

**PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

A meeting of the Planning and Development Committee was held on 12 August 2016.

**PRESENT:** Councillors J G Cole (Chair); S E Bloundele (Vice-Chair); P Cox, J Hobson, L Lewis (As Substitute), F McIntyre, P Purvis and M Walters

**OFFICERS:** B Carr and P Clarke

**APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE** Councillor J Blyth, Councillor L McGloin.

**DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS**

There were no Declarations of Interest made by Members at this point of the meeting.

**1 MINUTES - PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE - 22 JULY 2016**

The minutes of the Planning and Development Committee meeting held on 22 July 2016 were taken as read and approved as a correct record.

**2 SCHEDULE OF THE REMAINING PLANNING APPLICATIONS TO BE CONSIDERED BY COMMITTEE**

The Head of Planning submitted plans deposited as applications to develop land under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the Head of Planning reported thereon.

**SUSPENSION OF COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE NO 5 - ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**ORDERED** that, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule No 5, the Committee agreed to vary the order of business.

**ORDERED** that the following applications be determined as shown:

**M/FP/0692/16/P - Residential development comprising 51 no. two-storey dwellings with associated works (access and landscaping) and demolition of existing buildings at former MTLC complex, Cargo Fleet Lane for Gleeson Developments Ltd.**

The Head of Planning advised that the above application had been identified as requiring a site visit by Members of the Planning and Development Committee. Accordingly a site visit had been held on the morning prior to the meeting.

Full details of the planning application, planning history and the plan status were outlined in the report. The report contained a detailed analysis of the application and analysed relevant policies from the National Planning Policy Framework and the Local Development Framework.

The Head of Planning advised that although the Ormesby Table Tennis Club planned to expand in the future, at the current time, no planning application had been submitted, so this could not be taken into consideration when making a decision with regard to the application.

Neighbourhood consultations had taken place and two objections to the application had been received. These included a representation from Ormesby Table Tennis Club and an objection from Councillor Hubbard, the details of which were included within the report. There were no objections to the application received from the statutory consultees. The Secured by Design Officer requested that SBD accreditation should be sought by the developers.

A representative on behalf of Ormesby Table Tennis Club elected to address the Committee in objection to the application. The Head of Planning clarified that the land had been allocated as a housing site on the local plan, and although the Council were exploring options for development with the Ormesby Table Tennis Club, the Council had not received a formal planning application in respect of the land.

A representative on behalf of the applicant advised that he had obtained a copy of the Ormesby Table Tennis Club lease and plan and the plan did include the access road from Cargo Fleet Lane into the club but it did not show the road into the club itself.

**ORDERED** that the application be **Approved on Condition** for the reasons set out in the report.

**16/5034/VAR - Variation of conditions 1,2,5,6 and 10 of permission M/FP/1956/04/P at Land at Acklam Green for Mr C Dodds**

Full details of the planning application, planning history and the plan status were outlined in the report. The report contained a detailed analysis of the application and analysed relevant policies from the National Planning Policy Framework and the Local Development Framework.

Neighbourhood consultations had taken place and although a number of residents had called the Planning Officer to express support for the proposed variations to the scheme, no formal comments were received. There were no objections to the application received from the statutory consultees.

The applicant elected to address the Committee in support of the application.

**ORDERED** that the application be **Approved on Condition** for the reasons set out in the report.

**M/FP/0665/16/P - Erection of 5 no. additional units (4127 sqm) for use as either retail (A1), office/financial (A2), restaurant/cafe (A3), drinking establishment (A4), hot food takeaway (A5) and reconfiguration of car park and demolition of Dalby House at Parkway Shopping Centre, Coulby Newham for T Cornford**

Full details of the planning application, planning history and the plan status were outlined in the report. The report contained a detailed analysis of the application and analysed relevant policies from the National Planning Policy Framework and the Local Development Framework.

Neighbourhood consultations had taken place and no objections to the application had been received. There were no objections to the application received from the statutory consultees.

A representative on behalf of the applicant elected to address the Committee in support of the application. Members expressed concern with regard to the following:-

- the proposed loss of 22 car parking spaces from the existing car park;
- the request to extend the start date for the development from three years to five years;
- condition no 10 which specified that a change to any use permitted by the planning permission is permitted for the first ten years of the proposed development, subject to compliance with the remaining conditions attached to this planning permission.

The representative of the applicant requested Members to defer the application to provide the applicant with the opportunity to work with the planning officers to attempt to revise the application.

**ORDERED** that the application be **Deferred** to provide the applicant with the opportunity to work with the planning officers to attempt to revise the application.

**M/OUT/0772/16/P - Outline Residential Development at Land to rear of Pineda Close for Middlesbrough Council**

The Head of Planning advised that the above application had been identified as requiring a site visit by Members of the Planning and Development Committee. Accordingly a site visit had been held on the morning prior to the meeting.

Full details of the planning application and the plan status were outlined in the report. The

report contained a detailed analysis of the application and analysed relevant policies from the National Planning Policy Framework and the Local Development Framework. The Head of Planning pointed out that the approximate size of the site was 0.42 hectares.

Neighbourhood consultations had taken place and objections had been received from the occupiers of 4 and 6 Pineda Close and 114 and 116 Low Lane, the details of which were included in the report. There were no objections to the application received from the statutory consultees.

The Head of Planning advised that as the access road was not suitable for emergency vehicles to access, there was a requirement for the proposed new dwellings to have sprinklers installed but this would be dealt with via building regulations.

**ORDERED** that the application be **Refused** for the following reasons:

The application is unacceptable due to the access road which is considered to be hazardous as a result of its inadequate width and excessive length, and therefore is unable to accommodate the likely traffic generation from the proposed development in conflict with Policy DC1 (test d) General Development of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy.

#### REASON FOR REFUSAL

Planning permission was refused for the development because it is not in accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 or the policies of the Middlesbrough Development Plan set out below or all material considerations, including Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) and the particular circumstances summarised below:-

#### DC1 - General development

In reaching this decision the Planning and Development Committee were mindful of the particular circumstances of this application, namely that having carried out a Committee site visit Members were fully conversant with the proposed development, the access point on Low Lane, and the configuration of the application site and the details of the neighbouring properties. Having done so, Members considered that the access road to the development to be inadequate to accommodate the vehicle traffic generated by the proposed dwellings. Members therefore rejected the application.

### 3 **APPLICATIONS APPROVED BY THE HEAD OF PLANNING**

The Head of Planning submitted details of planning applications which had been approved to date in accordance with the delegated authority granted to him at Minute No 187 (29 September 1992).

#### **NOTED**