the development of Schemes A and B.
- 4.2 As set out within my Proof, there are no obvious reasons in planning terms why either Scheme cannot come forward and - where necessary - be granted planning permission.

SCHEME A

- 4.3 Scheme A proposes comprehensive redevelopment across Plots 1, 2 & 3 of the Order Land and the Redcar Bulk Terminal (RBT). My client can deliver the comprehensive and cohesive redevelopment of the North Industrial Zone as identified within the South Tees Regeneration Master Plan.
- 4.4 I am instructed that my client has been in discussions with Jingye regarding the use of the deep-water port to bring in bulk materials to serve the steelworks in Scunthorpe.
- 4.5 An indicative masterplan has been prepared and is included in my Proof. In summary Scheme A proposes:
- Retention and expansion of RBT;
 - A new wharf along the southwest shore of the RBT Land;
 - The north-east section of the site to be use for port-related industry, storage and distribution;
 - The south-east section of the site to be used for Manufacturing / Energy Uses (including the Carbon Capture and Usage project, if it comes forward); and
 - A heritage site on the location of the blast furnace, as per the South Tees Regeneration Master Plan.
- 4.6 The proposed uses for Scheme A would be Sui Generis and/or B2/B8.

SCHEME B

- 4.7 Scheme B proposes the reintroduction of iron and steelmaking to South Tees using existing infrastructure. I am instructed that there is no need for additional development to take place on the land in order to achieve this.

5 SCHEME A - ASSESSMENT

NEED FOR PLANNING PERMISSION

Land Use

5.1 For change of use, permission would be required as follows:

- Sui Generis (port) use on RBT Land would not require planning permission. Port use on Plots 1, 2 & 3 of the Order Land would require planning permission.
- B2 use on the RBT Land would require planning permission, but not on Plots 1, 2 & 3 of the Order Land.
- B8 use on the RBT Land and/or Plots 1, 2 & 3 of the Order Land would require planning permission.

Built Structure

5.2 Permission would be required for built development as anticipated as part of Scheme A.

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

5.3 I have assessed Scheme A against the key strategic policies of the development plan, most specifically Policy LS4 - South Tees Spatial Strategy and Policy ED6 - Economic Growth of the Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan. I consider that the principle of the Scheme is acceptable in planning terms.

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL CONSIDERATIONS

5.4 Development control considerations include *inter alia*:

- Highways and Infrastructure;
- Design;
- Flood Risk & Drainage;
- Ecology and Biodiversity;
- Impact on Amenity;
- Air Quality; and
- Heritage.

5.5 To secure planning permission, Scheme A will need to demonstrate compliance with relevant development control policies within the Development Plan.

5.6 There is, in my view, no obvious reason why planning permission might be withheld for Scheme A on any grounds relating to development control.

OTHER MATERIALLY RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS

5.7 In addition to the policies contained within the Redcar and Cleveland Development Plan, the following are also relevant:

- The South Tees Area Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), adopted May 2018;
- The South Tees Regeneration Master Plan, adopted March 2019 and updated in November 2019; and
- the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), published February 2019, and its associated guidance.

South Tees Area SPD

- 5.8 In my opinion, Scheme A complies with the aims of all materially relevant development principles within the SPD:
- Scheme A seeks comprehensive development, as sought by STDC1 and STDC2;
 - The proposed growth and expansion of the existing port operations meets the objectives of STDC4; and
 - The uses proposed by Scheme A match those sought by STDC11.
- 5.9 There is no obvious reason why planning consent would be withheld on grounds of non-compliance with the SPD.

South Tees Regeneration Master Plan

- 5.10 It is considered that proposals for Scheme A can demonstrate broad compliance with the South Tees Regeneration Master Plan. There is no obvious reason why planning consent would be withheld on grounds of non-compliance with it.

National Planning Policy Framework

- 5.11 I consider that there is general support in the NPPF for Scheme A.
- 5.12 There is no obvious reason why planning consent would be withheld on grounds of non-compliance with the NPPF.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

- 5.13 There is no obvious reason why planning permission would be withheld in respect of Scheme A.

6 SCHEME B - ASSESSMENT

NEED FOR PLANNING PERMISSION

- 6.1 Scheme B is for the reinstatement of iron and steelmaking on the SSI Land.

Land Use

- 6.2 The Scheme B Land was previously used for iron and steelmaking. I have no reason to believe that this use (Use Class B2) was unlawful at the time that iron and steelmaking was last taking place.

- 6.3 I do not consider the site's use to have been abandoned, and therefore consider the B2 use of the site to be existing and lawful. The lawful re-commencement of such a use would not require planning permission.

Built Structure

- 6.4 I am instructed that iron and steelmaking can take place on the site without the need for additional built structure. As such planning permission would not be required in this regard.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

- 6.5 I do not consider, for the reasons set out above, that planning permission would be required to allow for the recommencement of iron and steelmaking on the site.

7

CONCLUSIONS

7.1 For the reasons set out above:

- I do not consider there to be any obvious reason why planning permission would be withheld for the delivery of Scheme A;
- I do not consider that planning permission is required in order to lawfully recommence iron and steelmaking operations on the Scheme B Land.