Delegated Report

Reference:	19/00729/FUL	
Application Type:	Full Application	
Ward:	Chalkwell	
Proposal:	Erect street furniture comprising of groups of poles (usually two) between which is suspended, at high level, a wire to designate the perimeter of a nominated Eruv (An Eruv is a continuous boundary designated in accordance with Jewish Law) minor re-routing and re-positioning to the following previous locations 4A, 4B, 4C, 4D, 15-18 and 31 approved under planning permission 17/01263/FUL dated 03.10.2018	
Address:	Westcliff Eruv, Finchley Road, Westcliff-On-Sea	
Applicant:	Westcliff Jewish Association	
Agent:	Daniel Rosenfelder of Rosenfelder Associates	
Consultation Expiry:	24th October 2019	
Expiry Date:	8th November 2019	
Case Officer:	Janine Rowley	
Plan Nos:	911.002 Revision E; 911.4A; 911.4B Revision A; 911_51; 911.15 Revision A; 911.16 Revision A; 911.17 Revision A; 911.18 Revision A; 911.31 Revision A; 911.4C	
Recommendation:	**GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to conditions**	

WESTCLIFF ERUV - LOCATIONS SITE PLAN (NTS)

XX INDICATES REVISED LOCATIONS
APPLICATION REF 19/00729/FUL REFERS

DRAWING REF: 911.002 Rev'n E

ROSENFELDER ASSOCIATES
Chartered Architects + Planning Consultants
10-12 Perrins Court Hampstead LONDON NW3 (020) 7794 4425

1 Site and Surroundings

1.1 The application relates to eight specific locations described below, which would form part of the succession of individual placements of street furniture granted planning permission in October 2018 (17/01263/FUL). The Eruv is made up of existing features such as walls and buildings, and only where there are no features enabling continuity are specific items of street furniture required, such as those proposed. In association with designation of a nominated Eruv which is a continuous boundary designated in accordance with Jewish Law. That succession of street furniture placements to support the perimeter of a continuous Eruv boundary is predominantly focused on Westcliff but extends beyond into parts of Chalkwell, Leigh and Southend.

1.2 Location 4a at Station Road crosses at the railway from outside 114-116 Station Road to the south and to the southern fence bounding the railway. The location is characterised by commercial uses to the ground floor of properties along the south part of Station Road and residential units above. To the east of the site are further residential properties.

1.3 Location 4b is situated outside of no. 25 and 48 Holland Road. The Leas Conservation Area is further to the south beyond no. 48. The surrounding area is characterised by two storey dwellinghouses to the east and west and large flat developments to the southeast and southwest of Holland Road including (Homecove House) and Crowstone Court.

1.4 Location 4c at Station Road crosses from 130/132 to the south to the fourth pier of the railway wall to the north. The surrounding area is characterised by three storey and two storey properties which are predominantly residential with a commercial unit to the ground floor directly opposite the railway bridge. Westcliff Station is to the west.

1.5 Location 15A on Darlinghurst Grove crosses from the southern boundary of the Prittlebrook Greenway to the rear fence line of no. 18 Manchester Drive. The surrounding area is residential in character.

1.6 Location 16A is located to the eastern boundary of no. 2 Manchester Drive and the north playing fields serving Westcliff High School. The site is residential in character.

1.7 Location 17 crossing Kenilworth Gardens has schools to the north and south of the site within a residential area.

1.8 Location 18 situated on Mannering Gardens is surrounded by two storey residential properties to the south of the site and commercial premises to the north.

1.9 Location 31 along East Street is situated to the east and west of the railway bridge to its north and south sides. The Prittlewell Conservation Area boundary is set 1m away from the railway bridge to the south and 7m to the north.

1.10 Other than as described above, there are no heritage or other such designations on or in the vicinity of the site locations referred to above.

2 The Proposal

2.1 Detailed assessment of site circumstances following approval of planning application 17/01263/FUL, has prompted this application for detailed changes to the street furniture at some previously agreed locations plus some replacement locations.

2.2 Street furniture associated with designation of the Eruv perimeter boundary was granted planning permission (17/01263/FUL) at 40 locations, which are listed in the report at appendix 1. It is only this physical street furniture that required planning permission (as opposed to for example the concept and purpose of the Eruv). No markings or religious iconography are proposed to be fixed to the street furniture in association with the Eruv. This planning application solely relates to the eight locations described in paragraphs 1.2 to 1.9 above. In each of the following cases the proposed poles are 89mm diameter.

2.4 The previously approved locations (under planning permission 17/01263/FUL) for 4A, 4B and 4C were: sited on footpath next to the railway cutting next to Leonard Road crossing to the footpath next to 2 Hamlet Court Road; the footpath next to 20 and 22 Hamlet Court Road crossing to the ramped approach to Hamlet Court Road railway bridge (3 no. 5.5m poles with connecting wire); and use of the existing lamp post on the corner of Hamlet Court Road and Ditton Court Road. The locations 4A, 4B and 4C now proposed are as follows: 4A on the footpath outside of 114-116 Station Road to the south and southern fence of the railway to the north (2no. 5.5m high poles with connecting wire).

- 4B 25-48 Holland Road (a clear nylon wire to be fixed to a small white eyelet to the front of 25 Holland Road at 5.5m extending to a matching eyelet fixed to the front of 48 Holland Road.

- 4C at 130-132 Station Road party wall to the fourth pier of the railway adjacent to Hamlet Court Road (2no. 5.5m high poles with connecting wire).

2.5 Location 15 approved application 17/01263/FUL has been relocated together with amended poles heights. Previously location 15 was sited next to 69 Darlinghurst Grove crossing to footpath next to 73 Darlinghurst Grove (2 no. 3.5m high poles with connecting wire). Location 15A) is now proposed along the footpath next to 69 Darlinghurst Grove crossing to rear fence of no. 18 Manchester Drive (2 no. 5.5m high poles with connecting wire).

2.6 Location 16 approved under application 17/01263/FUL has been relocated from the footpath outside 34 and 36 Manchester Drive crossing to footpath opposite at Admiral Court Manchester Drive (2 no. 5.5m high poles with connecting wire). Location 16A) Footpath outside 2 Manchester Drive east flank concrete end fence post to footpath opposite adjacent to the school playing fields railing directly behind the telegraph pole opposite (2 no. 5.5m high poles with connecting wire).

2.7 Location 17 approved under application 17/01263/FUL has been relocated to location 17A footpath next to Westcliff High School for Girls on the south side of Kenilworth Gardens left of St Thomas Moore to the north (2no. 5.5m high poles with connecting wire and a 400mm x 800mm galvanised sheet to the central reservation).

2.8 Location 18 approved under application 17/01263/FUL is still the same although now numbered 18A however, the poles have increased in height from 3.5m to 5.5m. Location 18A footpath next to 61 Mannering Gardens crossing to footpath next to rendered brick wall between 56 Mannering Gardens and 60 Bridgewater Drive (2 no. 5.5m high poles with connecting wire).

2.9 Location 31 approved under application 17/01263/FUL has been amended moving further west away from the railway. Previously the location was on the footpath next to East Street Railway Bridge crossing opposite to the footpath on north of East Street (2no 5.5m high poles with connecting wire). Location 31A) is proposed on the footpath next to East Street Railway Bridge west of the pedestrian guard rail to the south adjacent to the fence at the rear of the footpath to the north (2 no. 5.5m high poles with connecting wire).

3 Relevant Planning History

3.1 19/00978/FUL- Erect street furniture comprising of an ornamental metal arch to designate the perimeter of a nominated Eruv (An Eruv is a continuous boundary designated in accordance with Jewish Law) at location 18A -Footpath between 38/46 Bridgwater Drive and location 21A - Footpath between 157/159 Carlingford Drive- Pending consideration.

3.2 17/01263/FUL- Erect street furniture comprising groups of poles (usually two) between which is suspended, at high level, a wire to designate the perimeter of a nominated Eruv (An Eruv is a continuous boundary designated in accordance with Jewish Law) at various locations around the borough- Planning Permission Granted (03.10.2018)

4 Representation Summary

4.1 Public Consultation

Site notices were posted at the 8 locations subject of this application. Letters of objections were received from 11 households which in summary object to the proposal on the following:

- Two 3.5m high poles walking down Holland Steps will change the view of the sea and the estuary;
- All these poles have to be linked up in a circuit so it is not clear where the other poles are going to go;
- Inappropriate to erect religious barriers;
- Poles and copper wires at Station Road are out of character
- It is environmentally unfriendly
- Holland Road is a cul de sac and attractive street
- Description of poles in Holland Road incorrect given it is a clear nylon wire to the front of 25 and 48 Holland Road 5.5m above street level
- Impact on birdlife
- Queries of installation and maintenance costs
- Impact on setting of Holland Road and steps
- Impact on views
- Conflict with development plan policies
- Conflict with Streetscape manual
- Extent of consultation
- Symbolic creation of a ghetto
- An Eruv is unnecessary and unacceptable
- Design unacceptable
- One sector of the community to create a visible boundary in any shape or form is wrong
- No need for further street clutter
- Westcliff on Sea is multi cultured and multi religious and for one small group to impose their culture in such a way on the majority is wrong

Conservation Association Westcliff Seaboard

- Object as the proposal would deface the streetscape of the immediate area in Westcliff and affect the Leas Conservation Area
- Conflicts with Councils policies contained within the Development Management Document, Borough Local Plan, National Planning Policy Framework

During the course of the planning application location 4B has been amended omitting the previously proposed poles and connecting wire from the steps between Holland Road and Western Esplanade to a connecting wire set 5.5m above street level connected by a eyelet on no. 25 and 48 Holland Road. The concerns in the above representations are noted and they have been taken into account in the assessment of the application. However, they are not found to represent a reasonable basis to refuse planning permission in the circumstances of this case.

4.2 **Highways Team**
No objections.

4.3 **Network Rail**
No objections

5 Planning Policy Summary

5.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019)

5.2 Core Strategy (2007) Policies KP1 (Spatial Strategy), KP2 (Development Principles), KP3 (Implementation and Resources), CP3 (Transport and Accessibility), CP4 (The Environment and Urban Renaissance), CP6 (Community Infrastructure), CP7 (Sport, Recreation and Greenspace)

5.3 Development Management Document (2015) Policies DM1 (Design Quality), DM3 (Efficient and Effective Use of Land), DM5 (Southend on Sea's Historic Environment), DM15 (Sustainable Transport Management)

5.4 Design & Townscape Guide (2009)

5.5 The Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule (2015)

6 Planning Considerations

6.1 The principle of supporting the installation of a succession of street furniture for the associated purpose of designating an Eruv perimeter and the equalities and diversity considerations related to this were agreed under planning permission 17/01263/FUL. The National Planning Policy Framework has been revised since determination of the above application but the relevant policy considerations have not changed in any material regard.

6.2 The main considerations in the determination of this application are design and impact on the streetscene, access, traffic and highways and impact on residential amenity and the proposals equalities and diversity considerations.

7 Appraisal

Design and Impact on the Character of the Area

7.1 The National Planning Policy Framework requires new development to reinforce local distinctiveness. Policy KP2 and CP4 of the Core Strategy, Policies DM1 and DM3 and the Design and Townscape Guide advocate the need for any new development to respect the character of the area and complement the local character.

7.2 Policy DM1 of the Development Management Document requires all development to be appropriate in its setting by respecting neighbouring development and existing residential amenities *"having regard to privacy, overlooking, outlook, noise and disturbance, sense of enclosure/overbearing relationship, pollution, daylight and sunlight."*

7.3 Policy DM3 of the Development Management Document states:

"The Council will seek to support development that is well designed and that seeks to optimise the use of land in a sustainable manner that responds positively to local context and does not lead to over-intensification, which would result in undue stress on local services, and infrastructure, including transport capacity".

7.4 Policy DM5 of the Development Management Document states that all development proposals that affect a heritage asset will be required to demonstrate the proposal will continue to conserve and enhance its historic and architectural character, setting and townscape value. In relation to development within Conservation Areas in particular, Policy DM5 states that:

"Development proposals that are demonstrated to result in less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset will be weighed against the impact on the significance of the asset and the public benefits of the proposal and will be resisted where there is no clear and convincing justification for this."

7.5 Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that the Council pays 'special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas when considering planning applications.' Impacts on the settings of such heritage assets must also be carefully considered under this legislation.

Site 4- Footpath along Station Road outside of 114-116 to the southern fence of the railway to the north (4A), (4B) a clear nylon wire to be fixed to a small white eyelet to the front of 25 Holland Road at 5.5m above street level to a matching eyelet fixed to the front of 48 Holland Road, Station Road (4C) and Hamlet Court Road (2no. 5.5m high poles with connecting wire).

7.6 Two sets of 5.5m high poles and connecting wire are proposed along Station Road one set to the east outside of nos. 114-116 to the southern fence of the railway to the north and another set from the party wall of 130-132 Station Road to the north fourth pier on the railway below Hamlet Court Road. As an amendment to the application as originally submitted a clear nylon wire is now proposed to be fixed to a small white eyelet to the front of 25 Holland Road at 5.5m above street level to a matching eyelet fixed to the front of 48 Holland Road.

7.7 The design and siting of the proposed poles and wire are found to be acceptable. The poles and wire in Station Road and connecting nylon wire to the front of 25 Holland Road and 48 Holland Road would not impact adversely on the character and appearance of the area.

15A) Footpath next to 69 Darlinghurst Grove crossing to rear fence of no. 18 Manchester Drive (2 no. 5.5m high poles with connecting wire)

7.8 The proposed poles would be situated on Darlinghurst Grove to the northern boundary of no. 69 and southern boundary of no. 18 Manchester Drive to the north.

7.9 The design and siting of the proposed poles and wire is found to be acceptable. The poles and wire would not impact adversely on the character and appearance of the area.

16A) Footpath outside 2 Manchester Drive east flank concrete end fence post to footpath opposite adjacent to the school playing fields railing directly behind the telegraph pole opposite (2 no. 5.5m high poles with connecting wire)

7.10 The proposed poles would be located to the east of no. 2 Manchester Drive and directly opposite to the north near the railing for Westcliff High School.

7.11 The design and siting of the proposed poles and wire is found to be acceptable. The poles and wire would not impact adversely on the character and appearance of the area.

17A) Footpath next to Westcliff High School for Girls on the south side of Kenilworth Gardens left of St Thomas Moore to the north (2no. 5.5m high poles with connecting wire and a 400mm x 800mm galvanised sheet to the central reservation)

7.12 Two 5.5m high poles are to be erected to the southwest of St Thomas More High School and north of Westcliff High School for Boys with a connecting wire between. A 400mm x 800mm high steel sheet is also proposed to match railings within the central reservation pedestrian guard rails under the line of wire.

7.13 The design and siting of the proposed poles, associated structures and wire is found to be acceptable. The poles and wire would not impact adversely on the character, appearance of the surrounding area. Details of the steel sheet to the central reservation can be controlled by condition to ensure the design is acceptable in relation to the impact on the character and appearance of the area.

18A) Footpath next to 61 Mannering Gardens crossing to footpath next to rendered brick wall between 56 Mannering Gardens and 60 Bridgewater Drive (2 no. 5.5m high poles with connecting wire)

7.14 5.5m high poles would be situated on either side of the road to the rear of the Spa shop (60 Bridgewater Drive) on the eastern side adjacent to 56 Mannering Gardens and an informal access road to the west north of 61 Mannering Gardens.

7.15 The design and siting of the proposed poles and wire is found to be acceptable.

31A) Footpath next to East Street Railway Bridge west of the pedestrian guard rail to the south adjacent to the fence at the rear of the footpath to the north (2 no. 5.5m high poles with connecting wire).

7.16 The poles are to be situated on the west and east side of Station Approach next to the existing chain link fencing with 2no. 5.5m high poles with connecting wire. The site is near but not within Prittlewell Conservation Area.

7.17 The design and siting of the proposed poles, associated structures and wire is found to be acceptable. The poles and wire would not impact adversely on the character, appearance of the area. Given the nature of existing street furniture and the scale and design of the proposal, it is not considered that any harm would be caused to the character and appearance of the Prittlewell Conservation Area.

Amenity and impact on residents

7.18 The proposed poles are slim line and similar to that of conventional highway street furniture. The height and position of the poles and nylon wire would not appear overly prominent and not result in material harm to the light, outlook, privacy or sense of enclosure of neighbouring properties.

7.19 The small white eyelets to nos. 25 and 48 Holland Road joined by nylon wire by reason of their siting 5.5m above street level would not result in material harm to the light, outlook, privacy or sense of enclosure of neighbouring properties.

7.20 The siting and size of the steel sheets to the central reservation of Kenilworth Gardens would be set a significant distance away from any residents (some 38m from 103 Eastwood Boulevard) and its relationship is such that it would not result in material harm to the light, outlook, privacy or sense of enclosure of the neighbouring properties.

7.21 Due to the location of the proposed street furniture it is not considered amenity of nearby residents are materially affected in any regard.

7.22 The development is acceptable and policy compliant in the above regard at all sites proposed.

Biodiversity

7.23 The locations proposed for the Eruv street furniture have no ecological designations. Taking into account the siting of the street furniture on the rear edge of footpaths and street furniture in the form of lamp posts, it is considered that the impact on ecology is negligible. None of the locations are sited within statutory nature conservation sites, sites of special scientific interest, local wildlife site nor sites known to be containing protected species.

Highways and access

7.24 The siting of the poles, nylon wire to the various locations set out above, steel sheets to central reservation of Kenilworth Gardens and the white eyelets to 25 and 48 Holland Road would not harm highway safety or access and Highways raise no objection to the proposal.

7.25 The development is acceptable and policy compliant in the above regard.

Equalities and Diversity

7.26 The report to this Committee for the installation of Eruv related street furniture, approved in October 2018, contained a full analysis of the proposals in the context of the Equality Act 2010 which sets out a general duty on public bodies. This duty requires the Council to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination and promote equality with regard to those with protected characteristics, such as race, disability, and gender, including gender reassignment, religion or belief, sex, pregnancy or maternity, and to foster good relations between different groups when discharging its functions.

7.28 This planning application falls to be considered on its planning merits but, given the nature of the application, in reaching its decision the Local Planning Authority must have regard to those provisions of the Equality Act 2010. The Act requires the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate that any decision it makes is reached in a fair, transparent or accountable way considering the needs and rights of different members of the community.

7.29 Like the main street furniture proposals approved in October 2018 this proposal has the potential to generate some negative and positive impacts on groups with the protected characteristics of age, disability, sex, religion or belief. The potential impacts, both positive and negative, of the street furniture proposals on the different groups were identified in the appended report and weighed against each other.

7.30 The street furniture proposed would not prevent walking along the pavement, driving or change the behaviour of any groups who do not currently observe the Sabbath. The development would not change the use of the land nor impose any changes in behaviour on others.

7.31 There would be benefits from the proposals to groups with protected characteristics, including parents and grandparents of young children, the disabled and their families, and the elderly. Officers consider that the benefits to these protected groups would outweigh the potential harm to members of other protected groups.

8 Conclusion

8.1 Having taken all material planning considerations into account, it is found that subject to compliance with the attached conditions, the proposed development would be acceptable and compliant with the objectives of the relevant development plan policies and guidance. The proposal would have an acceptable impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers and the character and appearance of the application site, street scene and the locality more widely. The proposal would not harm highway safety and is acceptable on biodiversity, equalities and diversity grounds. This application is therefore recommended for approval.

Recommendation

9.1 GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the following conditions:

01 This development must be begun within three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

02 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 911.002 Revision E; 911.4A; 911.4B; 911_51; 911.15 Revision A; 911.16 Revision A; 911.17 Revision A; 911.18 Revision A; 911.31 Revision A; 911.4C.

Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the policies in the Development Plan.

03 **In respect of all sites hereby approved, details of the design and colour of the external surfaces of the posts and poles and associated structures plus, in respect of site 17A the detailed location, size and design detail of the steel sheet fixings, shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority and approved in writing prior to the commencement of the development at a particular site. Each individual pole, post or structure hereby approved shall be completed in full accordance with the details approved under this condition within 6 months of the commencement of the implementation of that particular pole, post or structure.**

Reason: To safeguard character and appearance of surrounding area in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), Policies KP2 and CP4 of the Core Strategy (2007) and policies DM1 and DM3 of the Development Management (2015) and the advice contained within the Design and Townscape Guide (2009).

04 **A Construction and Maintenance Strategy, for all works hereby approved on or adjacent to the public highway, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with Local Highway Authority, prior to the commencement of the development. The Construction and Maintenance Strategy submitted shall include details on how the Eruv structure (poles, posts, associated structures and wire) would be constructed and maintained in a manner that would not compromise highway and pedestrian safety or unacceptably impact on movements on the public highway. The development shall be implemented and in full accordance with the approved Construction and Maintenance Strategy and maintained in accordance with this Strategy in perpetuity.**

Reason: In the interests of highway and pedestrian safety and to ensure that disruption to pedestrians and traffic on the road network arising from the development would be kept to a minimum in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) Policies KP2, CP3 and CP4 of the Core Strategy (2007) and Policies DM1, DM3 and DM15 of the Development Management (2015) and the advice contained within the Design and Townscape Guide (2009).

05 **No site works or other works associated with this development shall be commenced before an Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Works Plan, detailing the precautions to be taken to minimise damage to trees within and adjacent the sites and any works to be carried out to trees as part of the implementation of the proposal (where relevant), in accordance with British Standards BS5837:2012 and BS3998:2010, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in full accordance with the Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Works Plan approved under this condition. The approved tree protection measures shall be fully installed before the commencement of works and maintained during construction.**

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure a satisfactory standard of tree protection, pursuant to Core Strategy (2007) Policies KP2 and CP4, Development Management Document (2015) Policies DM1, DM3 and the advice contained in the Design and Townscape Guide (2009).

Informatives:

1 **The erection of the Eruv structures (poles, wires and any other associated works) on the highway would require a Highways Licence under the Highways Act 1980. This Licence would be subject to a number of conditions such as design, use of an approved contractor, indemnity insurance and a bond. If there are problems with any of these matters the licence would not be granted. The Highway Licence covers the proposal in terms of the positions of each pole and will check for any potential concerns, including impacts on clutter, sight lines, obstruction (this would be assessed in relation to all including the needs of disabled people), security and technical specification (including colour of poles and type of wire). The terms of the Licence require weekly inspections for the lifetime of the Eruv and the applicant must submit reports on the outcome of the inspection, any defects identified and actions taken to resolve. The Highways Group also charge an annual fee via the licence to carry out ad hoc inspections to ensure maintenance is being carried out.**

2 **Structures located on a footway or a footpath must allow for a minimum clearance of 1.5 metres for pedestrians. Location of any existing furniture in the vicinity must be taken into consideration to ensure that the minimum clearance required for pedestrians is not compromised.**

3 **The applicant is advised that any structures to be sited within or project over adopted highway will require Licences under the Highways Act 1980 in addition to planning permission. The exact location and details of these structures will be agreed as part of the licensing process. Please note that Licenses under the Highways Act 1980 will be issued for structures located on areas under the Local Authority's responsibility. For structures located in other areas, the applicant should seek an agreement with the land owner. For structures impacting on adjacent boroughs, agreement must be sought from the relevant authorities.**

4 **The applicant is advised that on sites located on traffic sensitive routes, deliveries during the construction period should not take place during restricted hours.**

5 **Any and all works carried out in pursuance of this grant of planning permission will be subject to the duties, obligations and criminal offences contained in the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). Failure to comply with the provisions of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) may result in a criminal prosecution.**

6 **The applicant is advised that they would be fully responsible for the maintenance of the proposed Eruv poles, wire and leci to be placed on the public highway at all times.**

7 **You should be aware that in cases where damage occurs during construction works to the highway in implementing this permission that Council may seek to recover the cost of repairing public highways and footpaths from any party responsible for damaging them. This includes damage carried out when implementing a planning permission or other works to buildings or land. Please take care when carrying out works on or near the public highways and footpaths in the borough.**